

MINUTES OF THE 320TH GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
May 3, 2010

Members present: Greg Sterling (chair), Greg Crawford, Peter Kilpatrick, Phil Bess (for Michael Lykoudis, Dan Myers (for John McGreevy), Rick Garnett (for Nell Newton), Carolyn Woo, Gaye Dannelly (for Jennifer Younger), Ani Aprahamian, Sunny Boyd, Andrew Bramsen, David Campbell, Laura Carlson, Mary Frandsen, Victoria Froude, Sandra Gustafson, Mary Catherine Hilkert, John LoSecco, Scott Maxwell, Chris Maziar, Mary Ann McDowell, John Renaud, John Welle

Graduate School representatives present: Brian Flaherty, Ed Maginn, Nyrée McDonald, Barb Turpin

Members excused: Bob Bernhard, Julie Turner

Invited Guests: Prof. David Severson (Masters of Science in Global Health); Prof. Don Howard (Ethics Committee member)

Reporter: Mary Hendriksen

Prof. Sterling opened the meeting of the Graduate Council at 3:30 p.m. He explained that there would be a re-ordering of items due to a commitment of Prof. Crawford and took up the agenda items as follows:

1. Minutes of the meeting of January 25, 2010: The minutes of the Graduate Council meeting of January 25, 2010, were approved as presented. [Minutes of Graduate Council meetings are posted on the Graduate School website at: <https://graduateschool.nd.edu/about-the-graduate-school/graduate-council>]

2. Announcements and updates from the Associate deans:

(a) Admissions: Dr. McDonald provided this update: The Graduate School received 4453 applications, extended 750 offers, and has taken in 420 confirmations, with some offers still outstanding. Prof. Sterling noted that these numbers indicate that roughly 1 out of 10 matriculate out of the applicant pool, with just under 20% of applicants offered admission. Of course, these are overall statistics; each program is unique.

(b) Student Affairs: Dr. Turpin noted that progress is being made on purchasing software to track such markers for students as conference presentations, publications, grants, fellowships, etc. She intends to make a decision on the vendor by the end of the summer.

Dr. Turpin then discussed the progress of a faculty/student committee Prof. Sterling convened last fall to review Notre Dame's graduate student policies related to childbirth and the family. The committee has reviewed policies of a number of

institutions related to accommodation for childbirth/adoption and will most likely submit recommendations to make Notre Dame's policy more generous in this area. The committee is planning to recommend as well that the Graduate School offer more support for graduate student parents—for example, workshops on balancing work and family, and a database of CPR-certified student babysitters on campus. In response to a question from Prof. McDowell, Dr. Turpin clarified that the childbirth/adoption policy is an actual accommodation policy—not a medical leave policy.

Prof. Sterling suggested that as the committee's work is still in progress, he encourages any members to contact Dr. Turpin or her co-chair, Prof. Kathie Newman, with suggestions.

(c) Professional Development: Prof. Carlson first discussed fellowship/grant activity this year—for which the Graduate School has given much encouragement. To date, nine students have won major awards, including one Fulbright, three NSF's, one Javits, one Newcombe, and one DOE.

Prof. Carlson added that her office is working to make fellowship/grant opportunities easier for students to locate. Her staff is working with the Colleges of Arts and Letters, Engineering, and Science to update the current graduate fellowship database. The Graduate School will launch a new database at the beginning of the fall 2010 semester. It will have an improved user interface and up-to-date records.

Finally, Prof. Carlson noted efforts to encourage students to create a COS profile, thereby accessing thousands of fellowship opportunities. Setting up the profiles will be an important activity at the Graduate School's revamped orientation (August 20).

(d) Academic Programs: Prof. Maginn reported that he has been working throughout the year with DGSs to construct a plan for each program on its optimal size. He has collected comparative data in a number of areas, for instance, the information distributed at the meeting on overall Ph.D. completion averages of AAU privates/aspirants. The data show Notre Dame falling right in the middle of this group—with an annual overall Ph.D. average of 134, as contrasted with Stanford at 416 and Wake Forest at 31. He will be sharing additional, program-specific information with DGSs and working with them to set targets for meeting goals on Ph.D. program size.

