

**Iowa State University
Graduate Council
MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting: Graduate Council	Key Roles
Date: February 20, 2019 Place: 3150 Beardshear Hall	Meeting Leader: Pamela Riney-Kehrberg
Start Time: 4:15 pm	Support: Sebastian Speer, Natalie Robinson, Judy Strand
End Time: 5:30 pm	Resource:

TOPIC
<p>Call to Order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seating of substitute council members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jim Dickson seated for Steven Lonergan ○ Ken Moore seated for Maria Salas-Fernandez
<p>Consent Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Graduate Council Meeting, January 16, 2019 • Agenda for February 20, 2019 meeting • Items from GCCC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal for Master of Athletic Training in Kinesiology • FYI – see attached list of approvals for Associate Graduate Faculty status. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Passed 10-0
<p>Announcements and Remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate Council Chair, Pamela Riney-Kehrberg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No comments • Graduate Dean, Bill Graves <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Graves brought up the possibility of having a time limit on the conditional pass of a final oral examination. Sometimes programs ask the Graduate College to allow their students to complete degrees when those students received conditions on an oral exam taken many years prior. Often, committee members may no longer be at ISU, and courses on the POSC are expired. Graves suggested a maximum deadline of six months to meet conditions but suggested a shorter time to complete conditions if the committee wanted to place more restrictive limits. ○ Ellinwood was against coursework needing to be current at the time of meeting exam conditions. He felt that once the exam is passed, the age of coursework no longer applies. He also noted that sometimes life comes up, so he didn't support being overly restrictive. ○ O'Connor said that outlining a policy around this would be fine as long as there is still room for some exceptions to be made. ○ Ellinwood asked what situations come up. Speer replied that what prompted this specific conversation was a student from 17 years ago asking to complete the conditions on her degree. The Graduate College does also get asked about meeting past exam conditions by students who are more recent than that. ○ Moore noted that not all delays fall on the students; major professors can also be the issue in these delays. Graves notes that not only would such a policy provide a clear deadline, but it also would allow the Graduate College to follow up when these deadlines are nearing. ○ Ellinwood suggested that meeting conditions in one year might make more sense than in six months, especially if a student needed to complete a little more research that was specific to a particular time of year. ○ Gottesman noted that a year would line up with the expectations of incomplete grades. Incomplete grades also allow for less time if the instructor wants to offer less time.

- Graves said that the Graduate College would make changes to the Report of Examination form and present those changes next month.
- Associate Graduate Dean, Carolyn Cutrona
 - Cutrona spoke about disability accommodations. She noted that most faculty are comfortable with the form that comes from Student Assistance, but there have been issues that faculty face in labs or other employment rather than in the classroom that warrant attention. Faculty cannot ignore a disability that is disclosed to them, and they should refer questions about disabilities in laboratory or other work environments to Cutrona or Human Resources.
 - Cutrona also noted that the Graduate College is working on a program similar to the bridge funding for arrival of a new child. When a student needs a break for injury or illness, departments will be able to apply for money from the Graduate College to split the cost of that student's stipend.
- Graduate College Office, Judy Strand
 - Judy relayed that Title IX trainings were recently held. These allowed students, staff, and DOGEs to get questions answered and have a deeper understanding of Title IX.

Review of Action Items

- Graduate Handbook committee proposal
 - Dobbs was not able to attend the last DOGE meeting, so she will get on the next DOGE meeting agenda and will report back to the Graduate Council with feedback.

Old Business

- Assessing Graduate Student Outcomes – Cutrona
 - Cutrona met with the Provost, and reporting student outcomes could be implemented as either 1) a centralized establishment of outcomes and a centralized collection of results or 2) can be up to the programs to decide. Either way there needs to be a requirement about what outcomes are being assessed, accountability that these outcomes are being assessed, and evidence that assessments are being used to improve the programs. Cutrona suggested that the outcomes could be required to be posted on the program's webpages and/or sent to the Graduate College to ensure that these steps are being followed.
 - Ellinwood supported the approach that each department would create their own standards, as university-wide standards would be difficult to implement due to the variability among programs. University-wide standards would not provide useful feedback to all programs.
 - O'Connor mentioned that showing outcomes and measuring them can be helpful in earning training grants.
 - Cutrona repeated that the requirement is that outcomes must be documented and used to reevaluate and improve programs. The Graduate College will develop a proposal for the next Graduate Council meeting.
- Selection of Major Professor – Graves
 - Graves delivered a proposal to require students to report a major professor to the Graduate College by the end of their second year (if their POSC is not already completed). He indicated that the Graduate College has no adviser or major professor of record for students who have not completed a POSC, and having a person listed on a student's Access Plus profile can be helpful for students and for the Graduate College. While it is likely that the POSC will be broken down into multiple steps when we move to WorkDay due to much of the feedback that the Grad College has received about the POSC, this proposal would just be a portal that allows students to select their major professor before the entire committee and program of study is determined.
 - Multiple members of Graduate Council indicated that two semesters seems aggressive and that it might not be feasible for students in all programs to determine a major professor by then. Graves responded that the 10th day of the third semester had also been discussed. Dobbs asked about Ph.D. annual review and suggested that might be a good benchmark for determining a major professor for Ph.D. students.
 - Ellinwood brought up the idea of students using this portal to enter their advisers rather than their major professors. Wolanyk said that in physics, students would have trouble knowing who their major professor would be by the end of the second semester, but the 10th day of the 3rd semester might work. Gray indicated that in her program, early selection of a major professor is discouraged

due to the rotation of classes and encouragement to get full exposure to faculty members over two years in the program. The program assigns a faculty adviser for the first two years.

