|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dr. Torey Nalbone (Chair) | Dr. Jenifer Chilton (CNHS) | Dr. Kathy Snella (FCOP) | Amanda Whitt (ExO) |
| Dr. Jessica Holm (CEP) | Dr. Hassan El Kishky (COE) | Dr. Erin West (Faculty Senate) | Monica Kenzi (SCOB) |
| Dr. Annamary Consalvo (CEP) | Dr. Gokhan Saygili (COE) | Dr. William Geiger (ExO) | Catherine Watkins (FCOP) |
| Dr. Mary Fischer (SCOB) | Dr. Jon Seal (CAS) | Dr. Alecia Wolf (ExO) | Brittani Riley (ExO) |
| Dr. Tom Roberts (SCOB) | Dr. Dewane Hughes (CAS) | Rebecca McKay Johnson (ExO) | Pierre Neuenschwander |
| Dr. Bill Sorensen (CNHS) | Dr. Michael Veronin (FCOP) | Dr. Sam Carrell (ExO) | ( = PRESENT) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ITEM | DISCUSSION | ACTION |
| I. Call to Order | Zoom |  |
| II. Approval of Minutes | 1. Approval of minutes from December 11th, 2020 GC meeting | Vote to approve December minutes; motion by Mary Fischer, 2nd by Erin West, passed unanimously |
| III. Committee Reports   1. Curriculum Committee 2. Ad Hoc | Provost Mirmiran to address the Council approx. 15 minutes   1. Curriculum Subcommittee report and recommendations;    1. 9 new courses, 3 program changes (attached) 2. Graduate Research Assistant Task Force Proposal    1. Deferred, waiting for decisions/outcomes on funding and accessing financial assistance. See b) ii and c) under Unfinished Business (WG) 3. Mission/Vision/Goals committee to focus on statement clarity, clearly defining goals of Graduate School –    1. Deferred until time/resources available to focus (TN) | Provost addressed the Council stating Graduate School will be aligned with the Research Office. Graduate School is not changing, just aligning. What initiatives should be put in place to better and improve departments with the alignment?  William Sorenson asked if faculty from the research center would have to apply for GRF to serve on Thesis & Dissertation committees. Provost responded they apply like our faculty has done, no barriers, accommodate without red tape. Dean Geiger stated we are 1 University, faculty at Health Science Center are UT Tyler faculty. Mary Fischer requested an organizational display to see the dotted lines. Torey Nalbone will get with the Provost to get that dotted line organizational chart.  a) Mary Fischer - to get answers to curriculum program questions, Torey Nalbone will send an evote for those new programs. All other new courses and program changes passed. \*All new courses and program changes approved by majority evote Jan 25, 2021  a)Dean Geiger - no updated as of yet. Alecia Wolf - keep this item on the waiting list while we wait for decisions and outcomes of other financial and funding items.    b) Torey Nalbone requested the Graduate Council to look at the document to see if this is the way we want to go; send feedback. Dean Geiger asked for document to be shared with Pierre Neuenschwander to share on HSC campus. Pierre - the schools have their own mission statements, but they don’t have a Graduate School. Torey Nalbone - both campuses are 1 unit; Grad Council needs to come up with goals. Send feedback to Torey or Alecia. |
| IV. Unfinished Business | 1. Single Curriculum Committee    1. Meeting scheduled for Jan 21, will include representation from UG and Grad, per Dean Geiger only curriculum will be cross referenced, not entire councils. (TN) 2. Strategic Enrollment Management Task Force    1. Proposal presented to Lucas Roebuck and Provost Amir Mirmiran – waiting on feedback       1. Proposal for funding stated: we agree that funding resources are a key component to the success of an effective recruitment and enrollment model. We propose that (UNIVERSITY) resource allocation for recruitment and enrollment be reviewed in a holistic way to optimize student attraction and retention for our academic programs. This may be inclusive of but not limited to funding for student recruitment, scholarships, assistantships, and waivers. We propose annual collaborative reviews with stakeholders of resource allocations to determine return on investments and evaluate effectiveness for long-term planning.       2. Create ad hoc group to devise an inclusive plan for awarding additional funds that come as a result of proposal (BG/AW). Grad Council (GC) should be proactive and come up with an inclusive plan for how we can award any additional funds that result from the proposal and determine how we can use the new model to award what we are currently awarding. Specifically, what will determine allocation of funding for student recruitment, scholarships, assistantships, and waivers. Can use Grad Research Asst Task Force findings as a starting point. 