

PURDUE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL

Minutes of the Graduate Council Meeting
September 19, 2019
1:30 p.m.

First Meeting
Purdue Graduate Student Center

PRESENT: Linda J. Mason, chair, Council Members, Dulcy M. Abraham, Christopher R. Agnew, Blake A. Allan, Thomas W. Atkinson, Taylor W. Bailey, Rita A. Burrell, Ryan A. Cabot, Kuan-Chou Chen, David S. Cochran, William (Bart) Collins, G. Jonathan Day, Duane D. Dunlap, Emad Elwakil, Keith B. Gehres, Margaret Gitau, Richard H. Grant, Patricia Hart, Signe E. Kastberg, Timothy B. Lescun, Samuel P. Midkiff, James L. Mohler, John A. Morgan, Melanie Morgan, Paul F. Muzikar, Zhan Pang, Tina L. Payne, Paul Salama, Abraham Schwab, David G. Skalnik, John A. Springer, Mitchell L. Springer, Rebecca H. Stankowski, Jill Sutor, Joseph D. Thomas, Xavier M. Tricoche, Eric Waltenburg, Yoon Yeo, Chenn Zhou

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE RECEIVED FROM: Christopher K. Belous, Janice S. Blum, Athena Kennedy, William McCartney, Beth McNeil, Manushag (Nush) Powell, Anson Soderbery, Candiss B. Vibbert (Provost's Representative), Nicole J. Widmar

ABSENCES: Daoguo Zhou

GUESTS: Jacob Askeroth, Gregory Blaisdell, Shawn Donkin, Debbie Fellure, Korena Vawter

I. MINUTES

The minutes of the April 18, 2019, Graduate Council meeting were approved as presented.

II. DEANS REMARKS AND REPORTS

- a. Dr. Linda Mason welcomed the new council members. Dr. Mason emphasized the importance of the role of graduate council members at the University in moving graduate education forward. It is critical that we have the opinions and ideas of the council to move forward.

Dr. Mason noted that as she begins her second year as the Dean, she would like to address several items that she discussed with the Board of Trustees, The President, and Provost.

- Year of Mentoring: Mentoring is critical for people going on promotion. We want to focus on the relationship between faculty and students. Dr. Mason noted that as she talks with students it is critical in how they connect with their graduate program, what they want out of the graduate program, and how we move them to be successful both in retention and moving toward graduation rates. There are a number of models on how we mentor and what we mentor. We will focus on two parts:

- 1) From students perspective of mentoring and how to ask for mentors.

- What is mentoring?
- How to have multiple mentoring?
- What happens when it goes wrong?
- What should it look when it goes right?

Information will be provided to students to be able to ask what they need. Dr. Mason noted that what we find is there are problems with communication. Often times it may be a communication breakdown or miscommunication of expectations, so working with students to start asking what they need, where do they get it and how they get it and who to get it from.

- 2) From faculty – resources for faculty on how to mentor. We are not trying to be prescriptive of what we should do as a mentor. We want to introduce some practices to use to help in developing mentoring programs for themselves or to train students to be better mentors. Awards were presented last year awarding not only graduate faculty mentoring, but awards were presented to post-doc's and students also. Workshops will be provided with the first one in October on Mentoring Graduate Writers. The Graduate School supports three assistantships in the Writing Center to help graduate students gain expertise in writing. There are students that are excellent writers who hold their Graduate Assistantships providing 60 hours per week to help graduate students with writing. To supplement that, we will be holding this workshop with the writing lab to provide resources along with a book to the faculty who attend on how to mentor graduate writers and what faculty can do to help their students to be mentored on how to write better.

