

**Pathway Goal:** Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity  
**Action Item #** 2-5

**Report:** Year-End: May 2018

**Action Item Description:**

Graduate Faculty & Student Support

**Submitted By:**

Name	Department
Peter Gray	Anthropology

**Working Group Members:**

Name	Department
Peter Gray	Anthropology
Kendall Hartley	Graduate College
Kate Korgan	Graduate College
Valarie Burke	Graduate College
Anne Stevens	English
Jaci Batista	Civil & Envr Eng & Construction
Josue Epane	Health Care Admin & Policy
Toni Repetti	Hospitality
James Mah	Dentistry
Hasan Deniz	College of Education
Aya MacDonald	Art
Seong Park	Criminal Justice

**Process and Timeline: Provide a brief summary of the year-long process for your working group.**

- Participate in GA issues/projects as needed; continue to work on realizing Top Tier GA goals.
- Collaborate on development of financial training, resources, and support for graduate students.
- Continue development of faculty and career development and faculty mentorship efforts.
- Collaborate with new Faculty Development Institute (when established).
- Help implement new minimum credentials requirements and updated Graduate Faculty Status guidelines to ensure quality.
- Collaborate with graduate Success Institute to develop strategic professional development programs.

**Describe what has been accomplished so far this year.**

The committee has met three times in fall 2017. At the first of these meetings, the committee primarily discussed graduate student financial resources and faculty career development and mentorship support. The summary points of that meeting were: Sub-committee will remain alert to potential involvement in the roll-out of SALT or other financial literacy programming. Sub-committee might consider surveying online scholarship resources for grad students that apply widely to ensure current and helpful as a central resource possibly on Grad College website, in addition to including links to specific programs where unit-specific funding sources are noted online. Consider how faculty development program changes in process align with sub-committee mandate. Consider what online and other training for faculty development might look like.

Discussion at the second meeting focused on remote defenses and teacher training for graduate students. Both positives (e.g., recognizing potential financial burdens of requiring a graduate student to visit campus for an in-person defense if have moved elsewhere) and negatives (e.g., technology demands) of remote defense were debated.

In a third meeting devoted primarily to remote defenses but also touching on departmental external funding resources and consideration of new 2016-2017 Oklahoma State graduate student stipend data, the committee's work and recommendations can be summarized as follows. The committee recommends that UNLV Graduate College policy allow remote defenses in principle. To constrain how these are structured and how frequently they are employed, the committee suggests allowing at most two remote connections (e.g., a student and a committee member would count as those two maximum remote connections) for a defense. A Grad College representative must be present. The committee also recommends a form be created that specifies who will be involved remotely in a defense, provide a compelling rationale for remote involvement, and give details how (e.g., technology, location) the defense will take place. Signatures from a departmental and higher unit (e.g., Grad College) representative must be obtained.

What about emergencies vs. planned remote defenses? What if someone can't make a defense in person due to an emergency? The committee discussed some need for emergency, last-second flexibility for unexpected circumstances that don't have signed approval, but did not have specific guidance.

The committee suggests that departments lacking such departmental-specific information might consider adding this information to their websites or perhaps some other equivalent source of information to help provide further support to grad students seeking external scholarships, internships, and jobs.

The committee did not reach any consensus views about possible feedback or recommendations based on looking at the newer OK State data.

The committee's recommendations from last year regarding Graduate Faculty Status, graduate advisory committee roles, and teaching qualifications has moved through the GC executive committee and the Council. Changes will be implemented beginning in the spring semester.

The Graduate College is undertaking a graduate coordinator survey regarding 4 top tier issues, including GA needs. This committee will analyze and summarize this GA data and make recommendations regarding campus GA needs and priorities.

### Identify next steps.

The Committee will next be reviewing summer 2018 doctoral graduate student research fellows' applications and making award recommendations.

The committee will review the GA needs data & graduate student and faculty professional development needs assessment from the graduate coordinator survey and make recommendations regarding campus-wide needs and priorities.

The committee will present language regarding best practices for remote defenses.

### What will your final product be at the end of the year? Such as, what metrics which will be used to assess your progress/achievement, will a report be generated, etc?

The Committee will seek to provide additional guidance and recommendations that address the scope of its mandate. This will include at least the following: 1) appointment of summer doctoral research fellows; 2) recommendations for campus GA needs and priorities; 3) recommendations for graduate student and faculty mentorship and professional development needs; and 4) the committee will provide remote defense recommendations for campus implementation.

