

1 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

2
3 April 9, 2019

4
5 Members Present: P. Lanier (MGMT), L. Bourdeau (MODL), H. Chu (CMIX), T. Cline (ARCH), H. Damico
6 (CODI), G. Davis (KNES), F. Del Favero (EDFL), E. Habib (CIVE), K. Hermann-Turner (COUE), D. Khey (CJUS),
7 J. Lemoine (NURS), C. Matherne (MGMT), C. Ratliff (ENGL), C. Roche-Wallace (MUS), H. Stone (EDCI), D.
8 White-Jefferson (NURS), Linda Fairchild (EDFL GRAD)

9
10 Members Absent: S. Duke-Sylvester (BIOL), M. Farmer-Kaiser (ex-officio), C. Lenahan (NURS), M.
11 Mokhtari (PETE), Daniel Odion, (CIVE GRAD), A. Petculescu (PHYS), B. Schubert (GEOL), K. Smith (ARCH),
12 T. Wilson (ACCT), M. Zappi (CHEE)

13
14 P. Lanier called the meeting to order at 2:03pm.

15
16 **Announcements**

17
18 Motion made to accept the March 12, 2019 meeting minutes with corrections. Motion seconded and
19 carried.

20
21 Motion made to accept the applicants to candidacy. Motion seconded and carried.

22
23 **Committee Reports**

24
25 Student Appeals – No report

26
27 Curriculum Committee – H. Stone reported that, in March, the Curriculum Committee reviewed 8 course
28 change forms and that 6 were approved, 2 were recommended for approval with changes, and none
29 were declined. Motion made to accept report. Motion accepted and carried.

30
31 Fellowships Committee – No report.

32
33 Graduate Faculty Membership Committee – Two reports were provided by W. Ferguson, not present.
34 The first report detailed those graduate faculty applications that did not require Committee review as all
35 three independent review entities (College Dean, Department Head, and College Peer Review
36 Committee) were in agreement with recommendation for appointment at the level requested by the
37 individual applicants. The second report detailed those graduate faculty applications that required
38 review by the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee

39
40 The second report noted that of the 30 total graduate faculty applications submitted this cycle, 19
41 required no further review per University policy, and thus recommended appointment to the Graduate
42 Faculty at the membership level applied for by the individual applicants and recommended by their
43 respective colleges. The remaining 11 applications were forwarded to this Committee for further review.

44
45 Of those applications forwarded to the Committee, three were unanimously recommended for
46 appointment to Graduate Faculty membership in accordance with that requested on their applications,
47 under the applicable, respective college criteria and the University Guidelines for Graduate Faculty
48 Membership. One application was recommended for level I membership requested in the application,

1 but was strongly encouraged to reapply as the applicant was identified as exceeding the college criteria
2 for level I membership by the Committee and/or one or more of the three College review entities. Four
3 applications were recommended for appointment at level I membership but with notations of various
4 short- and long-term issues of concern that may have serious future implications for the respective
5 applicant and/or College. Two applications were unanimously recommended for appointment at Level I,
6 a level of membership lower than that they requested in their application, with the encouragement of
7 the Committee to reapply at their earliest opportunity once they are able to satisfy the minimum
8 requirements for the higher, level two membership. Finally, the Committee recommended the denial of
9 one application, as the three College review entities had noted that the applicant was no longer
10 affiliated with the University.