- Professional Development: This goes with mentoring to encourage students to participate in professional development and to understand that one cannot get everything from one person in life and that one needs to get it from multiple people and part of that is the professional development. A list was provided at the beginning of the semester with 170 workshops that will be offered this semester. The Council discussed and approved what the expectations of requirements would be for research credits last year. There were 1300 faculty who have not had those conversations with their students or had not checked the box; which is normal the first time a rule goes out. We hope the faculty will be aware of how to do it and what to do next semester. Part of that discussion is not only what is the expectation for the student to do for their research credit hours, but that it will lead to a conversation of what to work on during the semester on professional development opportunities and where is their career going. With the idea that will be covered with the Initial Course Participation (ICP). The new Faculty Workshop spent considerable time covering developing a mentoring statement with examples of mentoring statements and asked them to start thinking about having a mentoring statement available to hand to their students. Professional development is critical. The other thing that comes with that is our Pathways Project that we are working toward career development for students, especially

Ph.D.'s outside the academy. We know that the rate at which Ph.D.'s get academic jobs continues to decline, so we are thinking about where else they are going to go. In some fields, it more common not to go into academia and other fields we want to have that discussion. Faculty are not always comfortable having these other discussions, so there is a program, Aurora Development eLearning Platform. Anyone with a purdue.edu email account can log in to do career development with all the types of careers of what can be done with a degree. People videotape discussions of what they did with their degree and where they are and how they ended up with this pathway or another pathway. This is a great tool for graduate students to use as they can do it any time that works for their schedule.

- b. Dr. Linda Mason asked for volunteers for two Task Force committees.
 1. Graduate student pay – looking for representation from each College and the regional campuses. Currently, we have commitments from faculty members from Agriculture, Liberal Arts and Science along with four students and a faculty member from each college. The reason that we want to look at this is after going through Success Factors and the transition pay issue. It brought up the issue of understanding graduate student pay and understanding where we meet in the Big 10. We have generated the data where all of our departments lie and what our average student receive. For a fiscal year (\$18, 500 on this campus; it ranges up to over \$35, 000 for a half-time fiscal year appointment) so the range is considerable up there. We rank in the middle of the bottom of where we are on minimum stipends realizing that is a false number in a way because of the way everyone is paid as it is not one set number. We want to examine if we made some changes. The Graduate School does not set the minimum rate; Human Resources sets the rate. This would be a recommendation from the Provost to Human Resources what will be our plan of recommendation for this. In that, we need to understand if we raised it how that would affect departments and to do the math with a change fixed budget. The issue associated with competitiveness when recruiting students. What are those offers and how does that affect what we are doing and budget-wise. Having a broader discussion of what stipends are and where stipends are going and what we need to do. There will be a side adjunct on that committee also looking at the issue of graduate student housing on this campus. Most of the meetings will be done through email and video conferencing due to a large committee.
 2. Online Ph.D. and policies associated with an online Ph.D. – Purdue does not offer an Online Ph.D. and is not authorized to offer an online Ph.D. No one in the Big 10 offers an online Ph.D. Dr. Mason noted that she is not advocating for that, but the question was brought up to what policies that we do not have in place that prevent this from happening. Purdue does approve several online doctorate degrees. To clarify, there is a difference between a Ph.D. and the Doctor of Education or the Doctor of Technology or the Doctor of Nursing Practice. Those degrees that can be offered online are primarily course work doctorates. The idea of restrictions, policies that would be in place to have an online Ph.D. is the question that has been brought forward to the Graduate School for discussion.

