GRADUATE FACULTY COUNCIL

MINUTES

March 28, 1990

United Nations Room, 4:00 P.M.

1. The meeting was called to order at 4:00 P.M. Dean T. Giolas presided.

2. It was moved (F. Carstensen), seconded (A. Abramson), and passed without dissent on a voice vote to approve as distributed the minutes of the December 13, 1989 meeting.

3. J. Henkel moved the following:

   AUTHORIZATION TO CONFER GRADUATE DEGREES --

   It is recommended that the degrees of Master of Arts, Master of Business Administration, Master of Dental Science, Master of Fine Arts, Master of Music, Master of Public Affairs, Master of Public Health, Master of Science, Master of Social Work, and Doctor of Philosophy be conferred upon those candidates who have satisfied all requirements and have been duly certified by The Graduate School for award of said degrees throughout the conferral periods ending May 20, 1990, August 31, 1990, and December 31, 1990.

   The motion was seconded (R. Coons) and passed without dissent on a voice vote.

4. T. Giolas responded to a question raised by J. Wilkie and F. Carstensen concerning the resolution passed at the December 1989 meeting which urged that the Dean of the Graduate School be included directly in the process of determining levels of compensation for Graduate Assistants. Giolas indicated that he was pursuing the matter.

5. Introduced for general discussion by the Council was the report of the Graduate Faculty Standards Committee. The report, entitled "Proposed Resolution for Certifying Graduate Faculty," was distributed previously to all members. The purpose of the discussion was to explore not only the report but also feedback concerning it that has been received from several faculty members and administrators since its distribution. S. Greenspan, the Committee Chair, was was introduced to speak briefly and to lead the discussion. He began by introducing members of the Committee.

Greenspan noted two key provisions of the existing Graduate School By-Laws concerning appointment to the Graduate Faculty: (1) two levels of appointment (eligibility to advise at the master's level and eligibility to advise at the doctoral level), and (2) periodic review for recertification of Graduate Faculty appointments.

The Committee surveyed comparable institutions. Of the sample of 50, at least 30 responded. Most responding institutions appear to differentiate between master's and doctoral levels of appointment. Most seem to have some form of "sunset" provision for appointments. Greenspan stressed that the proposed procedures should be perceived as facilitative rather than punitive.

As a result of discussion, the Committee agreed to incorporate in the text of the proposal language to address five changes agreed to by consensus. Highlights of these changes follow:

PROPOSED ACTIONS (pp. 4-5)

a. Concerning 1.b.1. (p. 4) -- Eligibility to serve as an Associate member of master's advisory committees was added to eligibility to chair master's advisory committees.

b. A fourth item was added (p. 5) which states that, as in the past, individuals not formally associated with The Graduate School may be appointed to serve on advisory committees as External Associate Advisors at either the Fellow or the Member level.

IMPLEMENTATION AND TIMELINE (pp. 5-7)

a. Concerning #2 (p.5) -- The duration of the provisional appointment for new appointees was increased from one year to three years.

b. Concerning #2 (p. 5) -- A sentence was added at the end of the item extending eligibility for a three-year provisional appointment to faculty returning to scholarly service upon completion of a major service assignment.

c. A tenth item was added (p. 7) which states that, as in previous practice, an appointee to the Graduate Faculty may serve as an Associate Advisor in any Field of Study irrespective of the Field(s) of his or her own appointment(s).

T. Giolas was recognized for the purpose of speaking to the report. He applauded the Committee's work and expressed support for the first half of the report. He indicated, however, that difficulties might well arise in attempting to implement some of the provisions outlined in the report. Specifically, Giolas identified the ten-member committee and the criteria for evaluation, key elements of the process proposed in the report, as concerns. He asked Council members to consider an alternative proposal which would link the process of evaluating faculty members for Graduate Faculty appointment to the granting of tenure and the PTR process. New faculty members coming aboard would be granted an automatic provisional appointment at either the Fellow or at the Member level. This generally would be consonant with the Committee's report, which provides for a three-year initial provisional appointment (originally one year, but changed by consensus to three years). Giolas, however, recommended that the duration of the initial provisional appointment be set at six years because the review of faculty members for the granting of tenure normally would occur toward the end of the six year period. Upon the granting of tenure, the faculty member would be granted a seven-year re-appointment to the Graduate Faculty. Giolas stressed his belief that the Graduate Faculty appointment procedure should be linked in this way to the PTR process.