3. Future of funding graduate study, GA funding for fully admitted students    1. Provost Mirmiran allowed for TA funding for online students and has a proposal in the works for additional TA/GA funding (WG); funding questions tie in with Grad Research Asst Task Force and all are pending information and approvals from the Provost office. Vote on keeping GA policy that states GA funding can only go to fully admitted students, and that the academic department is the party responsible for ensuring GA policy is followed (AW) 4. Holistic Admission practices    1. Dean Geiger to contact UT System (Lemoine) about holistic admission    2. Create ad hoc group to devise a proposal for guidelines for implementing a holistic admission process here.    3. Can provisionally admitted students count their performance in the first semester as part of the (holistic) decision making process? Discuss/vote if appropriate 5. Thesis & Dissertation roles and responsibilities    1. Alecia Wolf asked for the feedback that came in from the departments when it was presented previously. Researching programs and possibilities for tracking timelines and sending date reminders. Feedback received from several GC members. (AW)   **Document attached for approval as a guideline for programs that do not have their own handbook with this information available to students. After Committee forms are approved, the Grad School will send reminders once per semester of due dates and deadlines via our CRM.**   * 1. Leave of absence during candidacy; what options available for a leave of absence once a student has been accepted into candidacy? Discuss/vote if appropriate  1. A review of the definition of the role of the Graduate Advisor – report deferred.    1. Tabled, not removed; BG/TN 2. External Peer review    1. Document to address the aim of the review drafted by Torey Nalbone, up for discussion | a)  1. Meeting planned with Laura Owens, should be ready to propose as an adoption in February  b)  1. (i./ii.) Dean Geiger - suggested an Ad Hoc be created to be proactive allocating funding. There should be involvement of programs in making decisions about who receives the award. Dean Geiger - we receive feedback on who receives the reward. Brittani Riley - after the application deadline the scholarship office sends the list to the Dean’s for disbursement, assumption is the department has agreed they want the student. Torey Nalbone - if Graduate Research funds become available a process needs to be created. Discussion revealed that faculty do have input on the allocation of funding so no ad hoc is needed. If we get additional GRA funding we can look at developing a process.  c)  1. Awaiting feedback from Provost. Vote requested regarding changing to allow provisional and conditionally admitted students to receive funding. Torey Nalbone - if Council believes that non-fully admitted students be funded? Gokhan Saygili questioned percent of our students are prov/cond admitted? Brittani Riley will get the numbers and send them. Erin West - what other schools do? Alecia Wolf - they fund only fully admitted and have no oversight of the funds. Pierre Neuenschwander - if the students have time to get the forms together and are the funds short? Torey Nalbone - the inconsistency of programs causes the issue and it depends on where the funds come from. Pierre Neuenschwander - motion to allow programs to appeal the decision for students that have tried to get outstanding items; Hassan El-Kishky 2nd the motion; passed unanimously. Torey Nalbone - no appeal, no funding. If student has backing of the dept. they should appeal it.  d) Dean Geiger will contact Lemoine at UT System again; on hold  e)  1. Alecia Wolf - Thesis and Dissertation Roles and Responsibilities document be approved to provide to departments and students to understand the process and deadlines, etc. The current process and previous discussion about integrating into the new LMS, but nothing set in stone. Torey Nalone requested feedback on this and the document will go back out.  2. Torey Nalbone - Leave of Absence during candidacy, not just prior to. Jenifer Chilton - it would allow the clock to stop for students when they run into issues during candidacy. Dean Geiger - students have to continuously enroll, Peirre Neuenschwander - continuous enrollment is important for research. Dean Geiger - the program can make a request on behalf of the student, if they support it. Proper chain of command should be followed for approval up to Graduate School Dean. Catalog should be updated with this decision.  f)Torey Nalbone met with Dean Geiger, will get a milestone document for programs out to Graduate Council.  g) defer |
| V. New Business | 1. Representation from Health Science campus at Graduate Council Meetings (TN) 2. Admission Appeal Subcommittee 3. discuss process for appointing a committee comprised of GC members to hear Admission Appeals (WG/BR) | a) Pierre Neuenschwander - keep representation of UT Health Science Center to 1 person for now.  b)Catalog states there is an appeal process via the Graduate Council. Dean Geiger - committee can be appointed by Graduate Council when the situation arises. Mary Fischer - leave naming of the ad hoc by the sitting Chair of the Graduate Council. Torey Nalbone - there is not written procedure for the appeal process; he, Brittani Riley, and Alecia Wolf will put together a policy. |
| VI. Announcements /Open Forum | 1. website alignment and access | Alecia Wolf - has been talking with Katie Hall and there have already been links added to the 3 sections of the HSC on the website. |
| VII. Adjourn |  | Adjourn – 3:00 PM Mary Fischer made motion, Hassan El Kishky 2nd |





