

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
Graduate School  
Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, March 12, 1974  
11:30 AM 626 Campus Club

**Present:** Professors Frank Ungar, Edward Silberman, Frederic McDuffie, Donald Otterby, Charles Walcott, Mary Turpie for Betty Robinett; Professor Hernan Vidal, by invitation; Graduate Student representatives, Paul Stembler, Marcia Tressler, Dennis Jackson; Deans Kenneth Keller, Andrew Hein, Kenneth Zimmerman; Beverly Miller, Bonita Sindelir, Taewon Rno; Dean May Brodbeck, presiding; Shirley McDonald, Secretary.

**A. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION**

**1. Graduate Faculty Nominations - clarification of criteria**

A draft on policy and procedures for Graduate Faculty nominations received preliminary discussion at the February meeting of the Executive Committee. The Policy and Review Committees were asked to consider the draft in detail and report their reaction.

Dean Zimmerman attended meetings held by several of the committees and mentioned some suggestions and comments coming out of the discussions.

- a) In small fields where there may be no senior faculty to make the nominations, should self-nomination be permitted? (This situation may exist in areas in which there is no graduate major, but coursework is available for use as a minor or related field; appointments at the A-1 and A-2 levels are necessary for teaching and serving on students' examination committees.)
- b) The question of mandatory letters of recommendation as part of the nomination process was discussed. The Physical Sciences and the Language, Literature and Arts Committees do have such a requirement. The Plant and Animal and the Health Sciences Policy and Review Committees would like to institute the practice; the Social Sciences Committee left the question open and the Education-Psychology Committee favors a flexible policy.
- c) On the appointment of graduate students at the A-1 level, one Policy and Review Committee feels that the statement in the policy draft is too rigid. Dean Zimmerman suggested that exceptions in isolated cases can be considered, but that the general policy as set forth in the statement should obtain.
- d) Another suggestion involves the inclusion of a statement to cover the few situations in which the student's adviser is not the chairman of the examining committee.

Graduate Faculty nominations for the Social Sciences are reviewed by the Unit Committees which do not have student representation. This is an experiment which was initiated because it is felt that a better review and a more consistent reviewing process is possible by faculty who are familiar with the nominees. Professor Walcott said that the principal objection to this practice is the lack of student input and that the Policy and Review Committee spent some time exploring alternatives which would provide for student participation. Several of the Policy and Review Committee members suggested that the logical place for student input is at the department level and the Committee would like to see a systematic mechanism which would incorporate student input into the review of A-3 and B nominations at the department level.

Professor Walcott explained that there is considerable variation in the nominating procedures by departments and that the Policy and Review Committee plans to survey the current practices in the Social Sciences fields. The Committee would like to continue with the review by the Unit Committees until the survey is complete and there has been time to evaluate the experiment.

Dean Brodbeck asked that this issue be resolved before faculty commitments are made for the fall.

Mr. Stembler referred to self-nomination to the Graduate Faculty mentioned earlier. He asked whether it might be better for a Graduate School Dean to recommend to the Graduate Faculty in areas where there is a lack of senior faculty. Dean Keller suggested that the appropriate Policy and Review Committee consider these cases first and then refer them to the Dean of the Graduate School for final action. Dean Brodbeck agreed that this would be a better administrative procedure.

Professor Silberman said that the Physical Sciences Policy and Review Committee would prefer endorsement by the Directors of Graduate Study on all nominations since the Directors are not always aware of them nor of their responsibilities in this and other matters. Dean Brodbeck pointed out that nominations to the Graduate Faculty are not to be dependent upon a single individual's recommendation. However, since the nominations are to be coordinated through the Directors of Graduate Study, transmittal of the documents through their offices to the Graduate School would give some assurance that the Directors are informed. The Dean mentioned a handbook, to be prepared in the Graduate School, which will include information about duties and responsibilities of Unit and Policy and Review Committees, Directors of Graduate Study, and the like.

Professor Ungar said that the Health Sciences Committee wishes to retain its present procedure of the initial review of A-3 and B nominations at the Unit Committee level because these committees are more knowledgeable about the nominees and the procedures will be more consistent. The nominations for A-3 and B appointments then come back to the Policy and Review Committee for final recommendation before going on to the Graduate School Dean's Office.