- Graves noted that language for temporary faculty or faculty adviser could be used in place of major professor. Bowler suggested that we could use the DOGE as the major professor, but it was also noted that DOGEs across campus vary widely in their responsibilities. Briess stated that the process of requesting one major professor early in the program and then changing that person later could be awkward for students.
- It was suggested that rather than having the students tell the Graduate College who their adviser/major professor will be, programs could be required to tell the Graduate College who should be listed as the adviser for students. This was generally supported by the Council, and the Graduate College will take this feedback and consider a new proposal.
- Current [Distance Policies](#) for participating in final oral exams – Speer
 - Speer presented alterations to the committee participation at a distance portion of the Graduate College Handbook. His suggestions align the preliminary oral exam and the final oral exam distance policies. He also proposed removing all mentions of distance participation in Ch. 6.2.6 of the Graduate College Handbook because it is better to have the policy listed in only one place for each exam. Finally, Speer suggested a change to allow all oral exams to have one distance committee member and any committee with five or more members to be allowed two committee members participating remotely.
 - Graves asked what was meant by “a student’s entire Ph.D. degree program is completed at a distance” (stated in the Graduate College Handbook), and Speer responded that AESHM (HSP M) is currently the only program with an entirely-online Ph.D. program. Though HSP M has had success with their students coming to campus to complete a prelim, Speer has also received inquiries about distance policies from other departments considering online Ph.D. degrees.
 - Miller asked why there are specifically two members allowed at a distance but not three or more. He shared that he had been on committees with someone else at distance or he had been a distance participant, and all had gone smoothly. It was suggested that two distance members might be a good number because that leaves a majority of committee members present at the defense.
 - Bowler stated that the Graduate College Handbook suggests that when a committee member cannot attend an exam, a student’s first course of action should be to permanently replace that faculty member. She suggested a reordering of steps to take when a committee member cannot attend an exam so that participation at a distance is listed first.
 - Speer will make some changes and bring the updated proposal to the next meeting.

New Business

- Concurrent credit shared credits for 48 credit programs - Riney-Kehrberg
 - The Graduate College Curriculum Committee requested that Riney-Kehrberg bring forward a situation they have when reviewing concurrent undergraduate-graduate degrees. Concurrent undergrad/grad degrees allow students to double-count 6 credits between the two degrees, but MBA concurrent programs have a long-standing exception that allows them to use 12 double-counted credits. The committee was wondering about having a fully formed policy that allowed all programs over a certain number of credits to use more than 6 credits rather than just maintaining the exception for MBA programs.
 - Ellinwood asked if this was pertaining to just undergraduate and master’s degrees, and Speer responded that yes it was only master’s degrees, as you cannot be a concurrent undergraduate/Ph.D. student. Bowler indicated that it made sense to scale the number of credits that can be double-counted by the number of credits in the degree program, and Cutrona suggested that we consider allowing 20% or 25% of the master’s degree credits to be double-counted.
 - Strand said that the Graduate College would write up a policy and present it at the next meeting.
- Proposal for revisions to the Post Doc resignation policy, [Postdoc Policies and Guidelines](#)
 - PLAC sent forward a proposal to eliminate a rule that allows postdocs to carry over time off if they move to a P&S position. The intent of the change was to have a uniform policy so that some postdocs were allowed to carry their accrued time off into a P&S position, while others were not.

- Miller asked if this policy change would be overly harsh on postdocs, but O'Connor suggested that this might be a good way to encourage them to actually take time off while they are a postdoc. Ellinwood suggested there might be postdocs who are afraid to take their time off, and this policy change would hurt those students. Gottesman suggested that if there are postdocs who are afraid to take time off, that is a separate issue, and it should be considered within the rights and responsibilities in the Graduate College Handbook.
- After some discussion, Graves indicated that it seemed like the Council was fine with uniformity, but it felt that the uniformity should be in allowing postdocs to keep accrued time off rather than lose it.

Committees

- Liaison to the PLAC meeting: Steven Lonergan. Coordination between the Policy library and the Graduate handbook.
 - No additional comments.
- Graduate Faculty Membership Committee: Nicola Bowler, Chair; Debra Marquardt; Isaac Gottesman; Carolyn Lawrence-Dill; Aileen Keating; Steven Lonergan – ex officio and in an advisory role
 - No additional comments.
- Departmental Graduate Handbook Committee: Drena Dobbs and Matthew Ellinwood, Co-Chairs; Steven Lonergan, Carolyn Cutrona, Joshua Wolanyk
 - No additional comments.
- Anti-bullying Committee: Carolyn Cutrona, Pam Riney-Kehrberg, Amanda Bries
 - No additional comments.

Other Items/Issues

Next Meeting: February 20, 2019, 3150 Beardshear

Associate Graduate Faculty Approvals

Status	Name	Department	Major
Graduate Lecturer	Margaret Mathison	Mechanical Engineering (M E)	
Graduate Lecturer	Clark Colby	Art and Visual Culture (A V C)	
Associate Graduate Faculty (affiliate non ISU employee)	Jacob Dodson	Civil Construction and Environmental Engineering (CCE E)	Civil Engineering (C E)
Associate Graduate Faculty (non-tenure track ISU employee)	Erin Bowers	Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering (A B E)	Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering (A B E); Industrial and Agricultural Technology (IATEC)

