

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes

May 10, 2017

L. Pratt, M. Herman, R. Ager, G. Didier, C. Pealer, C. Rodning, D. Weingart, K. Elfer, G. Morris, B. Mohan, J. O'Brien, M. Cunningham

1. Meeting called at 8:32
2. Approval of April Minutes. Rodning motioned, Ager seconded. All approved.
3. Grad Council Meeting Dates for Fall 2017
 - a. Attendance will be necessary due to the review schedule.
 - b. We've rotated around the professional schools, and haven't had anyone from the business school in a while, so we may want to add them. They've been adding more research based masters, so it may be good for them to see our processes.
4. New Certificate Program in SLA on Engaged Scholarship
 - a. Based on the Mellon Fellowship that CPS got. Will allow grad students to take courses to help develop pedagogy surrounding service and receive a certificate.
 - b. How would this work with the fellowship already offered by CPS? That fellowship is paid, so there can't be interchangeable courses between this certificate and that fellowship.
 - c. What are the general requirements for certificates? It has to be attached to the pursuit of a degree. You can't just enroll at Tulane for the certificate, but you can get it while you work on a PhD, for instance. We don't have a lot of these certificates for PhDs.
 - d. It involves 3 one-course classes through CPS that are similar to their seminars, plus 3 courses in their own field that are considered "community engaged" and one "community engaged" course outside their field.
 - e. How does this work with the 48 credit hour max for PhD candidates? That can be waived, but these courses will likely be part of the degree plan. The department would inform the registrar that the degree and the certificate would take x number of hours, and that's what the requirements would be based off of.
 - f. Rodning move to approve, Herman seconded. All in favor.

5. Vote on new track in Biomedical Sciences

- a. New track within the existing MS in Clinical Research for pre-surgical training.
The background is that we have many students who don't match at the end of medical school. This program would make them more competitive. The proposers are concentrating on the fact that the pre-surgical training would make them more competitive. This track does add more credit hours .
- b. Anything that helps them get placed in residencies is a good thing.
- c. Are these tuition paying students? How do they fund this? Almost entirely loans. Not matching is a nightmare, so this would be a good option for them.
- d. Are there other tracks currently? No. Everything else is just general clinical research.
- e. Is there any data on where these students go afterwards? No, but it could be reported next year.

6. Graduate Assistant Policy Review

- a. The policy we found is from the 1970s. Mike Herman does not recall anything general from his tenure as graduate dean.
- b. Nothing university wide – whether there's a university minimum stipend? How do you distinguish between the 20 hours of work versus when it becomes research/training.
- c. When do students start to teach? Do any programs allow students to teach classes from day one? To the best of our knowledge students have to be in residence for one year before they can teach a solo course. Would the 18 credit hour restriction cause any problems? For the most part that should be satisfied after two semesters.
- d. The difference that benefits you versus the PI. The research that would go into your dissertation is your own work, versus the work that your PI requires. We are aware of some students who are getting pushed to work in a lab on something unrelated because, say, a postdoc left.
- e. It also covers some of the rules about how other jobs would work

- f. The PI needs to describe how other activities are related to their training. Or, we get it approved to work a bit extra for a while. Whether you get put on the papers is quite significant as to whether this is actually training.
 - g. If a student thinks it's not relevant, that would be more of a grievance issue
 - h. There have been departments working on sensitive material that couldn't be published, including publishing dissertations.
 - i. We need to address the concern in our policy. If a student thinks they're working more than 20 hours for someone else, then they need to use their particular school's grievance policy.
 - j. The grievance would be simply that that the student is working more than 20 hours on service. Each student should be also meeting with their advisor, and hopefully this should be coming out.
 - k. We got away from using Kronos for timekeeping because it's not suitable for grad students, but PIs and advisors need to be assessing this
 - l. This is talking about the academic year. During the summer, there's more flexibility, since students have 9 month contracts
 - m. We're going to bring this up with the Provost
 - n. The process for removing a TA, that involves annual feedback. If you've got a student who's not performing well as a TA that you want to remove there needs to be a paper trail.
 - o. We will send this out again in advance of our first meeting in the Fall
7. We need to change our constitution slightly since currently the Provost is supposed to be the chair of this committee. Additionally, some of the things that we approve may need to go to the Senate educational policy committee. We need to clarify our relationship to the University Senate.
- a. Anything that requires SACS approval should go to the Senate committee on Educational Policy. Of late, it's been going straight from us to the Provost, to OAIR, to SACS, bypassing the Senate.
8. Self-Study Document for Master's Degree Program Reviews
- a. Will be sent out to the deans this week.

- b. May want to specify that the document will be about 2-3 pages, plus appendices.
We will probably specify how long each section should be, roughly.
 - c. We will supply departments with lists of students from the registrar. Those lists were pretty incorrect, but the departments should be able to narrow it down.
 - d. What are our responses supposed to be? It's not an approve or disapprove, but it's feedback that we want to be able to give. We'll write a paragraph or two response.
9. Departing GC members
- a. Mike, Rick, Kate
10. Donut Days
11. Meeting adjourned