



Minutes of the Graduate Board

Thursday, March 23, 2006

Executive Conference Room
Student Faculty Center
Health Sciences Center Campus
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Ann E. Barr, Saroj K. Biswas, Beth Bolton, Daniel L. Canney, James L. Daniel, Jay Fagan, Judith Litvin, G. Augusto Lorenzino, A. Marjatta Lyyra, Elizabeth Moran, Wesley Roehl, Jagbir Singh

Ex-Officio Member:

Aquiles Iglesias, Dean, Graduate School
Zebulon Kendrick, Associate Dean, Graduate School

Graduate School Staff:

Cheryl Jackson, Assistant to the Dean
Kathryn Petrich-LaFevre, Director of Graduate Information
Michael Toner, Research Associate

Approval of the Minutes:

Ann Barr motioned to approve the minutes of January 19, 2006. Augusto Lorenzino seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously passed.

Business:

The focus of discussion was the Board of Trustees' revised policy on the structure of the Graduate School. Dean Iglesias noted that the Student Appeals Committee was added to the text, while only select changes were made in the wording throughout. This was done to ensure that the Graduate Board would be advisory to the Board of Trustees and not a decision-making body. He further noted that membership in the Graduate Faculty remains somewhat exclusionary under the new policy, with only tenured and tenure-track appointees eligible for Graduate Faculty status.

The Dean also provided copies of the Graduate Faculty Criteria and Responsibilities document that had been approved by the Graduate Board in February 2004 but voted down by the Graduate Faculty-at-large in May 2005. While not wed to the document, he offered it as a foundation on which the current Graduate Board could build a policy that would broaden the pool of faculty to serve on committees. He explained that in the original drafting of the document strong opposition had been expressed to not stipulating "tenure or tenure track" for fear of the University's attempting to operate without tenure and tenure-track appointees. His concern now lies in the inclusion of CETs, who are those in the Clinical Educator Track, and Research Professors.

Elizabeth Moran agreed that the Graduate Faculty Criteria and Responsibilities document was a good place to begin discussions. Ann Barr inquired, in light of the revised policy, about the status of the CETs in Physical Therapy who are currently active on dissertations. The Dean noted that they are grandfathered in and that the committees on which they sit will experience no disruption. Faculty with M.F.A.s and current outside readers are also not jeopardized by the new policy.

Dr. Barr expressed concern that second-class citizenship was afforded to Adjunct Faculty and noted that they should be judged on their accomplishments and scholarship, not type of appointment. Jagbir Singh asked who determines the level of one's accomplishments and scholarship. The Dean replied that the criteria vary by discipline and are established by the college/school with its dean's approval.

The Dean expressed his desire to see the Graduate Board establish criteria and responsibilities for the Graduate Faculty that could be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval. This would eliminate the possibility that the Trustees might develop blanket criteria for Graduate Faculty status that may not suit all schools and colleges. He noted that while the Graduate Faculty-at-large will be advised of any new policies, that body no longer has the power to vote the policies down.

Saroj K. Biswas stated his preference for the two-tier system as he does not believe Adjunct Faculty should serve on committees. Wes Roehl pointed out that the term "adjunct" is used with multiple meanings. He questioned why, if they are outsiders, are they on the Graduate Faculty? Associate Dean Kendrick noted that it was a compromise term when the Graduate Faculty Criteria and Responsibilities document was drafted.

Marjatta Lyyra pointed out that whatever changes are made to the Graduate Faculty policy, Temple should keep itself in line with its peers and aspirant schools. Associate Dean Kendrick noted that "Research Active" faculty at other universities generally do serve on committees. Dr. Biswas asked if the "Research Active" designation is utilized both by the University and within the Health Sciences System. Jay Fagan noted that the latter distinction is key to the adjunct discussion as the Health Sciences System is outside of Temple University. The Dean asked what the CETs bring to dissertation committees if they have no research experience. Dr. Barr suggested approval be granted on an individual basis, noting that clinical expertise is important for some dissertations.

Returning to the Graduate Faculty Criteria and Responsibilities document, the Dean suggested broadening the language in the first bulleted item and questioned the deletion of the "adjunct" term. He further noted that scholarly and creative work should constitute qualifications and should be current. He offered to revise the document and to send it to the Graduate Board for review. Dr. Fagan suggested taking the revised document to the Graduate Faculty-at-large to avoid a strong backlash. Dr. Moran posited that an introductory paragraph might be helpful.

Discussion turned next to the role of Emeritus Faculty on dissertation committees. The Associate Dean noted that because many remain active following retirement, although they are no longer Temple employees, a policy is needed to address their role. It has been determined that to prevent student progress from being impeded, retirees should be kept on committees and continue to chair, provided they meet the criteria established by their school/college.

Other Business:

Several student appeals have moved directly to Legal. In addition, several requests have been received from prospective students who received rejection letters. These requests are forwarded to the individual department for response.

Responses to fellowship offers are currently being received for the more than 80 that were extended. About five have rejected their offers, while another six or seven have accepted. The negative responses lead to questioning whether Temple is making its offers too late. If this is the case, the deadline for Fall applications would have to be moved up to December. Such a unilateral decision is

unlikely, however, as the December deadline would not be feasible for all departments. Psychology's deadline is earliest, set at December 15. They work through the end of the year holiday and hold interviews beginning January 2. This level of commitment cannot be expected University-wide. The Dean pointed out, however, that a Criminal Justice conference is held each December—and many students know at that time already where they will be the next Fall.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned @ 4:00 p.m.

The next Graduate Board meeting will be held on Main Campus, 3B Conwell Hall, on Wednesday, April 19, 2006, @ 2:30 p.m.