### You may have reference material to attach to this report. Select from the list.

No additional reference material

**OR**

Any material generated by this working group (if completed at this time)

### Additional information to include (optional).

Please find notes enclosed for each of the fall 2017 committee meetings.

---

**End of Mid-Year Report**  
**Remainder of the report will be completed in May.**

### Year-End

This portion is to be completed in May.

#### 2017-18 Accomplishments.

The committee reviewed and provided funding recommendations for summer 2018 UNLV doctoral fellowships.  
The committee advanced recommended prose concerning remote thesis and dissertation defenses for potential inclusion in the Graduate Catalog.

#### SWOT Analysis: Determine the strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats presented in the data.

Strength(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The committee rigorously evaluated, approved and advanced potential Graduate Catalog prose (see verbiage in April 17 meeting notes) concerning remote thesis and dissertation defenses.</li> <li>• The committee thoughtfully reviewed summer 2018 doctoral fellowship applications, with those funds (starting summer 2017) an important source of doctoral student support.</li> <li>• The committee held substantive discussions, with resulting notes enclosed, on various topics concerning faculty and graduate student professional development and support.</li> </ul>
Weakness(es)	Some anticipated university initiatives—SALT, a faculty affairs position to support faculty development, a campus teaching center—did not emerge during 2017-2018, though the sub-committee mandate would have entailed synergies with them.
Opportunity(ies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss and refine evaluation criteria including a rubric before conducting summer 2019 doctoral fellowship application review. Make decisions concerning summer doctoral fellowship and other university fellowship/scholarship outcomes available as soon as possible in spring to aid student planning (especially for summer).</li> <li>• Develop, in partnership with other key players, online content including videos for graduate faculty training.</li> <li>• Develop, in partnership with other key players, guidelines for graduate student teacher training before and continuing after graduate students engage in instruction.</li> <li>• Exit surveys or interviews with graduating students could be consistently employed. The information needs likely vary by unit so items asked may be unit-specific rather than universal.</li> <li>• Professional engagement with graduate alumni poses opportunities to seamlessly connect the Alumni Association; Department, College and University fundraising (i.e., development); and Department, College and University community engagement (e.g., in supporting bridges by which graduates may return for presentations, to be recognized, and to aid in career support of new graduates).</li> <li>• Continued opportunities to use and refine levers such as teaching reassignments, promotion and tenure criteria and Graduate Faculty status criteria to support faculty who successfully mentor graduate students.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee discussed how resources in support of aiding graduate student external funding might best work and look. Committee felt that unit-specific information can be placed on websites or otherwise made available to complement university-level support.</li> </ul>
Threat(s)	

### 2018-19 recommendations and next steps

- **What does the SWOT analysis reveal?**
- **What should the goals / activities be for the subcommittee?**
- **Who should be responsible?**

The committee could continue next academic year with some change in tasks. No further work is needed to craft remote defense guidelines. The committee could continue to handle summer doctoral fellowship applications. New committee assignments could be added based on need, such as reconsidering how GA funds are distributed. The committee could work with other stakeholders such as a possible faculty development center.

### You may have reference material to attach to this report. Select from the list.

No additional reference material

**OR**

Any material generated by this working group

### Additional information to include (optional).

Please find notes from 5 meetings enclosed.

---

**End of Report**

---

## Top Tier Subcommittee: Graduate Faculty and Student Support

September 26, 2017

SU 224, 1:00-2:00 PM

Present: Jaci Batista; Hasan Deniz; Valarie Burke; Brianne Heinle; Kendall Hartley; Joseu Epame; Anne Stevens; Peter Gray; James Mah; Toni Repetti

Not present: Moinak (but email address needed adjustment, perhaps accounting for why not present)

Prior to the meeting, the subcommittee mandate was shared as follows, including the two bullet points on which to focus during the September 26 meeting.

