

Council in Attendance:

Sarah Codd (Engineering)

Alan Dyer (Agriculture)

Mary Murphy (Letters – Letters & Sciences)

Anne Christensen (Business)

Jean Shreffler-Grant (Nursing)

Michael Reidy (Ex Officio, Graduate Educ.)

Christopher Livingston (Arch –Arts & Arch.)

Roshan Patel (Student rep. Arts & Arch.)

Devon Hassa (Student Rep. Arts & Arch.)

Also in Attendance:

Amanda Brown (Graduate School)

Tony Hartshorn (Agriculture)

Melis Edwards (Graduate School)

Erin Smith (Graduate School)

Karlene Hoo (The Graduate School)

Absent:

Yves Idzerda (Sciences –Letters & Sciences)

William Ruff (EHHD)

- Meeting started at 9:05 am
Chair elect: Alan Dyer
- Introduction of new member- Dr. Mary Miles (not present)
- No comments from campus
- March 7, 2014 minutes approved with minor change
- Guest Presenter –Dr. Tony Hartshorn, Land Resources & Environmental Sciences
 - New faculty in the college of Agriculture
 - Served as a Grad rep on 2 Ph.D. exams
 - Scholarship is becoming more and more public. Celebration of grad **work**
 - Simple thought: **Work** = Force x Distance (of student)
 - o Distance (Time line of events students)
 - 3 minute thesis : Web Presence to celebrate graduate students
 - Dean Hoo: The GS has invested in video display monitors for 108 and 9 Montana Hall
 - o Can promote the 3-min thesis internally
 - o Anything external may approval through Tracy Ellig’s office
 - Student member Patel: Discussed film dept.’s map of film projects –could do that for any thesis.

- Committee members: Proper reviews are not being turned in.
 - o Unclear what is expected of the GS rep on the thesis/dissertation committees
 - o GS program officer Brown: to address this issue by providing a list of what the GS would like the GS rep to report.
 - o Dean Hoo brought up a related topic: videoconferencing
 - o Videoconferencing may dilute what the GS rep can comment on.
 - Committee member Reidy: Planning council matrices (measurable outcomes-showing success over time).
 - o Matrix is to be shared with the GS
 - o Question: are these the correct outcomes to be measured?
- Committee Updates and Reports
 - **Governance Report**
 - Thesis/Dissertation Committee membership policy
 - o What credentials are required?
 - o Discussion: GS Dean and Dept. Head to “vet” other than TT (tenure track) to serve on committees, for example, adjunct faculty, affiliate faculty and so forth
 - Recommendation: Dept. Head to nominate but approval by GS Dean
 - Previously-under no circumstances can adjunct faculty serve
 - Now-as long as someone is an adjunct faculty, the Dept head can nominate and the Dean can approve/deny
 - Uniformity of “Titles” and roles of faculty across campus unclear
 - Committee member Reidy: distinctions between TT and non-tenure track (NTT)
 - Committee member Codd: The NTT faculty should not be counted when considering the number of faculty within a dept. There are many valued NTT whose career development has benefitted by being able to serve on thesis/dissertation committees. This is where the Dept. head nomination weighs in.
 - Committee member Shreffler-Grant: Nursing is different than most programs and flexibility is needed
 - Committee member Murphy: One of the issue is the exploitation of the NTT faculty
 - No compensation for serving on these committees or meeting/advising graduate students. They are only compensated for the courses taught (and this is what is in their contracts).
 - There are many experts in their fields that do not have Ph.Ds
 - o Dean Hoo: raised the issue of Graduate Faculty Status that exists on a number of campuses for the very reason of not having to determine by “label” who can serve. She proposed:
 - One of the UGC standing committees vets this status of individuals nominated by the Dept. Head. The committee determines or denies the nomination. Most often the granting of Graduate faculty Status can be for three (3) to five (5) years.

