

Graduate Council
March 17, 2014
226 University Hall
Meeting Minutes

Graduate Council Members Present:

Prosper Boyaka, Anne Carey, Russell Fazio, Amy Ferketich, Lisa Florman, Sarah Lang, Michael Lisa, Jeff Parvin, Cheena Srinivasan, Carol Whitacre

Graduate School Staff Present: Scott Herness, Patrick Osmer, Ann Salimbene, Kathleen Wallace, Susan Reeser (recorder)

A. Approval of Minutes

- Professor Florman called the meeting to order and asked for a review of the minutes from the February 17, 2014, Graduate Council meeting. The minutes were approved as submitted.

B. Graduate Council Curriculum Committee Reports and Actions

1. Proposal to create a new track within the interdisciplinary M.A. program in East Asian Studies for graduates of the Defense Language Institute's language programs in Chinese, Japanese and Korean
2. Proposal to create a 12-month mid-career professional M.A. track in Slavic and East European Studies targeting foreign area officers from the U.S. Armed Forces
 - Associate Dean Herness explained the reason for each of the two proposals, reviewed the vetting process, and answered questions from council. The proposals were voted on together and were unanimously approved by the Graduate Council. The proposals will be forwarded to the Council on Academic Affairs for further processing.

C. Announcements

1. Dean Osmer reported on a March 6 event that connects with the Graduate School's career development efforts called *Startup Snapshot* organized by the Office of Technology Commercialization to showcase some of Ohio State's most promising startup technologies to perspective mentors and investors. The participants were each given three minutes to describe and promote their ideas with the hope of finding investment funding. Dr. Whitacre said that TechColumbus provides business advice and access to capital in a 15-county Central Ohio region to help startups grow.
2. Dean Osmer reported that in preparation for the March 18 semester meeting, the graduate studies committee chairs and department chairs sent him their top three most important/pressing issues or challenges that relate to graduate education. A summary of departmental comments was prepared listing the comments into five main categories: student funding, fellowships, doctoral review, Graduate School policies, and other. Dean Osmer said that some issues show a factual misunderstanding about some Graduate School rules and policies and can be easily addressed. He asked council to help talk through some of the more substantive topics in preparation for what he can expect to hear during the semester meeting.

Council reviewed several of the more contentious topics dealing with funding such as the fellowship competition and its review process, the need to increase funding for incoming, multiple year, and summer graduate students, and the possibility of revisiting the doctoral program review assessment to re-evaluate resource distribution. Dean Osmer asked council to please attend the March 18 semester meeting to help get the conversation started and assist in responding to the discussion points.

D. Business

1. Dean Osmer reported on the ongoing review taking place of the emeritus faculty policy. At the provost's request, Dean Osmer is working with Susan Williams, vice provost, Academic Affairs, David Manderscheid, executive dean and vice provost, Arts and Sciences, and Dr. Whitacre, Office of Research, to improve and clarify the policy. Dean Osmer said that the direction of the policy revision has been identified and reviewed with the President and Provost Advisory Committee (PPAC), OAA Leadership, and the Council of Deans.

The proposed modifications to the policy are twofold. Faculty who wish to maintain their graduate faculty status can do so through a renewable petition process for an agreed, fixed amount of time, not to exceed five years. This will allow faculty to advise students and also require them to undertake all the duties and responsibilities of graduate faculty members. A second policy will be for faculty who retire or leave the university outright and only wish to see their current students through to completion. Dean Osmer said that the petition would need to be signed off by the department chair and the college dean as they will best know the financial concerns of the program and the strategic direction of the college.

Council discussed the benefits of having the department and college involved in the emeritus faculty process so that formal and legal connections with the university can be confirmed and the student's best interests are taken into consideration. Dean Osmer asked council to send him comments about the draft policy and wording.

Professor Florman adjourned the meeting at 4:47 p.m.

March 9, 2014

Dear All,

Here's a first draft with thoughts on modifying the current Graduate School policy for emeritus faculty. It's based on conversations we've had among ourselves and the discussion with the Council of Deans at its last meeting. Please take a look and let me know what you think.

Thanks,

Pat

DRAFT IDEAS

The three main points I take away from the discussions so far are:

- The need to develop a policy and procedure for allowing emeritus faculty who wish to remain active to petition to continue their graduate faculty status.
- There some words in the current policy that are red flags for some of the emeritus faculty.
- It would be good to make clear that one of the reasons behind the new policy is the importance of having someone with a contractual obligation to the university to be involved in the advising process for graduate students.

Except for the above points, I have not detected serious objections to the current policy as it applies to faculty who leave the university for other positions or to faculty who retire and want to see their current students through to completion but do not otherwise wish to remain as fully active graduate faculty. But please let me know if you think there are important objections to the current policy.

Proposed modifications to the current policy.

1. Faculty who wish to maintain their graduate faculty status

Petition process. A simple, straightforward process would be to have emeritus faculty petition to maintain their graduate faculty status for an agreed, fixed amount of time, in my opinion not to exceed five years. This would enable them to advise students (new and continuing) but it would also obligate them to undertake all the duties and responsibilities of graduate faculty members. This would keep them active and engaged in graduate education and thus respond to Cheryl Achterberg's good comment that simply allowing them to advise students would isolate them from other aspects of graduate activities, to the potential detriment of students. Furthermore it avoids the criticism that if they only advised students, they would be 'cherry picking' only the part of graduate education they were interested in, which would not be fair to regular members of the graduate faculty.

Here is some draft language for such a petition policy:

Emeritus faculty who plan to remain active in research, scholarship, or creative activity may petition the Graduate School to retain their graduate faculty status (with all its rights,

responsibilities, and duties). The petition should be based on the same criteria used by the graduate studies committee (GSC) to appoint regular graduate faculty and must be approved by the GSC. In addition, the petition must be approved by the department chair and the dean of the college. It should specify a fixed term, not to exceed five years, for the continued appointment after which it could be extended by mutual agreement and the same approval process.

2. Faculty who leave the university or who retire and only wish to see their students through to completion.

Wording changes. We are willing to entertain and make minor or cosmetic changes to the existing policy for faculty who leave the university or who retire and only wish to see their students through to completion. For example, we could modify terminology such as 'dissertation advisor' and 'academic advisor' and perhaps use 'co-advisor,' if that would overcome objections to the current usage.

Contractual obligation. We can add a phrase that a student needs to have someone with a contractual obligation with the university to be involved in the advising (so that readers of the policy will understand why we specified having an academic advisor in addition to the dissertation advisor).