

**Graduate Committee  
Approved Minutes  
Tuesday 7 September 2010  
ML1027 Memorial Library (Directly across from the Reference Desk, just past  
the stairs)  
1:00-3:00 pm**

Present: Claudia Pragman, Jerry Robicheau, Donna Brauer, Bob Sorensen, Bobby Bothmann  
(recorder)

1. Introductions

As some of us are new and new to each other, we went around the room and introduced ourselves.

2. Housekeeping stuff [DECISION]

a. Set up meeting minutes-taker rotation

Today—Bobby

5 Oct.—Claudia

2 Nov.—Jerry

30 Nov. (standby)—Bob

Donna will be next for spring semester

b. Need a substitute for the FA Executive meeting on 28 Oct.

Claudia (tentatively)

c. Need someone to co-chair our Tues. 19 Oct. meeting

Donna will co-chair; Bobby will make sure Donna has info she needs

3. Announcements

We went over the items below

a. MAGS announcement

--sent out week of 30 Aug.

College reps may send submissions directly to Bobby or bring them to the library circulation desk.

Let the staff person or student worker know the thesis is for the MAGS reserve folder. If you get a blank stare or someone who doesn't know what you are talking about, please understand this is a student worker. Leave it with them and put my name on it—it will get to me and I will know what to do with it.

The selection deadline is Friday Sept. 24; we have almost 11 days to read and review the submissions before we meet to recommend a winner.

b. meeting times

--1-3pm 1st & 3rd Tuesdays

--tentative faculty meeting on 30 Nov.

-- tentative sub-meet on 7 Dec.)

Our first sub-meet is also the dept. chair workshop time and date and that may be a problem; Bobby will go over this with Dean Flaherty to be sure this will still work.

c. GSR Web redesign or revision

--Dean Flaherty wants to make some updates

If you have comments, please let GSR know

d. Move away from binding to EDT (FYI)

--cost of binding is prohibitive

e. Other

--some questions on the Graduate Faculty Status application; see 7a below.

#### 4. Curriculum [DECISION]

##### a. No CDS submissions to-date

CDS will not open for new submission until Sept. 15

##### b. Agree upon last submission date for consideration at next meeting

Proposals submitted by the last Friday of the month will be reviewed and considered for recommendation at the next meeting; ask if GSR will add this info into their newsletter to faculty

##### c. Spring 2010 holdovers: #1666 and #1805; actions needed?

Recommended 1805; committee will review 1666 with other new proposals at next meeting

#### 5. Representative from this group needed for the Student Writing Taskforce (attachment—Writing Task Force Charge...docx) [DECISION]

Expressed need for writing evaluation of incoming graduate students.

Not all were present, so we will have this discussion on e-mail to see if anyone has a strong desire to be on this TF.

#### 6. Review of summer CDS topics [NEXT STEPS]

##### a. “Course-leveling”—(attachment: summaryof62610curriculummeeting.docx)

Donna provided some background: A MnSCU policy revision requires all courses to have outlines posted online; syllabi are the intellectual property of the faculty person; outlines are not. There are a lot of course outlines that are actually class activities or syllabi in the MnSCU system. When approving a course, the institution may only ask for a course description, course outcomes, a topical outline, and a sample syllabus for curriculum approval only. Bullet number 2 under the first heading: rather than “final syllabus” use the term “sample or representative syllabus”

We felt this topic is a subset of the larger discussion on course rigor and ties in with the concept of “Guidelines for Graduate Courses” (example:

[http://rackham.helpserve.com/index.php?\\_m=knowledgebase&\\_a=viewarticle&kbarticleid=227&nav=0](http://rackham.helpserve.com/index.php?_m=knowledgebase&_a=viewarticle&kbarticleid=227&nav=0)

<[http://rackham.helpserve.com/index.php?\\_m=knowledgebase&\\_a=viewarticle&kbarticleid=227&nav=0](http://rackham.helpserve.com/index.php?_m=knowledgebase&_a=viewarticle&kbarticleid=227&nav=0)> )

As a next step, this group should make decisions for expectations of kinds of outcomes/objectives that are appropriate for these courses. We asked are these Guidelines or Expectations? These are guidelines.

Bobby will follow up with John Banschbach and Tim Secott as to what that group felt were the logical next step?

We proposed the idea that this group set as a goal the writing of a set of guidelines for MSU for this academic year. We should bring this up at the meet and confer.