3. Master's of Science in Global Health: Prof. Sterling explained that Biology faculty have been working on a proposal for a new professional master's program—a master's of science in global health—since Fall 2009. While he thinks it a very good proposal, discussions have occurred all year on how it would be administered—whether outside or inside the Graduate School. If inside, it would report to the dean of the Graduate School; if outside, it would be analogous to the MBA degree in the Mendoza College of Business or a graduate degree in the School of Architecture and report to the college dean. The question of governance is important because the decision could extend to more than the current proposal and become a model for other professional masters programs, including

some in the pipeline. He and the other deans have continued to have robust discussions on this precise point of governance.

Until the governance issue is decided, Prof. Sterling said, it is not possible to have a vote on the proposed master's program; yet, to enable the Council to deal with all *other* aspects of the proposal, he suggested that, in parliamentary terms, the Council constitute itself "a committee of the whole." By doing so, members can discuss the merits of the proposal freely and be prepared to vote on it at the first Fall 2010 Graduate Council meeting. Given that the faculty proposers would like the first class to begin in Fall 2011, which means recruiting must occur in Fall 2010, expediting the approval process is important. After approval by the Graduate Council, the proposal must still work its way through the graduate affairs committee and the executive committee of the Academic Council, and then the full Council.

Seeing consensus on this point of parliamentary procedure, Prof. Sterling asked Prof. David Severson, one of the proposal's faculty backers, to lead the discussion on the program.

Briefly, Prof Severson outlined the proposal: a professional master's program of one-year duration that will provide "science-centric training" in the emerging field of global health. It "builds on Notre Dame's strengths in tropical infectious disease research and makes connections for students between classroom training in global health topics and the real health needs of the world's poor and underserved." Requirements are two semesters of coursework (primarily in the Department of Biological Sciences); one-two months of field experience in a resource-poor location (for example, with Catholic Relief Services); and the submission of a master's project. Prof. Severson noted that Duke and the University of California San Francisco have recently begun similar programs, with Arizona State University launching its program this year. Both Duke and UCSF have been overwhelmed with applicants.

Prof. Severson next outlined the curriculum requirements: 13 credits from six core courses:

- Global Health Challenges (3 credits) – to be developed. Present the multitude of causes for disparities in access to health care, the disciplines and sectors that can contribute to solutions, and the role of global health professionals.
- Research Methods in Global Health Science (3 credits) – to be developed. Prepare students for fieldwork by emphasizing project management, study design, practicalities of fieldwork and cultural sensitivity.
- Bioethics (2 credits) – available.
- Global Health Colloquium (1 credit) – Provide a venue to present research, training or service activities to peers and faculty, become familiar with other graduate students working/studying in global health related projects, and learn from seminar speakers about areas that will impact their future activities in global health.

- Master’s Project Research (4 credits) – Students will develop a Master’s Project topic in consultation with their Faculty Advisor and the Director of Global Health Studies and undertake research and writing. The Faculty Advisor and Director of Global Health Studies will establish a timeline and expected deliverables for each semester that are consistent with students’ completing their projects in a timely manner. Students will submit and present their Project to an evaluation committee.

Prof. Severson continued that they additionally propose nine credits from three elective courses (e.g. “Topics in Parasitology and Vector Biology” or “Cellular and Molecular Basis of Human Disease”), and eight credits of field experience.

Prof. Crawford confirmed that the College of Science has promised three years of funding for start-up—e.g., hiring a program director and staff. After the program is up to full speed in year three with an entering class of 15-25 students, it should sustain itself financially. He confirmed his support of the program and its fit with the Department of Biology, the College of Science, and the University.

Prof. McDowell, a Graduate Council member and a co-author of the proposal, noted that the program is tuition-based; thus, none of its funding will come out of the Graduate School.

Prof. Maziar said that she is accustomed to professional programs being governed by accrediting bodies. What is the situation for this type of program? Prof. Severson said while accreditation is an important topic in this emerging field, there is no current accreditation process.

Prof. Sterling noted that the Council of Graduate Schools “certifies”—not “accredits” professional science master’s programs—see http://www.ncsu.edu/grad/psm/docs/Guidelines_for_PSM_Affiliation.pdf. In fact, the designation “professional science master’s program” is a trade-marked title and logo. To date, CGS has certified 175 certified professional science master’s programs. He and Prof. Maziar discussed whether certification comes from CGS or the local graduate school.

Prof. Campbell sought reassurance that the courses listed in the proposal are regularly offered and have sufficient availability for more students. Prof. Severson provided that reassurance, with Prof. Crawford adding that Biology has hired 12 new faculty members, of which four are in the field of global health.