- c. Dr. Linda Mason noted that if departments have students who are underrepresented minority students that are toward the end of their Ph.D., we are asking and have been working with the colleges since last Spring about each college sending at least one student of interest to the Institute on Mentoring and Learning which is the Compact for Faculty Diversity. It is the largest organization of minority Ph.D.'s in the country. Dr. Mason noted that she attends each year and recruits for both faculty positions and Ph.D. students that are there. It is also for people who are looking for graduate work. The idea of the students of all three days of the conference is on mentoring minority students and preparing them for career preparations. The Graduate School pays for a certain contract number because we are a member of the Southern Region Education Board (SREB) which is who sponsors the conference. Dr. Mason serves as a member of the Board of Directors. This conference started with the National Science Foundation (NSF) Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) Grant and now has gone institutionalized international for the students who are there. We send four students to the conference on a regular basis as part of the dues cover a part of that. Dr. Mason noted that we had the head of the SREB come and speak to the Graduate Deans in the Spring. Students who attend the conference rave about the experience. For more information, contact Dr. Melanie Morgan.
- d. Dr. Linda Mason noted that significant progress is being made on the System-Wide Initiative. One of Dr. Mason's initiatives from last year was that we operate as a system. We have a Dean of a system-wide program in the Graduate School and that is the reason we have regional representatives who serve on the Graduate Council on the Policies and Procedures and degree programs. This body governs the policies and principles for the system and yet we do not operate fully as a system. In moving us toward that, we changed the applications system this past enrollment series where applicants do not have to pay multiple application fees to apply to multiple campuses. We changed the directives so the students who use to have to ask permission to send their application to another campus after being rejected. That has now changed so they have to opt-out if they do not want their application referred. Dr. Mason noted that the goal is to have one application as other graduates do with a common application. To have one application that will allow a student to indicate they want to Biology, for example, with a drop-down menu indicating that the program is offered at three other campuses. A student may check each box that the program is offered and upload the application. Simultaneously, the application goes out to the three biology groups and simultaneously offers can come in and the student can see if they were rejected by one program but may have two offers with other programs. They are then able to make a decision on the other program they want now. The idea is that we do not lose a student out of the system if they are interested in a Purdue degree that we give them the option to receive that degree at this institution within this system. Slate is the application system currently used and would not allow this to happen. Slate allowed only one application in the system at one time. After a year of negotiations with Slate and Purdue going with another vendor, Slate found a way to make the application work with more than one program. Currently, testing is being done on the application. We hope to start rolling some of these ideas out having multiple applications in the system. Other details that need to be worked out in the system are: we operate on different calendar systems, different breaks, different learning management systems a student would need Banner accounts at each campus. We will work through all of the details so all the systems will talk to one another and have a communication system in

agreement so we will be able to operate as a system as the Council does with policies and procedures.

- e. Dr. Linda Mason discussed the idea of electronic voting for the approval of new degree proposals, certificates, majors, and course proposals by the Council. Dr. Mason noted that the use of the Council's time would be much better spent in discussion of ideas, policies, and procedures than reading a list of items and everyone saying they agree, pass and go on. All proposals are available in Curriculog in advance. We rarely have a point once proposals have reached the Council for voting that there is a contentious decision that has to be made on the floor by the Council, so this is not the way we want to be operating as the Council. Dr. Mason noted that Tina Payne has been exploring the ability in Curriculog and asked her to give an update. Tina Payne noted that Curriculog has a feature called - Agenda. Undergrad is using it for a committee that is much smaller than the Graduate Council. The setup is taking longer as all of the Council members must be associated with all of the disciplines that could fall under each committee. Any proposal that has already been submitted, will not be able to go through this committee process. We have quite a few that go through that the Council will still be notifying us either by email or if we want to go ahead and approve at the meetings. Eventually, the proposal approvals will start going through the new Curriculog Agenda process. Dr. Mason noted that the advantage as we try to generate and facilitate and not be a wall, to facilitate the process moving along if we do not have to wait for a Council meeting if we can vote once a week or every two weeks. We can be voting and not waiting for a monthly meeting. Dr. Mason noted that we use the Council and the meeting time to have presentations of topics and discussions of how that will influence graduate education in each member's role. We can have a conversation about what things we are working on or ideas that we have, rather than most of the meetings spent on policies and procedures. Dr. Mason noted that we have a lineup of speakers that will hopefully spur some questions and discussion topics.
- f. Dr. James Mohler noted that historically the pending proposals of both courses and otherwise are read. Dr. Mohler noted that we are working towards changing that because he reads off the pending proposals and there is not a lot of discussion about them. What we will start doing is since the proposals are in each member's packet, he would encourage members to share with their colleagues at the college and department levels so that people are aware of the status of not only their own proposals but also those being proposed by others. Dr. Mohler noted that he and Tina Payne vet all proposals where they feel there could be issues and have discussions well in advance before they go to the Council. This is one more check and an opportunity for members if there is something that they know is a conflict relative to a proposal or if they want to know the procedure going on with a specific proposal.