##### b. “CDS” enhancements—(attachment: CDS Enhancements discussed at the 6.docx)

We like these and want to see them implemented Bobby will contact Chris and find out where are we. Bobby will bring up with Dean Flaherty and present them as needs.

#### 7. Prepare for Sub-Meet [DISCUSSION]

##### a. Discuss issues with the graduate faculty status

(GSR has a roster: <http://grad.mnsu.edu/faculty/graduatefaculty2010.html>)

--what happened to the revised application forms? This committee had revised the application to create three forms, one for each status level and the list of items needed was made more clear in the form. This application is not yet posted. Bobby will bring up with Dean Flaherty.

--Some committee members brought up some concerns about graduate faculty status. One concern is an assumption that regular and research status' credentials qualify someone to advise and teach a doctoral student and that the status has something to do with the number of articles they publish; the title "Research Faculty Status" title is an unfortunate choice of wording that seems to cause people to want this status so that they can do research, which is not the intent of the status; there are not enough categories to represent the kinds of activities that various people involved with graduate students engage in. We know the status is a construct for HLC accreditation. We felt the issues need more discussion in the faculty with specific concerns before we bring this up at the meet and confer. We will discuss this further at a later time

b. Discuss IRB issues

The IRB requirement has the advisor as the PI of a student's research and this is problematic; the student should be the PI of a research project; an advisor should not be asked to assume the responsibility of the student. We will ask Dean Flaherty to bring the IRB folks over to comment on the process for us and discuss further if required.

As an aside, I did a little investigating. The federal guidelines

[http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/irb/irb\\_chapter1.htm](http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/irb/irb_chapter1.htm) require an "experienced principal investigator" and the IRB sites I looked at all back that up. The one I found that breaks it up a little was from MIT, which allows students doing exempt research to be the PI, but all non exempt research requires the faculty advisor. Here are some of the sites:

<http://www.research.vcu.edu/irb/wpp/flash/IX-1.htm> <<http://www.research.vcu.edu/irb/wpp/flash/IX-1.htm>> Va. Commonwealth U

<http://irb.illinois.edu/?q=investigator-handbook/part1.html> <<http://irb.illinois.edu/?q=investigator-handbook/part1.html>> UIUC

<http://www.kenyon.edu/x35073.xml> <<http://www.kenyon.edu/x35073.xml>> Kenyon

<http://www.irb.umn.edu/guidance/pir.html> <<http://www.irb.umn.edu/guidance/pir.html>> U of MN Twin Cities

<http://www.drew.edu/Default-Content.aspx?id=16109> <<http://www.drew.edu/Default-Content.aspx?id=16109>> Drew U

[http://web.mit.edu/committees/couhes/population\\_students\\_invest.shtml](http://web.mit.edu/committees/couhes/population_students_invest.shtml)

<[http://web.mit.edu/committees/couhes/population\\_students\\_invest.shtml](http://web.mit.edu/committees/couhes/population_students_invest.shtml)> MIT

c. Discuss grading policy issues

A B-grade in graduate school is considered above average and C is below average; there is not a designation for an average grade

There should be a designation for an average grade because the lack thereof leads to grade inflation; what do you do with the average graduate student?

Discuss this semester and see what comes of the discussion. Also, is there a policy in place for total number of C grades?

d. Discuss next steps with regard to the two reports

i. Task Force on Grad. Ed. <http://grad.mnsu.edu/faculty/taskforce/>

ii. Thinking/Acting Like a Doctoral Institution report

<[http://www.mnsu.edu/planning/priorities/taskforce/doctoralcommitteereport\\_draftrecommendations.pdf](http://www.mnsu.edu/planning/priorities/taskforce/doctoralcommitteereport_draftrecommendations.pdf)> (PDF file)

This committee expressed to Dean Blackhurst that she should convey our concern about growth of graduate education being expected without additional resources; there is a disconnect with the idea of getting additional funds from outside sources; how do you get that support to get established? Ask

Dean Flaherty what Dean Blackhurst shared with him about the committee's feedback on the TF report.

Did not think of ourselves as a tier 1 institution; some programs are strong, others support the region  
You can't build a doctoral institution on the backs of faculty;

Main concern is how to get support and how we do this without exploiting the faculty; our main concern or issue

e. Solicit possible agenda topics for a graduate coordinators meeting in early Oct.

What is the purpose of the graduate coordinator meetings? Scope out the expectations

8. Other

Discuss/review the charge of this committee;

Respectfully submitted,

Bobby Bothmann