

**Iowa State University  
Graduate Council  
MEETING AGENDA**

<b>Meeting: Graduate Council</b>	<b>Key Roles</b>
Date: February 19, 2020 Place: 3150 Beardshear Hall	Meeting Leader: Bethany Gray, Chair
Start Time: 4:15 pm	Support: Sebastian Speer, Natalie Robinson, Judy Strand
End Time: 5:30 pm	Resource:

TIME	TOPIC	DISCUSSION LEADER
4:15	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance and seating of substitute council members               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No substitute committee members.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Gray
4:20	Consent Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Minutes</a> of Graduate Council Meeting, January 22, 2020</li> <li>• Agenda for February 19, 2020               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Passed 13-0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Gray
4:20	Announcements and Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduate Council Chair, Bethany Gray               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gray had no comments</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Graduate Dean, Bill Graves               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Graves noted that the Survey of Earned Doctorates came back recently. This is a yearly initiative by the National Science Foundation to track all students in the country who finish a doctorate. ISU generally has a response rate above 90%, but this past year, the rate was about 87%. The Graduate College would like to getting as close to 100% as possible.</li> <li>○ Graves noted that, compared to peer institutions, ISU Ph.Ds. have a lower time to degree, a higher percentage on Graduate Assistantships, a lower percentage of gender and ethnic diversity, a higher percentage of students with master's degrees prior to coming to ISU, and more ISU grads who pursue academic careers after earning their Ph.D. here.</li> <li>○ Graves also noted that today was Strand's last Graduate Council meeting. Strand was in the Graduate College for nearly ten years, and she will be sorely missed. A reception for her will be held on February 26<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Associate Graduate Dean, Carolyn Cutrona               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cutrona had no updates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Graduate College Office, Judy Strand               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strand told the Council that elections for the 2020-2021 Council would begin soon. Any member ending their tenure was more than welcome to nominate themselves if they want to continue to serve another three years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Gray, Graves, Cutrona Strand
4:40	Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exception to full graduate faculty status policies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not in tenure-track positions, but have the significant experience; came from CCE E first; individual brought to us last</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Ellinwood, Gray

fall was deserving of full participation in faculty; uncomfortable making an ad hoc decision in one case

- Ellinwood put new language in the policy. Situations that we only consider for ISU faculty in an Associate Membership appt.
- Ellinwood presented changes to the associate graduate faculty policy that would allow a process for non-tenured faculty to be allowed to be the sole major professor on graduate student committees. This would require a significant amount of research, proven longevity at ISU, service on several POS committees, and a commitment to education in their program beyond just research. This avenue for membership would grant all rights and privileges of full membership to an associate member. The renewal process would be similar to current renewal but would require a letter of support from the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the nominating department.
- Procedure for membership the same as renewal applications; must detail significant contribution and impact. Looked at by GFMC, go before Council for full consideration. Can ask more of nominators. All of these would come to Council.
- It was asked how this interacts with PRS. Not asking for a PRS, but if Chair supports it and shows documented history of graduate committee service, we can assume that the parties involved worked that part out. This Associate Member would have to have graduated at least 2 Ph.Ds., one would assume, to be eligible.
- Bridge funding for arrival of new child (Cutrona)
  - Cutrona presented the new policy with updates from the last meeting. There was still some concern that there could be small abuses of this policy, and there were a few small amendments in wording.
  - Enrolling in this program doesn't extend your LOI; you have to extend it.
  - Changed terminology to co-parenting families to make the language more inclusive.
  - Addition of one or more children (point 4)
  - If two co-parents want to split 12 weeks with a co-parent, those applying will be asked to list who they're splitting their time with; can work it in to form to make it not as easy to use 24 weeks for 2 parents, as we may not know if co-parents are applying
  - Each person will receive the same level of assistantship funding as they did before
  - After leave, they will go back to terms of their original appt.
  - Any mechanism for finding who's actually splitting; Friendly amendments where there might be more than 2 parents involved. Take out word "both"; each parent is eligible....
  - In #5 split among parents...
  - Vote - if passed, when go into effect; immediately
  - This new policy passed 13-0.
- Expired course policy and MFA degrees
  - Speer briefly presented information from non-English MFA programs and EDD programs. The EDD program does not need