III. AREA COMMITTEE REPORTS (Area Committee Chairs)

Graduate Council Document 19E, Graduate Council Documents Recommended for Approval:

Area Committee B, Engineering, Sciences, and Technology (Samuel Midkiff; chair, smidkiff@purdue.edu):

Graduate Council Document 19-38b, **CSCI 53300, Wireless Sensor Networks** (IUPUI)

Graduate Council Document 19-39a, **MSE 56200, Soft Materials** (PWL)

Graduate Council Document 19-39b, MSE 58900, Archaeology and Materials (PWL)

Dr. Sam Midkiff presented three courses for consideration. The courses were approved by the council, upon a motion by Dr. Midkiff.

Area Committee E: Life Sciences, (Ryan A. Cabot, chair; rcabot@purdue.edu):

Graduate Council Document 19-29a, AGRY 51800, Plant Physiology and Biotechnology Research Techniques (PWL)

Graduate Council Document 19-36a, ENTM 61000, Current Trends in Insect Pest Management (PWL)

Dr. Ryan Cabot presented two courses for consideration. The courses were approved by the council, upon a motion by Dr. Cabot.

CERTIFICATE(S):

Area Committee E: Life Sciences, (Ryan A. Cabot, chair; rcabot@purdue.edu):

Graduate Council Document 19-53a, Graduate Certificate in Spatial Data Science, submitted by the College of Agriculture, PWL

Dr. Ryan Cabot presented one certificate for consideration. The certificate was approved by the council, upon a motion by Dr. Cabot.

IV. PURDUE GRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT -- PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mr. Taylor Bailey, President of the Purdue Graduate Student Government (PGSG) welcomed the Graduate Council to the Purdue Graduate Student Center. Mr. Bailey noted the following items:

- The Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities as was endorsed last Spring, will be distributed next week. There is an introductory letter that addresses any potential concerns that this could accidentally be viewed as a policy document.
- Two issues facing graduate students is:
 1. Housing – Purdue Village going away
 2. Payroll – Transition to Bi-Weekly Pay
- Mental Health Awareness Week for Graduate Students in October
- Graduate Career Fair – October 15th
- Fall Picnic was a success.

V. PRESENTATION

Dr. James Mohler, Research Integrity Officer gave a presentation on *RIO/RCR*.

Goals of the Research Integrity Officer (RIO).

- Protect the integrity of the research record
- Steward the RM Policy and Procedures
- Ensure due process and procedural justice for all parties involved
- Represent Purdue at national level (work with other universities and federal funding agencies)
- Promote research integrity throughout Purdue's campuses

Reporting Research Misconduct

- RIO processes allegations of potential research misconduct:
 - By any Purdue associate – e.g., students, staff, post-docs, visiting scholars, faculty
 - Within the last six years (some exceptions)
- Anyone can make allegations
- All Purdue associates **required** to report observed potential research misconduct
- Allegations reported via any means of communication
 - Purdue Research Integrity Officer – researchintegrity@purdue.edu
 - Provost
 - Via Purdue Hotline: 1-866-818-2620

What is “Research Misconduct”?

- Conduct by a Purdue Associate taking place at Purdue or in connection with Purdue research that constitutes **Fabrication, Falsification or Plagiarism with Culpable Intent** in proposing, performing or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.
 - **Fabrication:** Making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
 - **Falsification:** Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results so that the research involved is not accurately represented in the research record.
 - **Plagiarism:** The appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- Culpable Intent – A knowing, intentional or reckless act or omission. An act or omission attributable only to mere negligence, honest error or a difference of opinion lacks Culpable Intent.