- The nominee should submit a portfolio that demonstrates research capacity/capability
 - The portfolio can contain letters of recommendation about the individual's expertise and so forth.
 - Committee member Codd: Not in agreement due to research qualification. Very specific individuals in mind, have excellent qualifications and would be a shame for them to not be able to serve
 - Dean Hoo: Then that is where the Dept Head can write a brilliant letter of support. We want quality on the committee. This, at the very least, is "owed" to the student.
 - Committee member Codd: Departments may decide to make a point to not nominate NTT.
 - Committee member Livingston: It comes down to currency. If you are doing research you are current in your field vs. someone who is teaching may not be current on the subject. Portfolio can demonstrate this.
 - Dean Hoo: Agrees, it is about currency. It comes down to the UGC standing committee to review the portfolio to determine currency and merit
 - Academic and Professional sides of the University
 - The UGC can come up with criteria for what is expected in the portfolio and see how it works for the greater good of the University
 - Committee member Codd: questions the line in the GS policy that states," the majority of the committee must be from the degree granting dept.
 - Consider change in the wording to address Interdisciplinary programs
 - Dean Hoo: the GS has revised the doctoral program guidelines and procedures.
 - Tightened up the wording on the policies but essentially they remain the same.
 - Note all significant policy changes will be vetted by the UGC. Example, the number of P/F credits to be transferred.
 - Be mindful that the "appeal process" exists.
 - Committee member Dyer: Looking into developing a Graduate Faculty Status Policy
 - Up to Committee
 - Committee member Codd: presentation of this concept needs to be less elitist.
 - Dean Hoo: There has been pushback on this campus on this notion. Reasons are unclear.
 - Motion to table the makeup of thesis/dissertation committee pending review of it by Committee members Codd and Reidy
 - Moved: Committee member Christensen; seconded: Committee member Murphy
 - Approved : All (voting members) present
- **Curriculum Committee Report**
 - Chair Bill Ruff not present.
 - Dean Hoo appealed Committee member Livingston to become a member of this standing committee
 - Proposed Ph.D. (Level II) in psychological sciences –presentation pitch
 - Committee member Reidy: Academic Working group exists that reviews new degree programs for the undergraduate council and reports to this council and also the faculty senate. Sharing of work burden.

- Committee member Murphy: Curriculum committee deals with deletions, requests and changes, and the entire council as a whole can address new programs
 - Motion that PhD program of psychological sciences Level II proposal be reviewed by the Graduate Council as a whole
 - Approved unanimously
- **Policy and Procedure Report**
 - Committee member Murphy: No new proposals appear to be on the drive
 - Dean Hoo: assumed responsibility for the breakdown in communication between the time the proposal is received to the actual placement of the proposal on the drive accessible by the UGC members.
 - Dean Hoo: At this late date the Dean will review the additional two proposals and make the decision on these.
 - She will apply the same criteria used by this committee.
 - Criteria: For GTA, linked to undergraduate curriculum. Freeing faculty to concentrate more on research or other work.
 - Committee member Murphy's recommendation:
 - Bio/chemical engineering, Computer Science, History, and Electrical engineering (no part. order), LRES.
 - Committee member Shreffler-Grant's recommendation:
 - Computer science, Electrical and computer engineering, History, Chemical and Biological Engineering, LRES
 - Dean Hoo request: The UGC needs to have for the next meeting, revised criteria for
 - PhD enhancement, Meritorious, and Presidential awards
 - Current Meritorious: STEM-fields only, Ph.D.
 - Current Presidential: MA & doctoral, STEM preference
 - Alignment with the strategic plan
 - RWR: Return without review due to not meeting criteria
 - Faculty arguing entitlement to 2. No entitlement, criteria must be followed.
 - Some depts. are omitted. They currently have no doctoral programs.
 - Should the awards be directed to attract individuals from other universities to grow the program. What does "new student" mean:
 - New to MSU or new to the graduate program of study?
 - Dean Hoo: preference for the MSU undergraduates to go elsewhere for their first degrees and maybe return for their doctoral degree.
 - Committee is requested to revise the criteria to satisfy the needs on campus while being mindful of the strategic plan.
 - Committee member Reidy: more focused requirements and purpose
 - Most of the students MSU trains stay in MT.
 - At the Ph.D. level only approximately 10% stay in MT.
 - Does the research at MSU benefit the state? For example, is the Ph.D. Ag research benefitting MT farmers?
 - Committee member Codd: by bringing in students from out of state into a research program, you're bringing in diversity and different experiences

- Committee member Christensen: This University brings in millions of dollars of grant money that stays in the state of Montana.
 - Committee member Murphy: We can't rewrite the criteria (Ph.D. enhancement) until we know how the money can be spent.
 - Can the money be unlinked to GTAs? Dean Hoo believes it can.
 - Has to be Ph.D. linked due to the source of money
 - Committee member Codd: Benjamin Award in the college of engineering, student initiated
 - Dean Hoo: The awards being discussed are faculty initiated
- Inactive Student Status Review (GS Amanda Brown)
- UGC read and reviewed the issue.
 - Issue: Grad Rep/committee member assigned to student for years, unable to keep track of students that stop attending. (Graduation, continuous enrollment policy, contact & university withdrawal, disappeared students- not automatically monitored)
 - Skews data
 - Dean Hoo: When a student is not continuously enrolled, the GS is not notified unless the GS initiates and questions based on milestones not be met.
 - GS Brown: Explained intent to register form. Students doing this repeatedly
 - The thesis/dissertation committee remains active.
 - Dean Hoo: proposal to go back to the dept. advisors/coordinators to compare the list of students they have as "active" with the GS's. A comparison between the two would lead to the GS "certifying" active vs. inactive students.
 - Request that the UGC come back with a policy/procedure proposal on how to proceed
- Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am
 - Next scheduled meeting: April 07, 2014 9:00-11:00am, Sherrick 103