The draft will be modified taking into account the suggestions accepted by the Executive Committee and a memorandum will be distributed to the Unit Committee chairmen, Policy and Review Committee members, and the Directors of Graduate Study. (The revised document, incorporating suggested modifications, was distributed on March 18, 1974.)

2. Graduate Program Review

Dean Brodbeck mentioned active reviews, in various stages, going on in some fifteen fields and brief progress reports were made.

Dean Keller said that the protocol for joint review with the Institute of Technology has been developed and that joint reviews of many of the programs within the Physical Sciences Policy and Review Committee's area can go forward.

3. Council of Graduate Students

Mr. Stembler reported that new officers had been elected at the February meeting of the Council. They are:

Paul Stembler, President  
Dennis Cooper, Executive Vice President  
Beverly Bailey, Vice President (Committees)  
Marcia Tressler, Vice President (Finance and Relations)  
Enrique Serra, Vice President (Public Relations-Liaison)

Mr. Stembler reported also that Vice President Chase spoke to the Council on Teaching Excellence and the University's involvement with the subject.

B. ITEMS FOR ACTION

1. Proposed M.A. and Ph.D. with a major in Hispanic Linguistics

The proposal submitted originally included an M.A. with a major in Portuguese and an M.A. with a double major in Spanish-Portuguese.

Dean Brodbeck reported that it was agreed that these proposals be tabled pending further review and perhaps revision.

At this time, the Executive Committee was asked to consider the proposal for an M.A. and Ph.D. with a major in Hispanic Linguistics. Professor Hernan Vidal, from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, was invited to present the proposal and answer questions.

Professor Vidal said that there is, today, opportunity for placement of graduates in Hispanic Linguistics as coordinators of languages; this requires training in linguistics rather than in literature. With an increase in Spanish Linguistics courses in educational institutions many of our graduates are expected to teach courses in Hispanic Linguistics. The study of linguistics has grown considerably thus affecting many language fields.

In response to Mr. Jackson's question about possible effects of this new major on existing programs in the department, Professor Vidal said that the introduction of the major would, indeed, strengthen the graduate program by providing training necessary to job placement and fulfilling national and social needs as well.

The proposal includes a typical program for the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees and other information necessary to the review. It was prepared in consultation with the Department of Linguistics.

The proposal was recommended by the Language, Literature, and Arts Policy and Review Committee on February 15, 1974.

Dean Brodbeck mentioned the Minnesota Higher Education Commission's requirement for careful documentation of all new doctoral programs and the possibility that additional or more detailed information might be requested.

It was moved and seconded that the M.A. and Ph.D. with a major in Hispanic Linguistics be established. Dean Brodbeck called for a vote by the Executive Committee and the motion was passed unanimously.

Final approval must come from the Board of Regents.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Shirley A. McDonald  
Secretary

April 24, 1974



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
TWIN CITIES

Office of the Dean

Graduate School  
Johnston Hall  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 18, 1974

TO : Members of the Policy and Review Committees, Unit Committee  
Chairmen, and Directors of Graduate Study

FROM : May Brodbeck, Dean *M.B.*

SUBJECT: Graduate Faculty Nominations Policy and Procedures

Each academic year there is often some turnover in the membership of the Graduate School Policy and Review Committees and the Graduate School Unit Committees and in the ranks of the Directors of Graduate Study. As a result, the Graduate School receives inquiries about the various procedures and policies upon which a fair share of the Graduate School operation rests. One of the subjects most frequently a matter of discussion is graduate faculty nominations. This being the case I would like to call to your attention the general criteria and categories for graduate faculty nominations and the general procedures surrounding the process.

Before discussing the four levels of designation for the graduate faculty, I would like to point out that appointment to graduate faculty status is to be judged not only in terms of the individual faculty member's qualifications for the appropriate scholarly activity in the given graduate program but also in terms of the individual's active involvement in the given graduate program. Hence, while an individual faculty member may have qualifications suitable for more than one graduate program, graduate faculty status for such a person should be limited to the program or programs in which he or she will actually engage in advising, graduate teaching, or committee work.