### Subcommittee Mandate

- Participate in GA Issues/Projects as needed
- Continue to work on prioritizing and realizing top tier GA goals
- Review and recommend Summer Research Doctoral Fellows for S'18
- Collaborate on development of financial training, resources, and support for graduate students: Financial report & roll-out of SALT
- Continue development of faculty and career development and faculty mentorship efforts (new FDI?)
- GA teaching preparation program: <https://proxy.qualtrics.com/proxy/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fcgsnet.org%2Fdo-you-use-masters-students-tas%23new&token=vPi3WA9HY4YQn1ZgLDRT3qN5GUNIYHZzexNi7qrbQk%3D>
- Recommendations for distance defenses and defense videos
- Help implement new minimum credentials requirements & updated Graduate Faculty Status guidelines to ensure quality
- Collaborate with Graduate Success Institute to develop strategic professional development programs

**September 26 meeting: focus on the fourth and fifth of these bullet point items** (i.e., financial training...development of faculty and career development...).

Minutes from September 26 meeting.

### Introductions of committee members and mandate.

### Focus on fourth bullet point about financial training.

- What is SALT? Financial planning resource that is optional for students. Somewhat similar to Mint? Financial literacy, planning, 401K, etc. free videos, etc. Now being worked on via legal concerning possible access to UNLV graduate students.
- Grad student financial literacy generally, e.g., loans from undergrad and grad. International students' financial issues too: money management. Student debt and loans issues. Setting students up for success when they complete degree and over long-term consequences. Discussions of some cases of grad student needs for financial literacy.
- UNLV Student Life and Climate Survey also pointed to demand for grad student opportunities for scholarship and fellowship support; varies by college/unit. Opportunities for scholarships.
- Scholarship data base and applying for scholarships is distinct from financial literacy.
- How would we get SALT info to grad students? Can't just live on a website and a mass email not sufficient to get to grad students. Roll-out plan? Orientation one possible avenue. One of obstacles to grad progress is financial—a common issue for UNLV grad students from UNLV.

Picture may vary by funding considerations across units, and issue of extra work load for some students too to increase income. Some working full-time outside of UNLV while grad students.

- Scholarship support. Workshops. How to write scholarship statements. Other guidance such as soliciting letters and CV, etc. Clearing house of scholarships. Some resources in the works. Wanting to avoid undergrad-centric. Major organizations for different fields, and linking to grad school. Could there be a grad college resource online for university generally? Also maybe links to specific units such as Anthropology or College of Engineering internships, etc. Possible push for webinar such as who to push for letter for reference where can do at own pace and convenience, and complemented by in-person workshop that's more hands-on. Could team up with Writing Center. Do keep track of RSVP and video view numbers. These may point toward one medium or another. Also workshop times. How to move: push for fall UNLV (Dec 1, for example) scholarships? But what of time frames for other scholarships?
- How can we more promote university-wide support for scholarships? Some other institutional grants that could support students preparing for GRE (Keith Rogers, TRIO) but don't have other grad students, so maybe ask them about such support. Target senior undergrads for some scholarships? Maybe find a way to reach out to senior undergrads too, like in sciences and health sciences. Also overlaps with BS/MS bridge program, and related scholarship considerations. Undergrad academic advisors. Several undergrad UNLV programs to develop and recruit undergrads. Most UNLV awards target already-enrolled grad students, while some funds for grad students applying. Why the Dec 1 UNLV GC application deadline? Answer is in part may not have results until spring. Also very competitive and tend to go to more senior grad students. GA appointment for full year, or should that be more flexible to be by semester? Idea could be that like in Geosciences can do semester-only GA. Workday will make some of these logistics different. Also something to be said for giving the student stability and grad coordinator budgeting; grad student accountability. Make clear in how message to students.
- When do grad students receive this info? Any verification of receipt?

Summary points: There exist distinctions between graduate scholarships and support to find, apply, and secure those vs. graduate financial literacy. Sub-committee will remain alert to potential involvement in the roll-out of SALT or other financial literacy programming. Sub-committee might consider surveying online scholarship resources for grad students that apply widely to ensure current and helpful as a central resource possibly on Grad College website, in addition to including links to specific programs where unit-specific funding sources are noted online.

### **Continue development of faculty and career development and faculty mentorship efforts (new FDI?)**

- Currently a faculty affairs position open: what would this mean for committee mandate, given possible overlap in scope? Is this a 'replacement' position or something new?
- How to distribute down from new faculty orientation and/or grad coordinator and/or grad faculty status to reach faculty? A webpage on mentorship for faculty. What would this look like? Should this be expanded? New grad faculty status policy document: also points to training for renewal. Grad training online? Figuring out what that might look like, and would that be palatable? Akin to what do for CITI training? Full vs. associate grad faculty status, and whether to eliminate that distinction; if continue, training specific to grad faculty rank/status?
- Requirements before can be chair of a committee? (do faculty know policies and procedures of school?) Co-chair of committee? Variation by discipline. Training like workshop that covers timelines, paperwork, Chairing too many committees can be a burden, so must be protected as new/early career faculty to some degree. Advising responsibilities can cut into limited time, even as advising students can synergize with a faculty member's research. Not all faculty chair or advise grad committees so workload equity considerations. Hospitality and use of industry faculty. May weigh in as implementation of new/recent policies plays out.