P. Clapp said that the report and the procedure it proposes will be perceived negatively and that they might serve to render the attainment of Graduate Faculty status unappealing to those who do not have it or who have lost it.

P. Rosenberg spoke of the report as a place to begin in an effort to insure high standards in the advising of graduate students.

G. Anderson and J. Knox expressed support for the goals of the report, but each raised questions about the likelihood that the kind of self-evaluation proposed in the report might lead to the making of hard decisions.

L. Strausbaugh expressed support for the report pointing out that the document identifies criteria to which faculty can aspire.

D. Cooperstein and P. Willett both indicated that they found totally unappealing the prospect that they would be unable to advise doctoral students as new faculty appointees at the University. Cooperstein added that there is too much bureaucracy here.

J. McKenna stated that there are already many ways to address the matter of faculty members whose levels of productivity are unsatisfactory.

Frequently raised in the discussion was the question "Is there currently a problem {which the report attempts to address}?"

J. Wilkie noted that the strength of the present system is its "built-in flexibility." She recommended that items nine and ten of the report (p. 7) be dropped.

B. Lovell spoke in opposition to the Wilkie proposal.

E. Pagoulatos pointed out that the negative comments concerning the report actually are not leveled against the report itself, but rather against the By-Laws. The By-Laws require that there be two levels of appointment to the Graduate Faculty as well as periodic review of appointments. The proposal contained in the Committee's report merely attempts to implement the requirements of the By-Laws.

W. Berentsen expressed support for some kind of certification process for members of the Graduate Faculty, including faculty members who are well-established.

T. Kehle expressed the view that research productivity must emerge as the primary criterion for the evaluation of Graduate Faculty appointments.

D. Cooperstein and P. Willett expressed their preference for automatic appointment to the Graduate Faculty.

T. Jones spoke in favor of the Giolas proposal, particularly with respect to the decentralization of the evaluation process.

R. Coons spoke in favor of the Giolas proposal because Fields of Study differ. He indicated that "brilliant thinkers" who may not publish extensively must be permitted to advise doctoral students in a Field such as History. A. Hiskes concurred, indicating that the same is true in Philosophy.

J. Thibodeau noted that the PTR process stops at a certain point in the case of senior faculty, so long-term periodic review of Graduate Faculty appointments is important.

Both A. Hiskes and L. Strausbaugh voiced the opinion that appointments to the Graduate Faculty must be Field-of-Study specific. Strausbaugh expressed support for the Giolas proposal.

Discussion was brought to a close. S. Greenspan, on behalf of the Graduate Faculty Standards Committee, expressed appreciation for all comments. He spoke in favor of assurance of high standards of scholarship in certifying (especially doctoral-level) appointments to the Graduate Faculty. He advocated some centralized control over

the process--to serve as a screen. He indicated that the matter of teaching doctoral-level courses should be kept separate from doctoral-level advising.

6. Adjournment was at 5:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas B. Peters
Secretary

THOSE PRESENT:

Councillors

A. Abramson
D. Allinson
G. Anderson
W. Berentsen
S. Biggs
W. Bohlen
R. Buck
F. Carstensen
P. Clapp
R. Coons
P. Douglas
G. Frantz
A. Gelfand
S. Greenspan
H. Hansen
A. Hiskes
T. Jones
N. Katter
T. Kehle
J. Knox
J. Koberstein
E. Kollar
B. Lovell
J. McKenna
C. Norgaard
E. Pagoulatos
P. Rosenberg
B. Rutherford
W. Smith
C. Spencer
L. Strausbaugh
J. Thibodeau
J. Wilkie
P. Willett
T. Yang
C. Zirakzadeh

Graduate School

T. Giolas
J. Henkel
E. Sellers
T. Peters