What is *not* “Research Misconduct”

- Authorship disputes
- Issues of credit, acknowledgement, citation
- Relational disputes between co-authors
- Student-advisor relationship disputes
- Intellectual property disputes

- Conflicts of interest
- Human and animal research subject issues
- “Questionable Research Practices”

Other Support Offices

- Student Academic Affairs (ODOS)
- Faculty Affairs (Senate)
- Graduate School (OGACR – ombuds/mediation)
- Office of Institutional Equity (OIE)
- Research Compliance Office (Exec. VP for Research and Partnerships)
 - Intellectual property
 - Conflicts of interest
 - Human and animal research subject issues

Research Misconduct Proceedings

1. Initial Assessment (by the RIO)

- The following two criteria, which must both be answered in the affirmative by the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) in order for an inquiry to commence:
 - Would or might the allegation, if taken as true, fall within this policy’s definition of Research Misconduct?
 - Is the allegation sufficiently specific and credible so that potential evidence of Research Misconduct may be identified and gathered?

2. Inquiry (by an appointed “Inquiry Committee”):

- The following two criteria, which must both be answered in the affirmative by an Inquiry Committee in order for an investigation to commence:
 - Taking the alleged facts as true, does the allegation describe conduct that may fall within this Policy’s definition of Research Misconduct?
 - Does there exist evidence that has been or could be readily obtained, which would help show whether Research Misconduct (as defined in this policy) has occurred?

3. Investigation: A specially appointed expert faculty committee does or does not make finding, based on a preponderance of evidence, that Fabrication, Falsification or Plagiarism occurred, and that the Respondent had Culpable Intent.

4. Appeal of Finding(s): The respondent may request review by a specially appointed “Appeal Committee” of a finding of research misconduct determined by the Investigation Committee (appeal is to the Provost).

5. Discipline: The Provost determines what disciplinary sanctions, if any, should be imposed on the respondent by the University.

6. Appeal of Sanctions(s): The respondent has an opportunity to challenge any sanctions decided upon by the Provost (appeal is to the President).

Evidentiary and State of Mind Standards

- Preponderance of evidence
 - “more likely than not”; less stringent than “beyond a reasonable doubt”
 - Means “preponderance of the available evidence” regardless of wished-for but unavailable evidence
- Culpable intent
 - (not) Negligently (but rather):
 - Knowingly
 - Intentionally
 - Recklessly

Who is Involved Typically?

- Complainant
- Respondent
- Respondent’s Advisor/Representative (if they choose)
- Inquiry Committee
- Investigation Committee
- Provost
- Involved Dean
- Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, Faculty Senate
- Expert witnesses, other witnesses, as needed

Confidentiality

- Required by the Research Misconduct Policy
- Violations may be considered misconduct
- Complainants encouraged to come forward
- Purdue Hotline always anonymous option
 - Proceedings tips difficult without cooperation of complainant
 - Inquiry criterion: Is the allegation sufficiently specific and credible so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified and gathered?

How Can You Self-Monitor?

- Discuss and promote research integrity best practices
 - Encourage open and regular dialog about research ethics
- Take the CITI online course on responsible conduct of research
 - Available to all Purdue associates
- Use iThenticate to monitor plagiarism
 - All faculty have free account from Purdue University
 - Scan all papers and proposals prior to submission

- Take GRAD 61200 Responsible Conduct of Research

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- a) Dr. Tom Atkinson presented the West Lafayette Fall 2019 Enrollment Report. The complete report is posted on the Graduate School website.
(<http://www.purdue.edu/gradschool/faculty/enrollment.html>)
- b) Dr. Rebecca Stankowski presented the Northwest Fall 2019 Enrollment Report. The complete report is posted on the Graduate School website.
(<http://www.purdue.edu/gradschool/faculty/enrollment.html>)
- b) Dr. Abraham Schwab presented the Fort Wayne Fall 2019 Enrollment Report. The complete report is posted on the Graduate School website.
(<http://www.purdue.edu/gradschool/faculty/enrollment.html>)

VII. CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

The council meeting was adjourned by Dr. Mason at 3:00 p.m.