Thesis and Dissertation

Roles and Responsibilities of the   
Chair, Committee Members, and Students

**Role and Responsibilities of the Chair**

* The Chair is expected to be familiar with current policies and procedures in the program and [The Graduate School](https://www.uttyler.edu/graduate/thesis-dissertation/thesis-faculty.php)
* The Chair is responsible for guiding the student to produce graduate level, original scholarship in the proposed topic area. This typically involves meeting with the student to develop the idea for the project and reading drafts of the written proposal, guiding the student to set a realistic timeline for completion of the thesis/dissertation, setting expectations for draft submissions and turnaround times, and guiding the selection of committee members.
* The Chair submits the Appointment of Thesis/Dissertation Committee form to [GradForms@uttyler.edu](mailto:GradForms@uttyler.edu) for Graduate School Approval.
* When the Chair is satisfied with the quality of the proposal, the student schedules a meeting of the Committee at which the proposed study is discussed. The proposal is given to committee members at least two weeks before the date of the proposal meeting. Unless otherwise directed by the Chair, committee members do not review drafts of the proposal.
* The Chair will guide the student in the selection of methods/procedures for data collection and analysis and assist the student in navigating the IRB approval process.
* The Chair will read the work in progress and suggest revisions and will regularly confer with the student to discuss the progress. The Chair can be expected to provide feedback on all aspects of the written documents including grammar and clarity of writing; organization of the literature review; thoroughness of studies presented; quality of the methodology proposed; appropriateness of proposed statistics, and formatting. The Chair approves both the abstract and final draft of the manuscript before it is circulated to the thesis committee.
* The Chair will help prepare the student for the defense.
* The Chair schedules the oral defense with [GradForms@uttyler.edu](mailto:GradForms@uttyler.eduT) (mandatory for dissertation; optional but recommended for thesis). The Chair facilitates the defense ([Guidelines for the Conduct of a Dissertation Defense](https://www.uttyler.edu/graduate/files/conduct-of-dissertation-defense.pdf); [Guidelines for the Conduct of a Thesis Defense](https://www.uttyler.edu/graduate/files/conduct-of-thesis-defense.pdf)), checks the manuscript after its readers have suggested revisions, approves the final copies, and ensures all committee members have signed off on the final copy before the manuscript is submitted to [GradForms@uttyler.edu](mailto:GradForms@uttyler.edu) for the final formatting check.
* The Chair is expected to maintain a respectful and professional attitude at all times.

**Roles and Responsibilities of the Committee Members**

All members of the student’s committee share responsibility in ensuring that the student produces high-quality scholarship.