	<p>an expired course policy, as they have a cohort model and do not accept transfer credit. The non-English MFA programs support a policy that admits more credit than the standard master's policy. The Council agreed to review an additional structure in the policy specific to MFA programs. This will be presented next month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master's tuition policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Not discussed at this meeting. Will be discussed at next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
5:00	<p>New Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expired Course policy exception for MPP degree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dr. Christina Campbell explained her program's request to allow more expired credits than the current policy allows.</li> <li>○ The exception would only pertain to graduates of the dietetics internship certificate who are currently in the online bridge program between the Dietetics Internship certificate and what will be the revised version of MPP</li> <li>○ By 2024, all dietitians will be required to have a master's degree to sit for exam as a registered dietitian</li> <li>○ There are over 100 student in the dietetics internship certificate right now, but the program will end as it currently exists in summer 2021</li> <li>○ These students who completed the certificate and are in the bridge program need to bring forward 14 or 15 credits from internship to their 30-credit degree requirement for the MPP. Take 15 or 16 online credits to get a master's degree. The problem, then, is that a few students will not meet the expired course credit rule because they earned their certificates more than seven years ago. Students need all 14 or 15 credits from the certificate to earn the MPP, and the program does not have enough credits to offer more credits for them to take; need to just be able to count those credits.</li> <li>○ Waiver for the program, 2 students, maybe give or take one or two, so that the MPP program can continue to allow them to use those old credits.</li> <li>○ The justification for this exception is that these students are working in their discipline for which the internship was a prerequisite in the first place, so they have not lost their understanding of any of the concepts taught in these courses</li> <li>○ Because this is only 3 to 4 total students, the Council suggests that we just manage this on a case-by-case basis; not a Handbook change, but this body would be approving the waivers.</li> <li>○ Ellinwood - allow students to graduate.</li> <li>○ National certs have changed, people caught in limbo b/n licensing; they have demonstrated and continued practice for which internship was the beginning.</li> <li>○ There are 5-year continuing education requirements to maintain licensure; to meet requirements of profession.</li> <li>○ Adams asked what needed to happen in order to approve these, and Speer responded that the Graduate College just wanted the overall opinion of the Council to have a standing exception for this program, rather than deciding it by himself. A straw poll of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

the Council showed overwhelming support to allow this exception.

- ED.D committee member requirement
  - Dr. Anne Foegen and Dr. Anita Micich presented a request to only require four faculty members rather than five for the ED.D program in the school of education. They emphasized that this was a practicing doctorate and had a different structure than Ph.D. programs. They also indicated that the proposal requested that professors of practice be allowed to be sole major professor for students.
  - Ellinwood noted that the discussions about Associate Graduate faculty serving as sole major professor would be discussed later in the meeting, and that the practicing professors would fall under that category.
  - Dr. Micich indicated that all of the professors of practice would have terminal degrees, but they would not have tenure lines. She also indicated that part of the proposal was a capacity issue for the professors of practice.
  - Graves asked if an outside member was still required, and Foegen replied that one is.
  - Micich noted that this is a smaller degree than a Ph.D., 54 credits rather than 72. The program is rigidly structured that the students will take two years of coursework with a preliminary exam in the spring of the second year that would be the outline for their dissertation. She also noted that most of the people in this program were working professionals in community colleges or K-12 settings. Academic output is still similar, but they tend to be in different types of journals than a Ph.D. in Education might publish. She also noted that ED.D students would not take as many credits of research as Ph.D. students.
  - Ellinwood expressed concern that this exception was being discussed for understaffing issues rather than any disciplinary reason. Some people expressed concern that even-numbered committees are harder to vote on, though it was pointed out that two members dissenting meant a Ph.D. student did not pass.
  - Many members had concerns about the scholarly reason for four members rather than five.
  - Speer noted that UNI requires four members on an ED.D committee and that a Ph.D. in Education usually has around 60 credits of coursework, while the ED.D would require 48.
- Predoctoral scholars wording change
  - Misty Treanor, the Postdoc Coordinator in the Graduate College, presented a wording change that is specific to predoc positions. These positions are not competitively hired like postdoc positions, so this needed updating on the Graduate College website. Someone was concerned that these predoc positions might be abused to get around the competitive search of postdoc positions, but Adams replied that you can already do that by writing limited position descriptions in your postdoc postings. There was general approval for this change.
- Postdoc Contact Person

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Treanor also proposed a new requirement for programs and units that employ postdocs. These units would need to have a Postdoc Contact Person (PCP). Essentially, this person would serve as a “DOGE” for postdocs, Leslie Hogben in LAS has already implemented this change. This person could be a current DOGE, Chair, or any other tenured or tenure-track faculty.</li><li>○ If on direct-pay fellowships, Treanor can’t get ahold of their info</li><li>○ The idea is for Treanor to get a list of postdocs from these PCPs</li><li>○ Like faculty and staff with annual review, yearly annual reviews for postdocs are required so that they can get raises</li><li>○ The PCP would be encouraged to meet with postdoc at least once per semester (preferred)</li><li>○ Rationale for PCP; very similar to DOGEs.</li><li>○ Treanor responded to a question indicating this would include non-academic units like Ames Lab.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

