All in attendance were asked to sign in before the meeting began.

**Introduction to GSC:**

- Explanation of transition from Graduate Student Union to Graduate Student Council.
- Discussion of partnership that was formed with the Undergraduate Student Voice Association (SVA) with the branches of Academic Affairs and Student Life Councils.
- Introduction of GSC Leadership Board (Art Morrill, Mt. Royal, Stephen Clark, Hoffberger, and Sara Hill, PEM).
- Discussion of the importance and role of Program Representatives. Representatives are to attend each meeting to ensure a full representation and voice is present for each Graduate Program. This allows for students to further interact with each other as well as off-campus and low residency programs.

**Meeting Goals:**

- Develop topics of discussion for the upcoming Town Hall meeting on October 8, 2014 at 2:30 PM.

**Predetermined discussion topics:**

- **2015 Thesis shows:**
  - Comparison of the three show model of 2014 Thesis shows to the proposed model of the two show structure for 2015.
  - Concerns about work that takes up a large amount of space and how that will effect the spacing for not only those students but for all the students included in the show. There would be lack of ample space for installation, properly lit rooms for projection, the combination of different types of works that require drastically different environments, etc.
  - The structure of the 2014 Thesis show is clarified for the 1st year students in attendance.
  - Discussion about how the programs were combined during the 2014 Thesis shows. (Some programs were shown all together in one space and other programs were intermingled with a different program(s) in the same space.) The solution would be to find an organization method that would work for each individual program as well as for every program as a whole throughout each portion of the 2015 Thesis shows.
Attention to previous conversations with Graduate Studies office about the possibility and want (from the students) to hire or bring in a curator or consultant to assist with the organizations of the 2015 shows.

The question is addressed of which aspect would be more beneficial to the 2nd year students: More space for each portion of the show or longer durations of time for each show?

General consensus shows that a longer duration for each show is preferred over shorter durations with larger/more spaces. The ideal solution would be for there to be both longer durations for each show as well as finding more spaces for the shows.

Discussions about what other spaces are available both on campus and off campus. It was expressed that the off campus 2014 shows in the D-Center were some of the “strongest” shows due to the cohesive nature of the space as well as the inter-program organization/curation of the show.

Concerns of the combining of different programs during the 2014 Thesis shows. For example, PEM and Community Arts were both in the galleries of the Studio Center and the shows became opposing forces of certain works needing a quiet environment and specific lighting to view the work being placed next to work that involved loud music, public activity, or extreme lighting.

Also, concerns about the “emptiness” of the shows last year specifically in Fox 3 gallery.

Questions about and explanations of who decides show placement. For the 2014 shows the spaces were selected by each individual student. For the 2015 shows meetings are being held with the 2nd year students of each program to discuss program grouping as well as program placing and gallery selection. These decisions will be inter-program decisions based on the 2nd year students and the program director.

It is suggested that further discussion of the 2015 Thesis shows be continued in the upcoming meetings with Grad Studies that will be dedicated solely to this purpose.

**GradEx:**

The main concern for the topic of GradEx is the amount of available exhibition space as well as funding for exhibitions.

Explanation of GradEx is given to clarify the purpose of the organization for 1st year students. GradEx originated with the SSG Undergraduate group and was later passed on to current graduate students in order to allow more control over the exhibitions.

GradEx has one specific gallery which is the Great White Wall in the Gateway Building. Often, GradEx exhibits on the 4th and 5th floor gallery spaces.

Issues with the Great White Wall include: all work exhibited in this space must be 2D work due to the fact that only one wall is available and there is not room for installations/sculptures/projections/etc.; there is confusion as to the exact location and placement of the Great White Wall; there is no public access to see the show due
to the necessity to swipe and ID card to gain access to the Gateway Building, therefore, public exposure is decreased dramatically.

- Questions arise concerning the specific budget for GradEx and how that relates to exhibitions taking place other than on the Great White Wall as well as the possibility of showing outside of MICA.
- Funding for GradEx can only be applied to shows that are on the Great White Wall. Further, funding is $500 per semester and can only be used for catering for the show openings (does not cover vinyl, promotional material, etc.).
- It is suggested that there could be a possibility for the use of funding outside of the Great White Wall if we present the idea to higher administration with a strong voice from the members of GSC and the graduate student population.
- Explanation of how the budget is decided and by whom. Student Activities decides the budget specifically for the Great White Wall. Grad Studies attempts to pull funds for the exhibitions outside of the Great White Wall. An example is presented of the GradEx sponsored film screening last year.
- Discussion about the possible solution of seeking the underutilized spaces on campus that could be used for exhibitions as well as off-campus. It is then expressed that in order to push forward with this idea of obtaining more space for GradEx that higher administration must see that students are submitting to the proposed shows and wanting to show work; as well as proof that students who do not fit into the category of “work that goes on a wall” do not have as many opportunities to show their work as those who do produce two dimensional work.
- It is expressed that we as a group must work towards specific solutions to these problems before we move forward to higher administration.
- Rebuttal is that we are students do not have a way to physically create more space or override the shows that have been previously booked in each space.
- The next suggestion is that we then look into spaces outside of MICA. In working with the off campus resources, there is also the possibility of collaboration with other institutions, community organizations, etc. This will also further MICA’s community engagement as well as foster student relationships between programs.
- It is encouraged that more students join Lauren Jefferson in the organization and planning of GradEx due to the fact that she is solely heading the organization and would have a stronger voice and more leverage if there were more students working with her.
- It is then suggested that we find a strategic combination of both the Thesis show and GradEx exhibitions issues in order to optimize the opportunities for more space.
- There is a suggestion of proposing to empty public spaces that we might occupy their space and transform it into a gallery space until further notice or change in the use. This then brings up the issues of insurance liabilities for the institution.
A committee is formed to further look into the spaces available on and off campus and work closely with exhibitions. This committee includes Jen Melvin (CP), Ashley (CP), and Heather Braxton (PEM).