Committee members are responsible for reading manuscripts within the agreed-upon minimum time frame (per committee member), suggesting substantive editorial changes, and providing rationale for their support and critiques. Committee members who perceive major flaws that are likely to result in a student’s unsuccessful defense should discuss these concerns with the student and Chair immediately.

Committee members are expected to maintain a respectful and professional attitude at all times.

Committee member’s responsibilities include:

* Committee Members are expected to be familiar with current policies and procedures in the program and [The Graduate School](https://www.uttyler.edu/graduate/thesis-dissertation/thesis-faculty.php)
* In cooperation with the Chair, advising the student from the proposal stage through the final defense
* Provide subject matter expertise as requested by Chair or student
* Reading drafts and providing meaningful feedback at each stage of the process
* Guiding the student in the selection of methods/procedures for data collection and analysis
* Corresponding with the Chair and student as needed for clarification/resolution of methodological issues during the process
* Faculty who wish to resign from a committee should demonstrate courtesy by directly informing the student.
* Assist the Chair in conducting the thesis defense.
* After the student successfully completes the manuscript and defense, the members, as well as the Chair, sign the manuscript.

**Role and Responsibilities of the Student**

The student is expected to engage in active preparation of the process from the onset of the program. Candidates are responsible for choosing a topic for approval, submitting proofread drafts of materials to the Chair, preparing adequately for meetings, thoroughly reviewing all policies and procedures, and communicating on a regular basis with the Chair via email, phone, or other communication modality.

Candidates are expected to maintain contact with the Chair throughout the process to ensure that the research and writing adhere to the agreed-upon plan. As the project is the student’s responsibility, s/he must frequently keep the Chair informed of progress. The student should contact the Chair in the event of any significant changes in his/her personal or professional life which may interfere with program completion. In order to document face-to-face meetings as a part of this process, immediately following a face-to-face meeting (within 48 hours), the student should email the Cahir with a summary of the discussion.

The student is expected to maintain a respectful and professional attitude at all times.

Student responsibilities include:

* Students are expected to be familiar with current policies and procedures in the program and [The Graduate School](https://www.uttyler.edu/graduate/thesis-dissertation/thesis-faculty.php)
* In accordance with the Committee Composition guidelines in the Catalog, students are expected to contact appropriate faculty to serve as chair and committee members.
* Students should be aware that some committee members (including chairs) may resign from a committee if the student does not make timely progress toward completion.
* Students are responsible for consulting with the Chair and listening to the Chair’s advice.
* Students will confer with the Chair to set deadlines to make sure that they are working at a reasonable pace.
* Students and the Chair will develop a timeline for draft submission.
* Students should avoid consulting the full committee for feedback without prior approval of the Chair.
* Students who wish to change committee members should demonstrate courtesy by communicating about the change directly with the faculty involved.
* Students should expect to make multiple revisions to their draft throughout the entire process.
* The defense may only be scheduled once the manuscript has been given final approval by all committee members.
* It is the student’s responsibility to be familiar with the Graduate School Calendar and the deadlines for filing for graduation, scheduling the defense and the final manuscript submission.

**Conflict Resolution**

Conflicts occasionally arise between students and their dissertation/thesis chairs or committee members. Sources of conflict may include but are not limited to disagreement about a timeline for completing the project, disagreement about the direction of the study or the interpretation of the results, and disagreement about the content, style, and editing of the dissertation or thesis manuscript.

If a conflict is disrupting the progress of the dissertation/thesis, the student should follow the procedures below.

1. The student must first make a documented attempt to resolve the issue with the chair or committee member who is involved in the conflict.
2. If unable to resolve the conflict, the student may follow up with the chair (except in those instances when the conflict is with the chair), followed by the program coordinator or the department chairperson.
3. If the conflict cannot be resolved within the department to the satisfaction of all parties, the chair or the student may forward the disagreement in writing to the dean of the College for further mediation.