

**Iowa State University
Graduate Council
MEETING MINUTES**

Meeting: Graduate Council	Key Roles
Date: March 25, 2020 Place: WebEx	Meeting Leader: Bethany Gray, Chair
Start Time: 4:15 pm	Support: Sebastian Speer, Natalie Robinson
End Time: 5:00 pm	Resource:

TOPIC

Call to Order

- Attendance and seating of substitute council members

Consent Agenda

- [Minutes](#) of Graduate Council Meeting, February 19, 2020
- Agenda for March 25, 2020
- Items from GCCC:
 - Graduate Certificate in Breeding for Organic Crops
 - Concurrent degree in Event Management
 - Dual-list Arch 451X/551X
 - Dual-list NREM 483X/583X
- Passed 13-0

Announcements & Remarks

- Graduate Dean, Bill Graves- COVID-19 Updates
 - Graves relayed that he has recently been working with campus leaders on a Pass/Not Pass policy for graduate-level work. There is some concern over the fact that the undergraduate and graduate policies are currently planning to handle the grading differently. The Provost's Council saw the proposal for the first time yesterday. Graves sent out the proposal to many members of graduate faculty for their input. Gray asked who was responsible for making this policy, and Graves responded that the Provost's Council and Deans of Academic Colleges made the original decisions on the undergraduate policy, so they will likely make the determination on the graduate policy as well.
- Sebastian Speer- 2020-2021 Graduate Council Nominations
 - Speer reminded the Council that nominations for the 2020-2021 Graduate Council will be coming out soon. He reminded members who are ending their term this year that they can re-nominate themselves and that any faculty member can nominate a colleague.
 - He also reminded the Council that there will need to be a new Vice Chair next year. Nominations for that will be accepted up to and through the next meeting. Ellinwood noted that his work in this role was rewarding and not overly burdensome.

Old Business

- Exception to full graduate faculty status policies ([proposal](#))
 - Ellinwood outlined small changes based on feedback from the last meeting.
 - Big change to include a support letter from department or graduate programs in support of change from associate to full member. Open it up to others for questions.
 - Graves: First highlighted sentence; syntax/wording - term appts who are; reads like appt is a person; members of the faculty; faculty with term appts wording change.
 - Jordan: or term faculty who are wording change. GC can make change to document.
 - Call for vote from Gray: Sebastian set up a poll in Webex and will release it; voting members should respond.
 - Bhattacharya: question; cannot see the entire document, but is there an appeals process? Can you appeal if you are denied full membership? Idea of Grad Council going against promotion and tenure

committee, the faculty, etc. Someone clearly not eligible, they are not eligible (like if first time Assoc member, etc). Ellinwood noted that appeals would like be rare, and that there is not an appeals process for associate graduate faculty status either.

