**Agenda for GCC Meeting with Meeting Minutes**

**Monday November 13, 12-1 PM**

Sam Lee, Delight Morehead, Rebecca Davis, Kimberly Walker, Ben Stanley, Mary Martin, Amy Griffin, Melissa Witman, Sanaz Taherzadeh, Andrew Hollinger, Myae Han, Cathy Foreman, Sheng Lu, Andrew Teplyakov, Michael Jung, Ivan Todorov, James Korman, David Burris, John Slater, Jackie Washington, Jerry Firestone, Danilo Yanich, LaRuth McAfee, Jill Higginson, Shannon Robeson, Lindsay Naylor.

Sam announces ExComm floating idea of hybrid meetings, asking for mood of council. Seems to be general agreement that a hybrid meeting would be desirable. Rationale —in person is desirable but back-to-back meetings would allow for zoom to be an option as a backup.

1. Approve minutes (if available): Sam will follow up on drafting last meeting notes to circulate, volunteer taking notes today. Considering Secretary to be a position open to general council instead of limited to ExComm. If pursued, would require a change of the bylaws.
2. Dean’s Report: Lou
	* Updates:
		+ Launching the search for the next assistant dean of graduate life
		+ Stipends, ongoing discussion with Deans, expect $24,500/9 months starting next fall. Still trying to figure out the “how” - high confidence level for increase.
3. Discussion and Vote on Faculty-Graduate Students Relations Working Group proposals:
	* Proposal 1: UD promote and enhance the functioning of Ethics Point for receiving, processing, responding to graduate student issues with faculty.
		+ Dean Rossi to provide further clarifications on the proposal: based on working group findings that we need to address faculty advising issues.
			- Concerns about treatment of students (e.g. exploitation such as doing things not in their job description; shaming, verbal and physical abuse; blacklisting; professional retribution), unreasonable behavior and lack of process at the university for handling that.
			- Some programs have structures that don’t allow students to change advisors (due to funding in many cases).
			- Lab and fieldwork environments where they are isolated from the department community and these things are not seen or reported.
			- Immigration status threatened or stipend.
			- Consequences downstream for graduate students
			- Chairs and program directors are also advisor’s colleagues making reporting and accountability challenging
			- Need to be attentive to student concerns
			- There is no one way for students to raise an alarm; typically, they come to the graduate college, but they have gone to the president, the provost, to anyone who will listen
			- We already have ethics point platform that we have to have to be compliant. Ability to make a report. Human Resources suite of complaints.
			- Proposal is to have graduate college should promote the use of ethics point with the intent of
			- Single point for reporting when other processes fail
			- Communicate the process to students
			- Tracking of concerns—gets a ticket that has a responsible party; help students get the resources they need. If not a resource issue, a committee will be created to address; includes financial bridge if needed and wellness resources; faculty affairs and legal
			- Creates accountability for students (intake and outcome)
		+ Questions from council:
			- Feedback that faculty would like to know how, after it is reported does it flow back to the advisor-advisee relationship? Is it mediated? Faculty affairs and HR can investigate. First information is gathered and then a finding is shared.
			- Ethics point can be anonymous—what are you going to encourage students to do? What will be the response? It stops there and students won’t know if anything has come from their complaint. Lab groups are not always large and so anonymity can’t be assured.
				* [response] A scenario would be to talk to the chair, sometimes it is a triangulation thing based on already exiting information at the department level
			- Should be last resort—should try to resolve within department first, but students don’t often do that first, they go straight to the president’s office.
				* [response] This will be part of the communications strategy, explaining what the steps are.
			- Ethics point is a private company—concerns about complaints becoming public knowledge
				* [response] We have contracts with many companies that handle our data—like google—they wouldn’t be able to make it public.
			- As an international student, more pressure not to share complaints. Communication to international students about the process specifically will be important
				* [response] Could be helpful to international students so that things can be resolved in an amicable way. Example of students who leave but who had been funded by their government and may have to repay costs.
			- Is it being utilized at all at present? Who is receiving the tickets? Is the person who handles them prepared to roll this out?
				* [response] Have talked to HR and they are okay with it—the first stop is a person to route the ticket to.
			- Has it been determined who would be the ticket recipient?
				* [response] Would go to HR first and then be directed as appropriate; likely to the Dean of grad student life.
			- Follow-up on the chain discussed before—sometimes it can just be the emotional exhaustion of the student, needs to be addressed an a less-elevated level.
				* [response] Having served on the committee we had a lot of discussions about this and we acknowledge that this process (ethics point) happens at the end. But based on our conversations there needs to be a place for elevated complaint.
				* **Motion to bring this to vote**:
			- Moved and Seconded
				* 1 opposed; 1 abstention
				* Proposal 1 passes and heads to the Dean of the Graduate College.
4. Proposal 2: Faculty Senate and the Provost to require Departments to consider changes to P&T documents (or Handbook) to include consideration of the quality of graduate advising and mentorship.
	* + If passed, we will recommend to the faculty senate and provost to consider changes to P&T documents to include consideration of quality in graduate mentorship
			- Discussion: There are many programs that have terminal degrees that are not a PhD (e.g. MBA); faculty concern for how to account for mentoring in professional programs or non-PhDs. Because it is possible that the metric could be unfair to hold everyone to the same standard, or how can we have a metric that accounts for difference in mentoring need/success.
				* Your comment suggests that there is already a metric in place for mentoring PhD students

