

Minutes of the Graduate Council
Friday, November 18, 2011 10:00 am

Members Present: Melissa Bingham, John Greany, Robert Krajewski, James Murray, Kasi Periasamy, Tony Sanderfoot, Steven Simpson, Gary Willhite, Carol Angell

Members Absent: Conner Doyle, Katie Josephson,

Members Excused: Gary Gilmore

Consultants Present: Raymond Abhold, Robert Hoar, Charles Martin-Stanley, Bruce May

Consultants Excused: Christine Bakkum

1. Approval of Minutes of 10/28 meeting, MSP
2. Review and approval of RSEL grants
 - a. Approval of awards for all subcommittee-recommended grants. MSP
 - b. Reject award of grant to application not recommended by subcommittee due to a substantially incomplete application. MSP
 - c. Recommend a change to the application form for future grants to add a section to make clear that a Budget Justification is required for a complete application.
3. Requests from Director of Graduate Studies:
 - a. Travel Grant Request for graduate student who requests funding between grant award cycles. Can the Director of Graduate Studies approve this request out of the cycle? Consensus is that the Director can approve these exceptional requests on a case-by-case basis at his discretion. Director may want to adjust the rules in a future meeting
 - b. Graduate Studies Task Force Update – We should look at the list of duties that the Director of Graduate Studies should take on. Are there any that the Council should recommend and bring forward to assign to the Director.
4. Graduate Faculty Status (revisions)
 - a. A Revised form was provided with suggestions from the Director of Graduate Studies. Revision now suggests that status is approved based on the Duties they are approved to perform rather than the title they hold.
 - b. Kasi provided research on comparable Institutions Graduate Status in support of the revised policy and forms.
 - c. More content should be added about limits of Temporary (formerly “Provisional”) Status.
 - d. Some concerns brought forward by Bruce May (CLA) (**Response from Bob in bold**)
 - i. Names of the current titles have inertia in by-laws, digital measures, accreditation that have to be addressed. **By-laws can have their own standards that translate the minimal standards here to the old titles.**
 - ii. Names of current titles have weight behind the titles that makes clearer indications about the graduate faculty status. **Colleges can create their own standards that are stricter than listed here –**

this is trying to minimalist – the lowest requirements that fit all the programs.

- iii. Annual Department Review is spotty and is often not done in many departments, may not be a control on status
- iv. Expected qualifications are controlled by the Departments/Programs, but the application of these standards varies widely across departments. **Yes, departments should set their own standards**
- v. Different colleges may have different standards, and the new plan may dilute the weight of the concept of “Grad Faculty Status”.
- e. Concerns from Ray Abhold (SAH), **Bob’s response in bold**
 - i. We need to address the status of IAS since we have consistently awarded faculty status to IAS.
 - ii. What are the other activities of Graduate Faculty (e.g., Graduate Program Director) that are not included in the 3 listed activities? **Such things are reviewed at the Department/Program and College level, and are not really in the purview of the Council.**
 - iii. The focus on “terminal degree” in the revisions will lead to having many exceptions requested.
 - iv. Maybe just let the Programs/Colleges make their own policies, and then the Graduate Council doesn’t need to get involved. **There are external agencies (Higher Learning Council) that require a campus-wide standard.**
 - v. SAH has the majority of the Grad programs, and this isn’t going to work well. Could work if the other duties are not restricted by the graduate faculty status.
 - vi. Should add internships/Preceptorships type activities to one of the status. **Is part of the 3rd item (“supervising graduate student work”). Should add footnotes that give examples of the “Activities” in the 3rd section**
 - vii. Change chair item to remove requirement for “experience serving on a graduate student committee.”
- f. Concerns from Charles Martin-Stanley (CBA)
 - Needs a closer look at the other non-restricted activities of graduate faculty to be sure that are not covered that may want to be.
- g. Can translate the new plan over to old titles (e.g., 3 checks = “full”, 2 checks = “associate”, etc.) – maybe this happens at the level of each college decides what is the equivalent of “full” on their own.
- h. Why does the Graduate Council even need to approve these titles if the colleges each have their own set of standards? We already require the colleges and programs forward to us their particular standards. We should ask them to send us the Policy that a given college will use and the Council knows the particular criteria applied. We would then approve policy and let the colleges implement their policies, instead of having to approve a given faculty application.
- i. Remove “Departmental review”, and replace with a requirement for the applicant going through the “College Policy Review” instead.

- j. Consensus is that the plan is worth proceeding with, but should be vetted through the colleges and the departments/programs. Need Department signature, but require Departmental Review (if your department has one). Need Dean's signature, but require College-level review (if the college has that level of review).
- k. If we require college level policies that it should be clear that College-level policies apply to members of each college exclusively.

Submitted by Tony Sanderfoot, 11/18/11