The floor is now open for the general forum:

- Security Issue:
  - Questions arise about the recent ID access issues and how Campus Safety might troubleshoot for the issue not to arise in the future.
  - Explanation of how Cristina Goncalves has been working diligently with Campus Safety to resolve the issue. As of now, it has been deemed “a glitch in the system”.
  - How will we deal with this situation if it arises again? Can Campus Safety provide a better solution if this were to happen again in the future?
  - Discussion about the conversation at Town Hall last year concerning ID access. Students were losing and gaining access throughout the semester and especially at the beginning and end of each semester. Also, students were gaining access to spaces that they should not have access to such as Grad Studies Office, other program studio spaces, Grad Lab Checkout, etc. The issue was never resolved.
  - The issue of the general attitude of Campus Safety is brought up. While trying to resolve ID issues, as well as during the time period where grad students had no ID access, Campus Safety was said to be very abrasive, rude, or completely ignored the issue.
  - The issue of ID access even extended off campus to MICA Place. Students did not have access to their studio, residential, or academic spaces. When they tried to address the issue they were passed back and forth between Campus Safety and Student Housing but neither were able to resolve the issue. When they contacted Campus Safety, as they were instructed to, in order to gain access to their spaces they were very often ignored, delayed, or received help but with much apprehension from Campus Safety. This still remains an issue, as their access is very inconsistent day to day.
  - It is expressed that since the opening of the 1801 building that the students who occupy that portion of the building have had very similar issues. For example, Rinehart is completely unsecure and anyone can access the space, which includes personal studios, equipment, etc. This presents issues of liability and safety as well as concern by the students who occupy the space.
  - This discussion moves forward to the concern of ample security within the building. With the opening of 1801 there are now twice as many students in the Lazarus Center but still only one security guard for the entire building. The same issue is apparent with MICA Place, as they do not have a security guard on the premises at all. This includes academic spaces as well as residential space.
• It is determined that the main issues are communication from Campus Safety to students, from Campus Safety to faculty and administration, as well as communication between the members of Campus Safety.

• **Handicap access for students with disabilities:**
  - The constant issues with the elevator presents problems for students with disabilities who need access to the higher floors. This goes on to include the issues with the elevator going in and out of commission in the Lazarus Center as well as the elevator in 1801 often becoming stuck.
  - Discussion about entrances and exits for the buildings. In 1801 there is only one exit from the ground floor other than through the Rinehart space and that exit is only accessible by stairs. MICA Place only has handicap access to the basement. The rest of the building is not accessible at all and the studios are on the 2nd and 4th floor. There are no elevators, lifts, or ramps to enter the building. Also, the Dolphin Building does not have elevators, lifts, or ramps.

• **Office of Diversity:**
  - Students would like to conduct a survey through the Office of Diversity pertaining to the minority students at MICA. This would collect some data addressing the barriers that exist for current students as well as alumni in order to improve upon these issues for minority students.
  - Questions concerning the amount of minority students who apply for admission into MICA as well as a discussion of how the ethnicity of students are not known when juries are held within the programs concerning admission.
  - Explanation of how other universities set a benchmark for diversity that is to be reached each year in comparison to the fact that MICA does not have this standard.
  - It is expressed that there is a want for a position in the Office of Diversity to solely help minority students with financial aid, scholarship opportunities, both inside and outside of MICA.
  - It is suggested that a committee be formed in order to further discuss these issues as well as form specific questions and requests to the Office of Diversity. Alanna Purdy (CA) is asked to head this new committee and Kurt Oster (CA) and Elliott Doughtie (Mt. Royal) volunteer to help with the formation of this new committee.

**Meeting Wrap-up:**

- The importance of the position of the program representatives is reinforced. As well as the importance of the opportunity of the Town Hall meeting and the opportunities it presents with higher administration.
- Again, it is expressed how we have more power to achieve our goals as a group rather than individuals.
• Meeting notes will be sent out to all in attendance and everyone will be added to the GSC Forum to further discuss the issue presented today.