There is not, but how to equitably establish a metric for different programs.

* + - * + If you don’t have PhD students it wouldn’t be included in the P&T documents…[response] I think we could give credit for the mentoring and often the invisible labor that is done. I think there are different department cultures and so specifics will be needed [response] guidance to faculty in department norms

Concerned at both department and university level [is the language flexible enough to send on the faculty senate?]

* + - * + Perhaps remove handbook and leave to departments. Departments will figure it out.
				+ Assumes that that every faculty member has the same opportunities

If it’s not in your workload, then it doesn’t matter. But if it is, it is included in the dossier.

The whole idea of the workload statement is to only report on what you are asked to do by the university. If you are not asked to do that it shouldn’t be evaluated, that would be a violation of the CBA.

* + - * + Hesitate because many departments are ignoring the CBA that gives workload credit when PhD students defend. Appendix B of the CBA gives credit equivalencies when students are graduated [response] some departments have different rules around graduate advising but most do not and are supposed to follow appendix B [response] we may be evaluated as to the excellence of our advising but are not compensated per the CBA [we tried to address this, and found that most departments don’t follow this] [agree that they are separate issues but we can’t keep piling on guidance without following already existing deadlines

Even doing independent studies isn’t recognized

Some departments have specifics, such as ours which is in our “teaching” section of our P&T. Maybe the language can be tweaked to allow for that.

This doesn’t have anything to do with the proposal.

* + - * + **Vote to strike the word “or handbook” - passes unanimously**

More discussion: I do want to support students; but do want to bring these other things to light—concerns that compensation for graduate student mentoring is not consistent across campus

May we consider language about if departments are going to update P&T to reflect mentoring and amplify compliance with CBA Appendix B.

Should we separate these things and can council also talk about the CBA as a different statement?

Definitely something to consider, because for example full professors who do not have a P&T process can ignore

* + - * + **Vote on whether to wait to vote on proposal until language is generated to urge departments to follow the CBA.**

**1 opposition**

Question to Dean Rossi about GC advocating to other units about following the stated workload.

Workload is not transparent

* + - * + Take a step back and think about who this proposal is to and who does it go to?

The appropriate place would be the faculty senate and the provost. The CBA is violated every day on this campus. To the extent that we can confer in language accountability. What do we do when universities unilaterally violate CBA—no real answer from AAUP. Use language that directs the departments back to the CBA. To do it in a way that enhances people’s files.

BREAKING NEWS: CBA agreed upon, will effect graduate mentoring.

Need a working group to reconsider language related to the CBA.

* + - * **Volunteers for working group: Jessica Sowa (Biden School); Teya Rutherford (CANR); Ben Stanley (CAS)**
				+ Workload policy is decided by faculty and approved by Dean “creature of the faculty;” also please consider “in-rank review” as part of discussion
			* Holding off on Proposal 2 until a later time. Ask working group to present at an executive committee meeting and get feedback.
				+ **Voted: 1 abstention, passes**
1. Committee and Working: Confirmation on continued willingness to serve from existing members.
	* + Any requests to move off of working group/committee
			- None identified.
	* Student life committee
		+ One faculty member needed: request for volunteer, please email Sam and Delight
	* Interdisciplinary curriculum committee: request for volunteers, an email request will be sent out
		+ One CAS rep needed
		+ One COE rep needed
2. CARES working group update – Lindsay Naylor (deferred due to meeting over time)
3. Formation of a working group on commercial conflicts of interest involving graduate students – Lou Rossi (deferred due to time)
4. Working group to review parental leave policy statement – Lou Rossi
5. Need faculty and student input to review and finalize language changes. (Deferred due to time)
6. Working group on graduate student awards and recognitions from the GC – Lou Rossi (deferred due to time)
7. Reports?
	* Grad student caucus
		+ Need to connect to working groups, please email: akridge@udel.edu
		+ Housing, follow-up on master lease pilot
		+ Elsevier journal subscriptions
			- Recommend reaching out to the library