October 22, 2020                                  1 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.                                   WEBEX

Council in Attendance:
Mike Wittie (Engineering)
Christopher Livingston (Architecture)
Brock Smith (Agriculture)
Mark Pernarowski (Letters & Science)
Tricia Seifert (Education)
Dawn Tarabochia (Health & Human Development)
Bradford Watson (Faculty Senate)
Catherine Dunlop (Letters & Science)
Anne Christensen (Business)
Dennis Aig (Arts)
Wade Hill (Nursing)
Craig Ogilvie (Dean of The Graduate School)
Doralyn Rossmann (Library)
Maureen Kessler (Student Representative)

Also in Attendance:
Emily Peters (Graduate School)
Donna Negaard (Graduate School)

Absent:
Que Vo (International Programs)

Meeting started at 1:03 pm on WebEx

October 8, 2020 minutes
• Motion to approve by Aig, 2nd by Dunlop, unanimously passed

Announcements
• Update from the Dean
  o Virtual Graduate School recruitment fair: over 30 departments hosting 1-hour Webex sessions for prospective students
    ▪ Attendees receive coupon to apply at no cost
  o Second Annual Candidacy Celebration: 5pm on Thursday 29th via Webex
  o Hooding ceremony was approved: afternoon of November 21st
  o Scholarship applications for childcare, food, international students: received 3x more applicants for each scholarship than had budget for – reallocated Graduate School budget to fund all the applicants
    ▪ Highlights need for increased stipend, minimum stipend (department set) for research grants, increased pay for GTAs
• **Faculty Senate update (Watson)**
  o Faculty Senate took proposal forward to accommodate childcare on campus; HR is trying to find a partner
  o Hoping to finalize and disseminate findings from COVID taskforce next week
  o Graduate courses and certificates were approved at Faculty Senate
  o Concern raised that COVID communications and policy updates are not listed in a central location—the university is working on organizing this information in a singular place

**Old Business**

• **Cybersecurity MS, Level II program proposal**
  o Call for comments on revised proposal:
    • Pg. 4: second paragraph needs more clarification: “A BS carries significantly more weight…”
      • Should it be an MS or is referencing a Computer Science BS?
    • Tarabochia moves to approve the proposal with clarification of the second paragraph on pg. 4, second by Wittie, unanimously approved
    • Livingston will ask for clarification and then forward the proposal

• **PhD in Indigenous & Rural Health, Level II program proposal**
  o Proposer will attend November 5th meeting

• **Graduate Certificate Policy**
  o Removed the language of “governmental, educational, or health care related agency”
    • These requirements may come from a different body – tried to create more flexible language
  o Updated language: “9-11 credits if such an amount is sufficient to obtain licensure or continuing education credits necessary to secure or maintain employment credentials”
  o Call for comments
  o Will revisit at next meeting for a vote

• **Co-convening, discussion on possible limits**
  o Review background: issue raised in an accreditation review
  o Possible option: no more than a set number (ex: 1/3) of a program’s curriculum can be co-convened
    • Could differentiate required courses versus electives
  o Open Discussion:
    • Seems difficult to have numbers of courses versus percentages, because of different total amounts required by programs
    • A ratio seems fair to create a distinct graduate level experience, but does not penalize smaller programs – great starting place
  o Q: Does this include 590/690 research credits?
    • A: Used the term “course” for this reason, would be ratio of coursework, not research credits
  o The recent cybersecurity proposal discussed the benefits of co-convened courses for undergraduate students
  o Q: Any sense of how many courses are co-convened?
    • A: Unsure. This information is not readily accessible
• Estimate 5-10% of courses through faculty senate are co-convened
  ▪ It would be helpful to have a sense of how many programs use co-convened courses—what would the impact of the policy be on existing programs?
  ▪ Might be helpful to look at a sample of programs to see how many classes are co-convened
  ▪ Suggestion that co-convened course could enroll no more than 1/3 undergraduates
    ▪ Often the other direction, more undergraduates in the course
    ▪ This would be challenging to enforce
    ▪ Focusing on the actual course instead of enrollment in the course would be better for tracking and enforcement
  ▪ Helpful to consider required courses separately from elective courses – policy could be for core courses with more flexibility for electives
  ▪ Q: Are there any best practices for teaching these classes? How to successfully teach these co-convened classes so that undergraduates and graduates get the learning outcomes they need? Is this a successful pedagogical approach?
    ▪ A: Graduate School will look at best practices on co-convening and data on co-convening in existing programs
  ▪ Peer learning provides great structure for undergraduate students, raises the level of conversation
    ▪ Raises level for undergraduates, but does that serve the graduates? Some skills gained from teaching undergraduates, but is the content at a high enough level?
  ▪ Usually offered to resolve departmental logistic issues—stabilizing enrollments, not enough faculty to teach, etc.
  ▪ Crossing disciplines is very beneficial to programs

New Business
• **UGC role description for CiM:** tabled

• **Conflict of Interest policy**
  ▪ Policy committee raised questions regarding the policy draft
    ▪ Where/how would disclosure of a relationship occur?
    ▪ Faculty privacy – what are the faculty rights?
    ▪ ADVANCE grant: restoring gender balance; spousal hires were used as an incentive to bring female faculties to MSU
    ▪ Is this setting back institutional or cultural change?
    ▪ Should the policy proposal be sent to the family advocate or office of institutional equity?
  ▪ History of the policy proposal: the power differential between students and faculty is a huge aspect; issues arise when there is a conflict and students must navigate the situation with a couple and the existing power differential
    ▪ The intent is not to require disclosure of private information, more of a managerial tool to fall back on when conflicts arise
  ▪ What about situations where students want a couple on their committee?
    ▪ There is an exception, over seen by the department head and the graduate school
    ▪ Expertise is usually the biggest concern; it might be in the student’s best interest to have both members on the committee
    ▪ Exception proposed as a 5th member
When does a couple need to disclose that they are a couple? Or no longer a couple? Or maybe do not want to disclose a same sex relationship?

“Conflict of interest” does not have to be a relationship; what the “conflict of interest” is does not have to be disclosed

Department Heads help create committees and function in an HR role; already help with committee decisions, balancing workloads, etc.

How is the decision made that there is a conflict of interest?

- Case-by-case situations do currently exist; would be extremely helpful to have a policy to direct these situations to

Process usually seems to start at the Department Head

The graduate representative was valuable for these situations

- It was in the best interest of the student, but it was removed because it was difficult for students to find this additional person
- Suggested creating a pool of graduate representatives willing to serve
- Feedback that a graduate representative was beneficial
- Graduate representatives are still an option, it is just no longer required
- Students never think there will be a conflict when they start their program. It can add additional conflict to request a grad rep later.
- Someone, such as a DH, could see a potential conflict and that triggers a grad rep

This specific policy narrows the problem to spouses, but there are also a variety of other problems – might send the wrong message to departments that have worked hard to bring couples, particularly females, to MSU

MSU has a current conflict of interest policy, this could be leaned on

- If there is a conflict of interest – a graduate representative can be added to the committee

Dean Ogilvie will send a revised version to policy committee

Adjourned at 2:31 pm

Next scheduled meeting – November 5, 2020 WEBEX