

April 14, 2015 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

Members Present: J. Albert, P. Auter, D. Baker, C. Briggs, T. DeNardo, S. France, J. Heels, H. Hurst, A. Khattab, D. Linton, A. Loewy, A. Magidin, D. Olivier, K. Smith, D. Wadsworth, M. Farmer-Kaiser (ex-officio member)

Members Absent: D. Bellar, R. Cheek, J. Davis-McElligatt, W. Ferguson, G. Gjertson, D. Harrington, R. Hernandez, A. Lakhotia, S. McInerny, S. Ritchey, M. Wright

Guest Present: Michele Feist

The meeting was called to order by D. Linton at 2:10 p.m.

Announcements:

The Council accepted a friendly amendment to correct the attendance in the minutes of the March 10, 2015 meeting to reflect the presence of A. Lakhotia. It then voted to approve the minutes as amended.

The list of degree candidates was presented and accepted by the Council.

The calendar of events for Graduate Student Appreciate Week was presented as informational material.

Linton announced the Annual Meeting of the Graduate Faculty would be held Wednesday, May 6th at 1:00pm. Location to be announced.

Linton asked to reorder the agenda and have the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee report first as Dr. Michele Feist was present to present the report. A motion was made, seconded, and passed.

Committee Reports:

M. Feist presented the report of the Committee on Graduate Faculty Membership. In the Spring 2015 review cycle, a total of twenty-eight applications for membership on the Graduate Faculty were received. Of the twenty-eight applications received, twenty applications (7 applications for appointment at Level 1 and 13 applications for appointment at Level 2) did not require review by the Committee as per the University policy. The Committee thus reviewed eight applications (1 application for appointment at Level 1 and 7 applications for appointment at Level 2). The Committee unanimously recommended appointment for three applicants requesting Level 2 appointments and the 1 applicant requesting appointment at Level 1; recommended for appointment three additional applicants requesting appointment at Level 2 with a majority vote; and recommended denial of appointment for one applicant requesting Level 2 membership with three votes for denial and 4 abstentions. In addition to providing recommendations on these applications for membership on the Graduate Faculty, the Committee reported that it debated three issues of importance to the review process: the definition and treatment of “in-press”

publications, the need for the individual colleges to revisit and to update their college criteria to eliminate vagueness and to clarify expectations for continuing scholarly and professional engagement, and (though not addressed in the written report) the absence of criteria to evaluate applications from researchers who are formally affiliated with the University but who do not have formal, full-time, and/or tenure-track faculty appointments. The Committee asked the Council to address these concerns in the University policy and/or to ask the individual colleges to do so in their individual college criteria revisions. P. Auter indicated that the College of Liberal Arts had met recently to review and to update its criteria. M. Farmer-Kaiser indicated that she had asked the Deans of the individual colleges to work to update their individual college criteria with the changes to the University policy in mind. D. Olivier asked if information can be provided to the colleges to help them identify perceived problems with their criteria. M. Farmer-Kaiser indicated her willingness to meet with the individual colleges regarding updating their criteria. M. Feist indicated her belief that until these issues are addressed, they should remain in the Committee's reports. All agreed. Finally, the Committee reported that it continues to support the practice of forwarding for its review all application that lack any (or any part of a) recommendation from the three college review entities as well as any that result in college recommendations that disagree on the level of appointment and/or recommend denial of appointment.