Referring to the budget distributed at the meeting, Prof. Boyd asked for clarification on the “15% Graduate School” notation. Prof. Sterling said that it should correctly be “15% University,” with Prof. Maziar stating that it is a standard revenue-sharing practice at Notre Dame that 15% of tuition funds from professional programs in Law, Business, or Architecture go directly to the University.

Then, asked Prof. Boyd, since the Graduate School provides a broad array of support services for graduate students—for example, appeals and a commencement ceremony—if the program is administered outside of the Graduate School, what entity will provide these services? Prof. Sterling said that they must be provided by the program—which is one of the points of the debate on governance.

Mr. Bramsen, president of the GSU, said that this is a concern for him. When graduate students are not considered constituents of the Graduate School, they can easily fall between the cracks. This is the case with the current class of ESTEEM students. Prof. Sterling said that this is indeed a concern of the debate, but it need not be a part of the discussion today.

Prof. Myers asked: If the program might not be a part of the Graduate School, why is the Graduate Council even considering it? Prof. Sterling clarified that *all* graduate programs at the University—whether in the Graduate School, the Mendoza College of Business, the Law School, or the Architecture School—must first gain approval of the Graduate Council, whether they report to the Graduate School or not.

Prof. Woo, who said she has served on the board of Catholic Relief Services for six years, observed that the proposed global health program appears to be very oriented towards diseases. She knows from her board work how much of the global health field is devoted to such topics as nutrition, sanitation, agriculture, implementation of pharmaceutical delivery, safe sexual practices, and education. She wonders if the proposal is properly a “global health” program or if it is more akin to a “global disease” or, possibly, a “global disease management” program. She wonders if the core curriculum provides students with the necessary training in non-disease global health issues.

Prof. Severson said that the curriculum reflects the current strengths of the faculty. Prof. Woo responded that she would prefer that the electives reflect the strength of the faculty and that the core courses provide a broad foundation in global health issues. She continued that there are enormous grants available from such funding bodies as Catholic Relief Services, for which Johns Hopkins, for example, is a partner.

Prof. Severson said that the expectation is that when the director comes on board, he/she will work on honing the curriculum. Prof. McDowell added that Prof. Katherine Taylor, the lead faculty member on the proposal, has held discussions with Catholic Relief Services regarding summer internship placement. She reiterated that the special emphasis of the proposed Notre Dame program is filling the gap many global health professionals display in basic science research. A great number of individuals who enter this field have a strong social science background but are lacking in basic science concepts.

Prof. Woo said that she applauded the effort on the proposed master’s program; the intent of her comments is to encourage the proposers not to overlook possible fruitful

grant partnerships. If the program allows Notre Dame to be a major player in grant activity, we should not leave that opportunity on the table.

Prof. Maxwell returned to the issue of the core curriculum. Duke, he said, has five core courses, of which two deal with research methodology—in all, seven credit hours in research methods. He would think that the program's students would need solid training in biostatistics or epidemiology. Prof. Severson said that Biology is making offers to faculty members in both biostatistics and epidemiology. The curriculum of the proposed program is still fluid at this point.

Prof. LoSecco asked how it is possible for the program not to require additional laboratory facilities, as the budget claims, for it is essentially doubling the number of incoming Biology students. Profs. Severson and McDowell said that the courses are not laboratory courses; they are lecture/discussion/primary literature courses. The incoming students already have laboratory skills through their bachelor's degrees. Prof. LoSecco said that he would think that more laboratory skills are needed. Prof. Crawford answered that in the field, very basic laboratory skills are most often what is needed—skills students would have gained already through their undergraduate work.

With no more questions, Prof. Sterling offered two suggestions to the proposers when they return to the Graduate Council in the fall and then take the proposal up to the Academic Council:

- Emphasize the niche the program is intended to fulfill—basic science competencies;
- Flesh out the curriculum in greater detail.

Prof. Maziar added: First, help us to understand what a global health professional does. Most Graduate Council and Academic Council members know what a lawyer, engineer, or architect does but do not have an equivalent knowledge of the work of a global health professional. Second, help us understand how this particular program will provide the necessary training for these people. These additions to the proposal would help both Graduate and Academic Council members bridge the knowledge gap.

Prof. Boyd said that in addition, she would like to know how the program would provide quality control—for example, the expected minimum GPA of applicants and how many credit hours they should have at the 400 level. If the program's expectations are different than those of the department, this should be clarified.