Individuals may be appointed as either associate or full members of the graduate faculty. Associate membership is divided into three levels: A-1, A-2, and A-3. Full membership is designated as a B appointment.

#### ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP--

Graduate Faculty Level A-1: To be designated for A-1 status the individual should be qualified to teach the specific material in the specifically cited course or courses at the graduate level. It is possible that the individual

may hold a non-regular appointment (such as Lecturer) or, if circumstances are highly special, he or she may be a graduate student at the University of Minnesota. (On A-1 appointments for graduate students, see the details in the Appendix to this memorandum.) With few exceptions A-1 appointments are for a specified period of time only.

Graduate Faculty Level A-2: To be designated for A-2 status the individual should demonstrate a general scholarly grasp of the overall program or field so that he or she can skillfully teach a variety of graduate courses in the program or field, and should display the requisite knowledge and judgment to serve on examination committees at the Master's and Ph.D. levels.

Graduate Faculty Level A-3: To be designated for A-3 status the individual should be qualified to be an adviser to Master's level students and a chairman of Master's level examining committees. To ensure that the individual is competent to be an adviser on research in a program or field, his or her record of publications should be considered. Except in rare cases publication is a prerequisite to A-3 status if the individual will be advising Plan A Master's students. With Plan B Master's advising it is conceivable that competence can be demonstrated without publications. Beyond publications, of course, the individual should be able to offer some knowledge of the advising process if not actual experience.

#### FULL MEMBERSHIP--

Graduate Faculty Level B: To be designated for B status the individual should be qualified to advise both Master's and Ph.D. level students. Individual competence here must be demonstrated by a strong record of research experience, advising, and publication. The cumulative qualifications and experience of associate membership in the graduate faculty are implied for full membership.

A few related points should be mentioned. 1) In the past it has been customary to appoint new faculty to the A-2 or A-3 level for one year irrespective of qualifications to gain experience with University operations. However, the delay sometimes unduly restricts a graduate program. Recognizing this, the Executive Committee of the Graduate School recently modified this previous custom such that where qualifications clearly dictate, new faculty may be nominated for A-3 level or B level status from the outset. Hence, a new assistant professor hired to develop a new sub-field within a graduate program, for example, may be immediately eligible for A-3 level or B status if he or she meets the appropriate criteria. Similarly, a new full professor, for example, who held full graduate faculty privileges at his previous institution need not be asked to wait one year for B level status. In short, the new faculty member, whether junior or senior, should be judged on his or her merits and experience. 2) If it is appropriate, appointments to A-2, A-3, and B status can be designated for specified periods. 3) Visiting professors are eligible for graduate faculty status at the level appropriate to their qualifications for the time they are at the University. The level of A-2 should suffice in such cases unless very unusual circumstances require an adviser's role.

There is some variation in the general procedures by which graduate faculty nominations are made. I will try to describe the common practices and the variations. First, it should be kept in mind that the Unit Committee and the Policy and Review Committees approach graduate faculty nominations in several ways. The arrangement used by four of the Policy and Review Committees (Language, Literature and the Arts; Plant and Animal Sciences; Education and Psychology; and Physical Sciences) divides the activity such that A-1 and A-2 nominations are examined by the Unit Committees and A-3 and B nominations are the responsibility of the Policy and Review Committees. In the Health Sciences the appropriate Unit Committee examines all four levels of nominations and sends on only the A-3 and B nominations for the further action of the Health Sciences Policy and Review Committee. At present, on an experimental basis, the Social Science Policy and Review Committee reviews no graduate faculty nominations; all four levels are handled in their entirety by the appropriate Unit Committees. Secondly, it should also be noted that while the general criteria described above apply to all six Policy and Review Committees and/or the appropriate Unit Committees, some of the Policy and Review Committees have specified additional detail to make the general criteria focus on the graduate programs associated with the Policy and Review Committee. Four of the Policy and Review Committees have written out these criteria.