11
12 The Committee, per its charge to include in its report any problems with the process, implementation,
13 and/or interpretation of the University guidelines and/of college criteria, offered the following areas of
14 concern. First, it noted continued concern with absent and late recommendations from the three college
15 peer review entities. Second, it expressed concern that “some recommendations by the various college
16 review entities (Dean, DH, CPRC) were quite short, even somewhat mechanical and/or boiler plate in
17 nature, and thus not very informative suggesting minimal review ... and/or potential lack of attention to
18 detail or content and/or lack of taking the entire exercise seriously.” Third, it noted continued concern
19 about applicants “not being very accurate or clear in the preparation or presentation of their requisite 5-
20 year curriculum vitae (CV) and/or supporting documentation, particularly with respect to lack of
21 attention to temporal clarity/actual dates of activities to be reviewed for this cycle.” Finally, the
22 Committee noted the need for all colleges – but notably the colleges of the Arts, Engineering, and
23 Sciences in this review cycle – to “regularly revisit/re-write their current guidelines to include and/or
24 better clarify desirable, relevant activities and/or increase (decrease) stringency in qualifications that
25 equitably can be applied to and across all relevant College faculty.” With the request that “all College
26 review entities to take their individual roles in the review process more seriously,” it concluded the
27 report by stating that “Graduate Faculty status on this campus, especially given its relatively modest
28 attendant resource benefit at present, should be more meaningful, consistent, transparent, and free
29 from potential gaming.”

30
31 J. Lemoine suggested that the approval process would be smoother if the documents received from the
32 candidates were clearer and if peer-reviewed publications were labeled. C. Roche-Wallace added that it
33 appears that edits to College of the Arts criteria for graduate faculty membership were not correctly
34 carried. There was a general discussion among the Council confirming that faculty were sometimes
35 unclear about how the criteria for graduate faculty applications applied and how their materials should
36 be submitted. P. Lanier suggested that the Council recommend every program review their criteria and
37 clarify what documentation is needed at the college level.

38
39 Motion made to accept the reports and recommendations of the Graduate Faculty Membership
40 Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

41 42 **Old Business**

43
44 **Update from Retention Committee on Exclusion of Financial Hardship Official Leave of Absence Policy**
45 P. Lanier reported that members of the Retention Committee had begun to review development of the
46 policy and that they are preparing a response for the Council. She added that she expected this response
47 from the Retention Committee by the May meeting.

48

1 **Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Student Climate Survey**

2
3 P. Lanier reported that she developed a template for committee members to review and that her
4 research confirmed that many of our peer and aspirant peer universities are doing a climate surveys
5 both at the graduate level and for their institutions as a whole.

6
7 **New Business**

8
9 **Request for Continuation of Dissertation Committee Chair/Membership for Departing Faculty**
10 **Member**

11
12 C. Ratliff presented a request from her to department to allow a faculty member who is leaving the
13 University at the end of the semester to be allowed to serve as committee chair for her finishing
14 students. She added that some are expected to graduate this summer, which would not require much of
15 an extension since the faculty member is resigning in May. For students who are expected to complete
16 their degree in 2019-2020, this faculty member is requesting to remain on the committees only as a
17 member rather than as chair. A motion was made for the faculty member to remain committee chair for
18 the students who are graduating this summer. Motion accepted and carried. J. Lemoine said that for
19 advanced students, it would be beneficial for to retain her as a committee member. A motion was made
20 to allow the departing faculty member remain as a committee member, and count as one of the three
21 required members of the graduate faculty, for students who have advanced and are advancing to
22 candidacy this semester until the completion of the student's program. Motion accepted and carried.

23
24 **Taxes withheld for International Student Funding**

25
26 C. Ratliff reported that a student in her graduate program received GSO funding to attend a conference
27 and was informed by the purchasing office that it was taxable income. D. Khey said that international
28 students are required to have tax withheld in advance while other students have to file their 10-99 on
29 their taxes at the end of the year. Both agreed that other universities have been interpreting the tax law
30 differently. D. Khey said that he will collaborate with the Graduate Student Organization to see what can
31 be changed and improve communication about the taxability of GSO funding awards.

32
33 **Graduate Council Elections**

34
35 P. Lanier reminded the Graduate Council that elections for membership as well as the chair of the
36 Graduate Council will be held in May. She added that she would be happy to fill members in on the
37 requirements of the position if they had any questions.

38
39 Motion made to adjourn at 2:49. Motion seconded and carried.