M. Farmer-Kaiser asked for clarification with regard to the University policy that reads in one part that "the Dean of the Graduate School and the chairperson of the Committee on Graduate Faculty Membership shall review *all of the applications* along with the college recommendations and forward applications that require review *as specified* ... to the Committee on Graduate Faculty Membership for review" but in another part specifies that this Committee review applications "only when any one of these aforementioned academic college entities (1) recommends denial of membership to the Graduate Faculty, (2) recommends appointment at a different level than applied for by the faculty member, and/or (3) offers recommendations that are inconsistent in any way or absent" (emphasis added). Do the Chair of this Committee and the Dean of the Graduate School have the ability to forward to the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee an application even if there is unanimity in the recommendations from the three college review? M. Feist and M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that this question arose during this review cycle as they reviewed the applications and accompanying recommendations and thus asked that the Council clarify this procedural question. A. Loewy and D. Olivier voiced support for the ability to send these applications to the Committee for additional review, indicating that if the policy gives the authority to review *all applications* then it also gives the authority to ask for additional review. A. Magidin and S. France disagreed and insisted that process is administrative only, with a surface review being required to determine if the recommendations from each of the three college review entities (Dean, Department Head and CPRC) do indeed match. M. Feist indicated there needed to be clarity in the policy as such ambiguity causes problems in implementation of the policy. A motion was made to accept the committee's report and then continue the discussion in Old Business. Motion seconded and passed.

As M. Feist would soon have to leave for class, the Council addressed the working description of the Committee on Graduate Faculty Membership for inclusion in the Graduate Council Handbook and the Faculty Handbook. H. Hurst presented the recommendations from the ad hoc committee. She explained the changes to the committee description that were prompted by the

changes made by the Council to the University policy over the past year (resulting from the recommendations of the University Task Force on Graduate Education Governance) and other changes proposed in the document. Discussion quickly turned to the purpose of the committee description and whether it should duplicate the policy. All agreed that the committee description should not duplicate the policy but rather should address the policy only as it defined the committee's purpose and role in the review process. As such, a motion was made to delete the last sentence and the entire paragraph two that repeated the policy and did not relate to the functions of the committee. Motion seconded and passed. Motion made to add a statement with regard to the committee chairperson's individual responsibility to review, with the Dean of the Graduate School, the applications for appointment to the Graduate Faculty. Motion seconded and passed. Motion made to change bulletin point three to revise the wording to be in line with the policy and to conclude with the phrase "recommendations that are inconsistent in any way or absent." Motion seconded and passed. Motion made to require the committee to offer reasons to justify a recommendation for appointment at a different level than that which the applicant applied (as is required for a recommendation to deny an appointment). Motion seconded and passed. Discussion then turned to the question of whether the committee should play an advisory role or has the ability to approve (and thus to disapprove) the criteria set by the individual colleges. The Council discussed the intent of both the recommendations of the University Task Force on Graduate Education Governance and the current University policy on this issue. Agreement was that the committee should advise the Council on problems evident with regard to implementation of college criteria and/or conflict with procedures defined by the University policy but that it does not play a formal advisory or approval role over the college criteria. Motion thus made to delete paragraphs addressing the college criteria and to replace them with the following: "Upon completion of each review cycle, the committee shall include in its report to the Council any problems with the process, implementation, and/or interpretation of the University policy and/or the individual colleges' criteria." Motion seconded and passed.

As part of its review of this particular committee description, the Council also reviewed recommendations made in past reports of the Committee on Graduate Faculty Membership to ensure full consideration. From the report dated November 10, 2014, the Council agreed that it had, in fact, already addressed recommendation 1 (that all entities be reminded that, for the new review process to work, all review entities must provide a complete justification for the recommendation being made); the Council agreed that recommendation 3 (that the policy more clearly address whether non-tenure line/non-continuing faculty qualify for membership) required more discussion and that it should be a priority for consideration in the coming academic year; the Council noted also that recommendation 7 (that requested criteria/benchmarks for measuring the ability "to work constructively" with graduate students) is still in need of consideration. From the report dated April 7, 2014, the Council reviewed recommendation 1 (requesting that the committee be a part of the review and approval process of college criteria) and decided that the decisions made today had addressed the request; confirmed that recommendation 2 (asking for standardized terms of appointment) had been addressed and corrected in recent revisions to the University policy; recommendation 3 (requesting committee review of all applications) was no longer relevant as both the Council and the committee believe the new process implemented for reviewing applications seems to be working well; recommendation 4 (requesting that each college peer review committee shall include one member of this committee) has been addressed in the revised University policy and will become part of the review process in the upcoming