- Motion to approve: Ellinwood, poll is up, voting members record there. 14-0
 - Approved 14-0
- Expired course policy and MFA degrees
 - Speer presented a policy that would allow for more expired course credits for MFA degree that is mostly proportional to the Ph.D. policy. Gray: because MFAs have a higher number of credits than MS or MA degrees, the proposal is for MFA students to use more expired credits than 2-year master's, but fewer than Ph.D. students
 - Because the average MFA degree has 60 credits, this policy would allow 24 credits over 10 years old with 10 of those credits allowed to be more than 17 years old. Make sure that it is clear that only 24 can be used for MFA.
 - Graves wanted clarification on whether Ph.D. student could count 36 between 11-16 years old and 12 over 17 years, or if the 17 years old were counted in the 11 or more years old. Speer verified that the total of 36 credits contains the 12 credits that are 17 or more years old, so only a total of 36 credits can be expired.
 - Gray: Can give this one a try, see how it works, this would be fairly generous to go with numbers here considering right now MFAs are limited to 6 credits only. Have to wait until next meeting to vote on these numbers, full text next time.
 - There was general consensus that this policy was adequate for MFA students, and an official wording for the handbook will be voted on at the next meeting.
- Master's tuition policy
 - ISU on ½ time receive 50% of tuition, those on ¼ time receive 25%; saw how other institutions compare to us; goal of determining whether Council make recommendations to change our policies.
 - Graves: When go to level of Academic College Deans, ultimately among important considerations is what the total cost of a student on assistantship would be; if we move toward full tuition coverage for master's student appointed at ½ time, that will cost roughly \$3000/sem. Nearly ½ of resident rate is what student is currently paying. Could look at our min. Stipend, we are higher than several other schools; we're less generous with tuition, so economics of it are such that there is push to reduce min. Stipend if we increase tuition support, no net change in total cost. Question from marketing perspective: better to receive higher stipend with less tuition school or vice versa? Tuition being covered more important than min. Stipend?
 - Ellinwood: looks to him that we're not offering that great of stipend and definitely not as good on tuition.
 - Graves: Penn State very generous, as well as WI; Speer: Penn State only tells average and not minimum. Min is the lowest number there
 - Klimavicz: some other schools cover fees as well, whereas ISU doesn't.
 - Adams: from perspective of student, net is the same either way; how much are they actually getting each semester; keeping them here; differential stipends where he came from and had to get a second job.
 - Adams and Ellinwood disagreed with that, noting many schools had higher minimums and paid full tuition for master's students. Klimavicz noted that fees, no top of tuition, can be up to nearly \$1000, which makes the stipend of master's student even lower.
 - Adams noted that the important part is the bottom line of how much total the student will receive, not necessarily where it is being allocated. Graves noted that many of the peer institutions had differential stipends based on experience, so it may distort comparisons. Jordan noted that the stipend being larger could be a deterrent to the student as stipend are taxed while tuition scholarships are generally not.
 - There was a question about self-financing vs. students on assistantship. Gray asked if cost of living could make up some of the difference between stipends. Speer agreed to research this and add a slide about that for discussion next month.

- Ellinwood wondered about compelling departments to pay more from already shrinking TA budgets and if this might push more departments toward hiring adjuncts instead of graduate students. He also noted that self-funded graduate students can be more easily taken advantage of, and reminded the Council that much of the push here comes from funding agency requirements of only funding up to that which is required by the institution.
- Bhattacharya: larger stipend, may increase tax liability, but tuition changes may not do the same; look at all students who finance master's education on their own vs. those who do receive stipend.
- Gray: cost of living in these various locations; Ames has lower cost of living than some of the peer institutions; Speer will look for that info
- Ellinwood: how to compel universities and research labs relying on certain amount of aid; Ellinwood came from program where this is unheard of; self-finance students can get abused in a system like this; horrifying that we require payment from students; would have to be a slow change in culture
- Gray: most funding agencies will only pay tuition school that university dictates for certain assistantship type; some want to offer more funding but can't because of our minimums; through teaching vs. Research also makes a difference.
- Haddad: 25% scholarship have to have another job to make a living and are exhausted.
- There will be more discussion about this next month.
- EDD committee member requirement ([proposal](#)) (additional documents available on [Agenda and Minutes Page](#)).
 - The EDD program requested to use four members on their POSC committees, rather than the five normally required for Ph.D. committees. Graves noted the outside member wording, which is pulled from the outside member wording for master's and Ph.D. committees, leaves much open to interpretation.
 - There was general concern about carving out a one-time exception, particularly based more on faculty availability rather than academic merit.
 - Graves: could be helpful to define "different field of emphasis" when talking about the outside member; how it can be interpreted. Currently our Ph.D. language, but this is an opportunity to provide justification as to why they wouldn't need a fifth person; main issue is 4 vs 5.
 - Gray: want further clarification from the program; if Council ready to vote now, Graves doesn't want to interfere with that, but Graves will talk to Foegen if Council feels that's important
 - Gray: concern is carving out one exception for one program, how many other kinds of doctoral programs would want a similar exception. Or would this just be a one-time thing.
 - Speer: comprehensive survey last year on Council with Gottesman: 78% feel 5 is the right number; about 20% thought less is better, 8% said more is better.
 - Graves: their justification is two-fold: don't have the faculty and degree program designed around cohorts, when time for final oral, going to be overly burdened all at once who need to have exams simultaneously; agrees with Gray that if we reduce number to 4 on committee due to insufficient faculty resources, then other programs with not many faculty could also want this; could set a precedent with the same justification
 - Adams: not swayed by the change in numbers; been on POS committees for 8 or 9 graduate programs; implied message is there are not enough people to serve; ensure intellectual breadth, should require more people
 - Graves: only min. Of two people have to be within the discipline, so feasibly could find a fifth
 - Bhattacharya: if Council doesn't do anything, will they come back and say that we need to have 2 people outside the field; that could be their response; Adams: that's effectively what the policy is saying right now
 - Ellinwood: effectively, driven by not enough faculty; cohort system is irrelevant, don't have enough faculty to serve appropriately; was approved by Regents, don't think we should give a one-off for this; if they don't have enough faculty, he's concerned about the oversight of the graduate program
 - Gray: second Ellinwood's response; admit smaller cohorts
 - Young: Comparing to Ph.D. and not Ed.D. programs; biased in what we see regularly with Ph.D. programs; looked t 3 random universities, they have 4 or fewer people. Someone responded that it was the program's responsibility to make that clear.
 - Graves: Foegen mentioned that typically, Ed.D. have fewer POS committee members
 - Speer: send back to them, open to more conversation, the reasons and justification were not enough to reach a passing vote at this point; Gray supportive of this path; not about available resources, but more of an academic argument.