With respect to procedures, the form designed to facilitate the process is Graduate School Form No. 74 (Revised 3/72) and entitled "Nomination to the Graduate Faculty." The revised form, which everyone should use, has the important addition of a category on advising experience (Item 11). As the form implies, to be considered for one of the four levels of membership in the Graduate Faculty, an individual must be nominated by a graduate faculty member in the field who holds a graduate faculty status equal to or higher than the status in question. (In cases where there is no faculty nominator at the level for which an individual is to be nominated, as happens with new programs and some developing programs, the individual should request that one of the Graduate School deans place the matter before the appropriate Unit Committee and/or Policy and Review Committee.)

Nominations for all levels should be coordinated and transmitted through the director of graduate study. Should the director of graduate study, the department chairman, or a majority of the graduate faculty in the field oppose the given nomination, the nomination nevertheless should be forwarded to the Graduate School for the appropriate Unit and/or Policy and Review Committees. If differing views about the nomination require expression, they should accompany the positive materials and should not be the basis for withholding a nomination if one qualified graduate faculty member in the field is willing to nominate the individual. The appropriate Committees will review the nominations and make their recommendations to the dean. Any request for a review of a decision on graduate faculty status should be predicated on the introduction of new materials and evidence not part of the original nomination submission. Occasionally, of course, Unit Committees and Policy and Review Committees will return nominations with incomplete supporting information prior to making recommendation to the dean.

A few final comments. Because the criteria and the procedures stated here

are sufficiently general to apply to all fields of the Graduate School, the Unit Committee and the Policy and Review Committees will want to formulate more specific guidelines and procedures adapted to the needs and circumstances of the fields of knowledge within a given Policy and Review Committee. The great diversity of the various graduate fields and programs makes it quite clear that highly specific criteria and procedures (particularly criteria) that apply uniformly to all Unit Committees and Policy and Review Committees cannot be written. In any case the hardness of the criteria should be tempered with flexibility and prudence. Quantitative measures may prove useful in the process but they in the end cannot substitute for qualitative judgment applied to an individual's combined teaching, research, and advising experience and qualifications.

APPENDIX (to Graduate Faculty Nominations Memorandum)1) Graduate Faculty Nominations for Duluth

The Duluth Graduate Faculty Committee reviews A-1, A-2, A-3, and B nominations for the Social Sciences and makes recommendations to the dean. In all other instances A-1 and A-2 nominations are reviewed by the Duluth Graduate Faculty Committee and forwarded to the dean, and A-3 and B nominations are reviewed and forwarded to one of the five Policy and Review Committees which in turn review them and forward them to the dean. (In effect, the Duluth Graduate Faculty Committee is an all-purpose Unit Committee for UMD graduate programs.)

2) Graduate Faculty Nominations for Mayo Graduate School of Medicine

A-1 and A-2 nominations are dealt with by the Unit Committee at Mayo and forwarded directly to the dean for final action. A-3 and B nominations require the further action of the Health Sciences Policy and Review Committee and are sent to the dean.

3) Appointment of Graduate Students to the Graduate Faculty

One special problem regarding A-1 level nominations relates to the case of currently enrolled University of Minnesota graduate students.

The guidelines are:

1. Graduate students being recommended for nomination to A-1 status should have completed all course work on their Ph.D. program and have successfully completed the written and oral preliminary examinations.
2. Whenever possible, a member of the Graduate Faculty should be directly responsible for the course being taught by a graduate student; this responsibility should carry with it the assigning of grades.
3. The course to be taught by a graduate student should be a 5-level graduate course.
4. Appointments for graduate students at the A-1 level will be made for a limited time only and in no case should a graduate student hold an appointment for longer than one year. If a graduate program finds it necessary to extend a teaching assignment beyond the one year limit, the recommendation for reappointment for a limited time must again go through the regular review procedures.
5. A statement from the director of graduate study should be attached to each nomination form, and this statement should clearly spell out the reasons why it is necessary to seek appointment for a graduate student to the Graduate Faculty. (Note that only in the case of a graduate student nomination to A-1 status, the signature of the director of graduate study is a requirement. This will guarantee especially careful examination of a unique situation at the graduate program level.)