Prof. Campbell commented that despite questions, the proposal is a very good idea and is precisely the kind of program Notre Dame should have. It is merely the details that must be worked out.

After clarifying that the Council was functioning as a committee, Prof. Sterling asked for a vote on Council members' endorsement of the proposed master's program in global health—with "endorsement" meaning support for the proposal in general and that it return to the Council in the fall once the governance issue is decided. There was no

debate. The vote was 18 in favor of endorsement, with one member opposed and no abstentions.

4. Proposed *Bulletin* revision relating to enrollment status during an appeals

procedure: Dr. Turpin explained that the *Bulletin* is silent on a student's enrollment status after dismissal from a program and during an appeals procedure [*Bulletin*, <http://graduateschool.nd.edu/assets/16757/bulletin.0910.pdf>]. General Counsel's office has recommended addition of the sentence: "Students cannot register or enroll for subsequent semesters, including the summer session, during the appeal process."

Members asked for the rationale of the proposal. Prof. Sterling explained that if a department dismisses a student, the only issue is whether the Graduate School will reinstate the student. They are no longer part of the program. This addition makes that clear. Others asked whether one of the implications of adoption may be a harmful effect on a student's visa status; another might be acceleration of student loan repayment. Dr. Turpin clarified that the entire appeal process cannot take longer than 30 days.

Prof. Campbell inquired about the success rate of appeals. Dr. Turpin responded that most appeals end with the Dean supporting the department's decision of dismissal. In the rare cases when the Dean does not, the student has successfully demonstrated that proper procedures were not followed or the department violated its own policies. The Dean typically does not question departments' academic judgments.

Various members asked about the congruency of the proposed policy with similar policies for undergraduate, law, and business students. After discussion, members voted unanimously to adopt the proposed revision "absent express inconsistency" with policies of other Notre Dame programs. Incorporated into the vote was a friendly amendment offered by Prof. Maziar that if a policy of a school is silent on this matter, the Graduate School will inform General Counsel's office so that that deficiency, too, can be remedied.

5. Report of the joint Graduate Council/Director of Graduate Studies on Ethics

Education: Throughout the year, a faculty committee met to formulate recommendations for integrating ethics training in graduate studies. The committee's report was distributed before the meeting. In brief, it recommends "implementation of a comprehensive responsible conduct of research and ethics training program for graduate students" at Notre Dame with the following program components:

- Responsible conduct of research (RCR compliance)
- Ethics introduction at Graduate School orientation
- Department and college components
- Lecture series and structured discussion on ethics
- Required workshop on ethics (3 hours; typically, 3rd-year students)
- 1-credit course on ethics (optional)
- Ethics recognition award for graduate students

Prof. Laura Carlson, chair, gave a brief overview of the report, and emphasized that the proposals should be perceived as the Graduate School working in partnership with departments. The report is presented to the Graduate Council both for its information and members' feedback but also because the Council must approve the interdisciplinary workshop requirement.

Prof. Gustafson asked how humanists would participate in the workshops. What topics would be relevant to them? Prof. Carlson suggested that intellectual property and academic ethics are two possible topics relevant to humanists.

Most discussion centered on the desirability of including humanists and scientists, for example, in the same interdisciplinary workshops. Mr. Bramsen said that he supported the idea in principle but believes the conversations may be difficult because students might talk past each other rather than to each other.

Prof. LoSecco said that given vastly different cultural norms, he wonders how international students would fit in with the new ethics requirements and whether they might require more introductory material. "Plagiarism," he noted, means vastly different things in different cultures. Prof. Carlson said that the requirement of a workshop is flexible within a graduate student's career. The workshop is just one part of a student's ethics training. The requirements certainly do not preclude departments offering classes or workshops to their students.

Prof. Myers said that the workshop timing—typically, taken in students' third year—seems late to him. If the idea is to motivate students to explore ethical issues throughout their graduate education, this seems a bit late to him.

Prof. Howard, one of nine Ethics Committee members, responded that the workshops are only one piece of a multi-faceted program. Some topics are better suited than others to students farther along in their graduate careers. Discussing these topics would be the point of the workshops.

Prof. Sterling asked Council members for a vote on endorsing the committee recommendations. It was unanimous in favor, with one abstention.

Given the lateness of the hour, Prof. Sterling said that consideration of his response to the Grantwriting Committee's report must wait until the next Graduate Council meeting. He adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.