- NSF software TEAM \$500 software for faculty to help manage grad student time(?). Maybe in a couple of months? Drs. Cho and Moon from engineering faculty possibly training. Committee can also make recommendations for resources.

Summary points: Consider how faculty development program changes in process align with sub-committee mandate. Consider what online and other training for faculty development might look like.

Conclude at 2:00.

## Top Tier Subcommittee: Graduate Faculty and Student Support

October 17, 2017

SU 213, 1:00-2:00 PM

Present: Hasan Deniz; Valarie Burke (Matt Martinez as proxy); Brianne Heinle; Anne Stevens; Peter Gray; James Mah; Toni Repetti; Seong Park; Josue Epane

Not present: Jaci Batista; Moinak Bhaduri; Kendall Hartley

### Subcommittee Mandate

- Participate in GA Issues/Projects as needed
- Continue to work on prioritizing and realizing top tier GA goals
- Review and recommend Summer Research Doctoral Fellows for S'18
- Collaborate on development of financial training, resources, and support for graduate students: Financial report & roll-out of SALT
- Continue development of faculty and career development and faculty mentorship efforts (new FDI?)
- GA teaching preparation  
program: <https://proxy.qualtrics.com/proxy/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fcgscsnet.org%2Fdo-you-use-masters-students-tas%23new&token=vPi3WA9HY4YQn1ZgLDR7T3qN5GUNIYHZexNi7qrbQk%3D>
- Recommendations for distance defenses and defense videos
- Help implement new minimum credentials requirements & updated Graduate Faculty Status guidelines to ensure quality
- Collaborate with Graduate Success Institute to develop strategic professional development programs

We addressed two topics today, each noted in bold. Notes from the discussion are included

#### 1. **Remote defenses**

Committee members and/or chair may also be away over summer. Summer defenses are sometimes done in Hospitality.

Student may already be gone on to place where got job.

Normally works well as long as student gets document to committee members with advance available. Hospitality has relatively few other audience members—mostly just committee members.

If you had a large set of people watching a defense or multiple committee members skyping in then this could be more challenging. Need an assured Internet connection.

Could be advantages—some mechanism—to enable remote defense.

Still would need to have an approval and should allow for outside people. But what if open the door and find that only the chair shows up in person?

What if student wasn't organized in time to create 'dire circumstances'? Expectation vs. acceptance of a process. Some kind of approval needed for remote defense. Maybe have a narrative in which here are the reasons for which a remote defense can be justified.

Also if do an examination of the candidate then could be difficult to do in person—so might variably work across disciplines.

Consider various issues like taking a job elsewhere or sabbatical or other geographic considerations. Some PhD students who have left and taking job elsewhere for whom it could be an economic hardship to return for a defense.

Worry about opening up the box of expectations—what is technological infrastructure? Is that available?

As university looks toward online education and degrees, this is something else that must be looked at.

Student's responsibility to set up room and arrangements for defense. Must have clear expectations: student held responsible for Internet connection, etc.—so in writing. Maybe approval form that notes student's responsibility.

If a strong dissertation then less of an issue, but if a weak dissertation and defense to what extent does the technology get blamed for the failure?

Keep same deadlines for defenses as already exist for Grad College timetables.

Approval must be given by committee for remote defense at specific day/time and with technology.

This is a privilege rather than entitlement. Reasons given for this, and certain colleges should have right to state they don't allow remote defense.

But who says OK for a defense? All committee members.

Must abide by university guidelines of video and surveillance, e.g., can't record during break (James Mah): see [https://www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/page\\_files/3/Video-Audio-Recording-Policy.pdf](https://www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/page_files/3/Video-Audio-Recording-Policy.pdf) Also note that if other audiences not supposed to be present then ensure that others aren't listening, watching or recording to show others against policy?

Also be clear about dissertations vs. theses vs. professional papers or other culminating projects. Any distinctions in how these rules apply? Maybe some fields/defenses lend themselves better than others to a defense (e.g., some arts with music or other culminating projects).