academic year; recommendation 5 (requesting that membership entail a “tangible award, administered and awarded by the Graduate School”) was set aside as accomplishable at the present time; recommendation 6 (requesting that Level 2 membership be “included as a prerequisite for membership on the Graduate Council”) was rejected; and recommendation 7 (requesting that the committee membership include two members from each college and that quorum for its meetings require the presence of at least one member from each college) has been partially addressed with the recent changes to the University policy and committee description. H. Hurst then moved to place discussion of Graduate Faculty membership levels on the agenda for the Council’s first meeting in Fall 2015. M. Farmer-Kaiser proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to call for the Council, over the next academic year, to fully review the issue of Level 1 and Level 2 memberships on the Graduate Faculty and to make any resultant recommendations for change to the University policy for implementation in 2016-2017. Friendly amendment accepted. Motion seconded and passed. Motion made to make revisions to the working committee description document as discussed and to bring it back to the next Council meeting for approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Upon completion of its discussion of the description of the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee, the Council returned to this Committee’s report and recommendations for appointment. The Council first reviewed the Committee’s recommendation that called for denial of appointment to the Graduate Faculty. The Committee report indicated much debate over the application and division in the final vote (with only 7 members participating and 3 members voting to deny and 4 members choosing to abstain from the vote). After much discussion by the Council and a review of the applicant’s CV, the recommendations provided by the college review entities, the Committee’s recommendation, and the University policy and college criteria, a motion was made to grant this applicant a special appointment to the Graduate Faculty at Level 2. Motion seconded and passed (with one abstention). The Council then turned to review the Committee’s recommendation for appointment of one applicant at Level 2 when two recommendations from the three college review entities had recommended appointment at Level 1. After much discussion by the Council and a review of the applicant’s CV, the recommendations provided by the college review entities, the Committee’s recommendation, and the University policy and college criteria, a motion was made to grant this applicant appointment to the Graduate Faculty at Level 1. Motion seconded and passed (with two votes against). The Council approved the other six appointments to the Graduate Faculty as recommended by the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee. The Council approved the recommendations for appointment that did not require review of the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee as recommended by the college review entities. Finally, D. Baker reiterated the recommendation that we ask the next Council and the individual colleges (as they review and revise their individual criteria) to address the questions surrounding appointment to the Graduate Faculty of researchers who are formally affiliated with the University but who do not have formal, full-time, and/or tenure-track faculty appointments.

The Council returned to Committee Reports.

Student Appeals Committee: No report.

Curriculum Committee: Report submitted in writing by S. Ritchey. Report was accepted by the Graduate Council.

Fellowship Committee: Report presented by A. Loewy announcing four of four Graduate Fellowships have been offered and accepted. Report was accepted by the Graduate Council.

The Council moved on to Old Business. Linton introduced the revised working descriptions of the Council's standing committees debated during the March meeting.

Motion made to accept the Committee on Graduate Fellowship Guidelines as revised. Motion seconded and passed.

Motion made to accept the Committee on Graduate Appeals Guidelines as revised. Motion seconded and passed.

Motion made to accept the Committee on Graduate Curriculum Guidelines as revised. Motion seconded and passed.

The Council turned to New Business.

Linton asked for nominations for faculty to serve as Grand Marshal for both the Spring and Summer commencements. Nominations were made by members of the Council and voted on by secret ballot. The Council selected the two nominees receiving the most votes: Dr. Edward Cazayoux from the College of Arts and Dr. Darryl Felder from the College of Science. M. Farmer-Kaiser will contact the honorees.

Linton reviewed the Recommendations to the University Strategic Planning Committee. Hurst indicated that the committee had already had its last meeting but that she had communicated these concerns. The Council nonetheless agreed that the recommendations should be forwarded to the chairpersons of the University Strategic Planning Committee and to the Provost and Academic Deans.

Motion made to adjourn at 4:56 pm. Motion seconded and passed.