- Bhattacharya: if do it for one, still a slippery slope; need an academic argument to be paramount; have to argue that Ed.D. is a specialized program; Gray and Speer follow up with program, return proposal to them with additional consideration.
- Bhattacharya noted that other programs who feel overworked may ask for similar exceptions if this is granted. It was noted that the cohort model would increase load on faculty all at once, rather than spread out as it can be for traditional programs.
- Bhattacharya noted that only two members inside the student's discipline, so there could be two outside members if a five person committee were allowed. There was general consensus that the cohort model and lack of faculty were not good reasons to allow this exception.
- Young questioned whether the Council was possibly biased because of their own Ph.D. training and their lack of knowledge of the difference of the EDD.
- This proposal was not approved, and it will be sent back to the School of Education asking for the program to make a more substantive argument that the EDD is specialized and give more academic support, rather than faculty availability, for a reason to allow this exception.
- Postdoc contact person (PCP) ([proposal](#))
 - Gray noted that the regulations and guidance given to the PCP were more stringent and structured than those of a DOGE, like meeting individually at least once a semester, with Dept Chair once a semester; not mandated of DOGEs right now; what is justification for these requirements for this role when not required in DOGE role. Speer noted that Treanor may see Postdoc needs, as a smaller population, as more homogenous than those of graduate students in differing departments.
 - Speer: this policy would also extend to pre-docs as well.
 - Adams wondered about the justification for this role. Sattasathuchana mentioned that postdocs might be more vulnerable. She said that meetings with postdocs were more feasible because there are fewer total postdocs and postdocs may be more isolated and may not even know the PCP when they get to campus.
 - Adams is also concerned about the lack of mentioning the sponsor/PI at all in the document. The IDP mentioned, for example should be more between the PI and postdoc, rather than the PCP or postdoc coordinator.
 - Gray: distinction between role of PI and PCP is not clear.
 - Graves: reach out to Treanor and see what her intent is; not to have her play a role in developing content of IDP, but just assisting with admin steps to get the form and submit it properly.
 - Will take this back to Treanor: Gray and GC will assist with that.