Linda J. Mason, Chair

Tina L. Payne, Secretary

APPENDIX A

PENDING DOCUMENTS

(September,2019)

BOLDED ITEMS ARE IN REVIEW WITH AN AREA COMMITTEE

Area Committee B, Engineering, Sciences, and Technology (Samuel P. Midkiff, chair; smidkiff@purdue.edu):

Graduate Council Document 19-33b, CE 59801, Breakthrough Thinking For Complex Challenges Engineering (PWL) Sem. 1. Lecture 3 times per week for 150 minutes. Credit 3.

Graduate Council Document 19-38a, CSCI 53200, Cloud Computing Systems (IUPUI) Sem. 2. Lecture 2 times per week for 75 minutes. Credit 3.

Graduate Council Document 19-38b, CSCI 53300, Wireless Sensor Networks (IUPUI) Sem. 2. Lecture 2 times per week for 75 minutes. Credit 3. Prerequisites: CSCI 53600 or instructor permission. Credit Hours: 3.00.

Graduate Council Document 19-15a, ECE 61020 Operation of Modern Power Systems (PWL) Sem. 2. Lecture 3 times per week for 50 minutes. Credit 3.

Graduate Council Document 18-22a, IE 68500, Competitive Strategy (PWL) Sem. 2. Lecture 3 times per week for 50 minutes. Credit 3.

Graduate Council Document 19-39a, MSE 56200, Soft Materials (PWL) Sem. 1. Lecture 1 time per week for 150 minutes. Credit 3.

Graduate Council Document 19-39b, MSE 58900, Archaeology and Materials (PWL) Sem. 1 and 2. Lecture 2 times per week for 50 minutes. Lab 1 time per week for 100 minutes. Credit 3. Prerequisites: Junior, senior or graduate level standing.

Area Committee E: Life Sciences, (Ryan A. Cabot, chair; rcabot@purdue.edu):

Graduate Council Document 19-29a, AGRY 51800, Plant Physiology and Biotechnology Research Techniques (PWL) Sem. 2. Lecture 1 time per week for 50 minutes. Recitation 1 time per week for 50 minutes. Lab 1 time per week for 110 minutes. Credit 3.

Graduate Council Document 19-36a, ENTM 61000, Current Trends in Insect Pest Management (PWL) Sem. 1. Lecture 2 times per week for 50 minutes. Lab 1 time per week for 100 minutes. Credit 3.

NEW DOCUMENTS RECEIVED

(After the September 19, 2019 Graduate Council Meeting)

Area Committee A, Behavioral Sciences (Signe Kastberg; chair, skastber@purdue.edu):

Graduate Council Document 19-6c, EDCI 52003, Theories and Trends in Curriculum and Instruction (PWL) Sem. 1 and 2. SS. Distance. Credit 3.

This course focuses on current theories and trends influencing curriculum and instruction. A theory is a plausible or scientifically acceptable general principle or body of principles offered to explain phenomena. It is a belief, policy, or procedure proposed or followed as the basis of action. A trend, on the other hand, is a pattern of gradual change in a condition, output, or process. It reflects a general tendency of a series of moves in a certain direction over time. We will focus on understanding sources of current theories and trends and how they may influence work in curriculum and instruction. Permission of department required. Typically offered Fall Spring Summer.

Graduate Council Document 19-6d, EDCI 52004, Teachers As Leaders (PWL) Sem. 1 and 2. SS. Distance. Credit 3.

This course focuses on teacher leadership in instruction. Participants will examine the history of teacher leadership. Instructional coaching models will be examined and compared. Students will identify the various theories that support each coaching model and examine what is most present in their school contexts. Permission of department required. Typically offered Fall Spring Summer.