

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes

CHAired BY: Dave Kieda
DATE: August 26

TIME: 1500
PLACE: 300 Park, Winder Board Room

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Connie Bullis, Laura Kessler, Glen Hanson, Robert Mayer, Tim Formosa, Winston Kyan, Susan Johnston, Sean Redmond, Ben Bromley, H.Y Sohn, Paul Mogren, Nan Ellin, Ginny Pepper, Mary Jane Taylor, Ex-Officio – Edward Barbanell, Lyndi Duff, Associate Dean, Donna White

EXCUSED MEMBERS: Karen Wilcox, Vladimir Hlady

FINAL AGENDA

1. Minutes

Vote: Approved Unanimously
Abstained: None
Comments: As Amended-adding the conditional approval to the Lassonde Institute

2. Changes in Graduate Classification Discussion

This was introduced as an information item but will be coming to the Grad Council in the future to form a policy to clarify the process of switching to a Masters as an PhD alternate. The registrar's office currently doesn't have a process.

Discussion:

Q: Is it always appropriate to have a backup Master's degree for students who do not qualify for PhD degree?

A: It will be up to departments. If the department does not want to have a backup degree, they will need to state it explicitly, and that will become heir policy.

Q: Doesn't MPhil already serve this purpose?

A: Yes, but many departments (e.g. all of College of Science had eliminated MPhil's and a mass discontinuation of MPhils (among others) is coming to the Graduate Council soon.

Q: It is appropriate for a Ph.D. committee to be completely dominated by career-line faculty? The existing system and rules guard against this.

A: Yes, this is a concern. But the current system places a heavy burden on the tenure track faculty in a department, if only a small fraction of the faculty are tenure track.

Alternate approaches could also be discussed (e.g. increasing number of tenure track lines in the department, or decreasing number of graduate students in the department).

3. Graduate Faculty Discussion

Current Graduate School Policy:

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEES

The supervisory committee is responsible for approving the student's academic program, preparing and judging the qualifying examinations subject to departmental policy, approving the thesis or dissertation subject, reading and approving the thesis or dissertation, and administering and judging the final oral examination (thesis or dissertation defense). The chair of the supervisory committee directs the student's research and writing of the thesis or dissertation. The final oral examination may be chaired by any member of the supervisory committee consistent with departmental policy. If a graduate student's preliminary work is deficient, the supervisory committee may require

supplementary undergraduate courses for which no graduate credit is granted. Decisions concerning program requirements, examinations, and the thesis or dissertation are made by majority vote of the supervisory committee.

All University of Utah faculty members including regular (tenured or tenure track) research, clinical, emeritus, visiting, auxiliary, and adjunct are eligible to serve as supervisory committee members. The faculty member must hold an academic or professional doctorate, the terminal degree in the relevant field, and/or must have demonstrated competence to do research and scholarly or artistic work in the student's general field. Persons not from the University of Utah may also serve as committee members upon approval of the dean of The Graduate School (a vita for the proposed committee members should accompany the request). Committee chairs must be selected from regular faculty (tenured or tenure track). Immediate family members are not eligible to serve on a student's supervisory committee.

The supervisory committee is usually formed in the first year of graduate work. It is the responsibility of the student to approach prospective committee members with a view to their willingness and availability to serve in such a capacity. Faculty have the right, however, for justifiable academic reasons, to refuse to serve on a student's supervisory committee.

The department chair or director of graduate studies, depending on departmental policy, appoints the chair and committee members. The process of forming a supervisory committee is completed by filing a Request for Supervisory Committee form with the major department.

Master's supervisory committees consist of three faculty members, the majority of whom must be regular (tenured or tenure track) faculty in the student's major department.

Doctoral supervisory committees consist of five faculty members, the majority of whom must be regular (tenured or tenure track) faculty in the student's major department. One member of the supervisory committee must be from another department.

Exceptions to these guidelines must be recommended and justified by the director of graduate studies of the department or the department chair, depending on departmental policies, and approved by the dean of The Graduate School.

Master's Degrees

THE MASTER'S SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

Unless otherwise approved by the dean of The Graduate School, a supervisory committee consisting of three faculty members, the majority of whom must be regular (tenured or tenure track) faculty in the student's major department, is appointed no later than the second semester of graduate work. If a graduate student's preliminary work is deficient, the supervisory committee may require supplementary undergraduate courses for which no graduate credit is granted.

Graduate Faculty Discussion:

In some Departments and Colleges (Especially in HSC) not all faculty are regular (tenure track) faculty; some are career line (clinical). Current graduate school policy places restrictions on the number of career-line faculty that are allowed to serve on or chair Ph.D. And Master's degree committees. Current procedure is to grant blanket exceptions to certain departments each year in order to allow career-line faculty, who are supervising Master and Ph.D. degree research, to serve as committee members and chairs of the degree committees.

An alternate path, used by many other Universities, is to establish a university wide "Graduate Faculty", and establish a procedure for admitting tenure track and career track

faculty into the Graduate faculty, with periodic review. Only members of the Graduate Faculty would be allowed to serve on graduate degree committees.

Chuck Wight had previously introduced this idea to the Graduate Council last year. We hope to review it this year and make a decision whether to go forward with a Graduate faculty, based upon discussions with Departments, deans, the Graduate Council, and upper administration.

Discussion:

Q: Would Graduate Faculty have to be full time or would part time be allowable?

A: Not clear. At the present time there are part-time faculty who serve on graduate committees, as well as adjunct faculty at other institutions. This is an item for discussion as we develop concept of the Graduate Faculty.

Q: What would review or designation? process be?

A: Most likely a submission of request to join the faculty coming from the Departments and Colleges, and a review by the Graduate Council. There would probably be a review of each faculty member every 5 years or so. Similar processes are already in place for graduate faculty at ASU, for example. One committee member commented that there was substantial review burden at ASU, and it could have been made simpler by timing this review to occur at the same time as other RPT reviews (such as five-year post-tenure review).

Q: What would other responsibilities be?

A: It is unclear if the Graduate faculty would have additional responsibilities beyond serving on the student's degree committee. Ideas regarding any additional responsibilities is an item for discussion as the Graduate Faculty proposal becomes better defined.

4. Program Review Committee Assignments

Donna White presented. Jeff Stratman has left the University so Denise will rearrange and redistribute an updated list. Donna reviewed procedure. Ad hoc committees should pay special attention to crafting recommendations concisely and to fleshing out each section of the report. Also, reports should be submitted in a timely manner to keep the process moving along.

Discussion:

Q: Should there be more interaction between the internal and external review committees? The external committees sometimes ask for additional clarifications from the internal committee before finishing their report. If the internal and external committees had a joint meeting, perhaps this could speed up the process and make for a better report from the external committee.

A: The external committee can get a copy of the internal committee report and vice versa if requested, but it is impractical to have the two groups meet due to time constraints. It was also commented that on some other review panels for grants, it is sometimes the policy to keep separate reviews apart from each other in order to have two independent assessments. No motion was put forward to change the existing procedure.

5. Division of Cardiovascular Medicine Name Change

Dr. James Fang presented. The proposal was to change the division name to Division of Cardiovascular Medicine in order to indicate a more current reflection of the field and the evolving curriculum. Prior to coming to the GC, the proposed change was reviewed and

approved by the division faculty and chair, and was approved unanimously. The proposed name is also in line with similar programs at other universities.

Comments: None
Motion: Approve
Vote: Approved unanimously

6. Review of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism

Winston Kyan presented the Ad Hoc committee's report on the review of the PRT program. Winston summarized the report and read the Commendations and Recommendations verbatim.

Discussion: Suggestions were made by members of the GC and Winston will incorporate the minor edits and forward the revised report to the Ad Hoc committee and Assoc. Dean White by the end of the week.

Motion: Approve with amended changes (to be sent to the Ad Hoc committee and Associate Dean White)
Vote: Approved unanimously