Need to look up policies at peer and aspirational peer institutions. Best practices if connection is poor?

## **2. Teaching training for graduate students**

Anne Stevens in English noted the challenges of the 18 credit requirement before teaching for the structure of their grad program

Bulk of grad student teaching in English is small-group writing in English (first-year writing). Students in first semester teaching this are given materials via email and webcampus in summer and in advance of start of fall term plus an intensive boot-camp before semester starts. Take a 3-credit class simultaneously in pedagogy.

One model: take summer credits before start teaching. This more an issue for incoming grad students without teaching experience immediately put in a classroom, but less the case if a returning student (in which case could undertake training during regular academic term or summer preceding teaching).

PhD students with an MA may be fine and already have experience and training, and in contrast to those entering MA program with BA and without pedagogy training.

Ideas. Have grad student shadow the course in which they will be teaching. Do that for a semester then teach the same class subsequently. Perhaps a faculty advisor oversees a specific class. Must allow time to student for shadowing to prepare for subsequent teaching. In English: one class to teach first semester, also then writing center hours. So could step-wise introduce teaching.

But sometimes students want to teach something different: is the grad student prepared to teach?

Also a content piece besides the pedagogy. Classroom management techniques as part of pedagogy.

There are both some general teacher training considerations (university and federal policies such as sexual harassment, grading fellow grad students, etc.) and others specific to the discipline.

Would not want to see Grad College general training to replace something that must be catered to a specific field. Some policies must be sufficiently general to be flexible.

Follow up on observations, evaluations: must be a faculty member in charge of specific courses. Sit in on class, look at syllabus, etc. Challenge to get faculty members to agree to do this.

Co-teaching model. Addresses many of problems, including content or area-specific. What types of assignment? Goal of an assignment? How teach? Design a syllabus? In some fields and classes, a syllabus may already be put together for students.

Follow up by faculty, with students tweaking syllabus or such. Some reporting at end. Also checking that shadowing attendance in a class is consistent. May also give some responsibilities to wean them (co-teaching) a grad student into instruction experience. If establish in first year, then good training subsequently. Would other faculty do this so that equitable workload and standard. How present to students important.

How much time is left for teaching relative to GA hours (e.g., research)?

Also issue of university-wide resources like teaching center. What's the status of university-wide resources such as a possible teaching center?

What does math department do? Ask Moinak? Possibly look at other departments for what they require before put students in front of classroom?

Also look at other models from peer/aspirational peer institutions.

Note: **'Homework' before next meeting November 21, 1:00 PM, SU #213. Bring information about external funding from specific units like Anthropology (e.g., <https://www.unlv.edu/anthro/resources>). Look up 2-3 models from peer/aspirational peer institutions both for remote defenses and graduate teacher training.**

End at 2:02.

## **Top Tier Subcommittee: Graduate Faculty and Student Support**

November 21, 2017

SU 213, 1:00-2:00 PM

Present: Jaci Batista; Anne Stevens; Peter Gray; Matt Martinez; Brianne Heinle; Val Burke; Toni Repetti; Hasan Deniz; Josue Epane; Aya MacDonald

Absent with advance notice: Seong Park

Absent without notice: James Mah

The bulk of meeting time was devoted to discussion and committee recommendations concerning thesis and dissertation remote defenses. Toward the end of the meeting, brief discussion also took place concerning departmental/unit information on external funding in addition to new Oklahoma State information on GA stipends.

### **1. Remote defenses**

A number of links and information on peer, aspirational peer, and other institution's models for remote defense were shared prior to the meeting. That information, including links, are provided below. These models include ones such as UCF, ASU, and Oregon that are regularly viewed as insightful for UNLV policy, in addition to other models representing a greater array of institutional contexts such as UCLA. Also note committee discussion at the previous meeting, with notes governing pros and cons to remote defenses (e.g., can be a financial burden on a student who has moved to return to campus for a defense).

The UCF information represents minimal university criteria, but individual colleges can be more stringent. If department wants to enable remote defenses, then they can choose to do this.

ProctorU is a paid service that electronically monitors behavior in room during exam, which Toni has used. Can be a way to prevent getting outside help. The student would know the thesis/diss best so would likely be hard to cheat even with assistance off-camera during a remote defense. Make exception if allowed. Preferred if on campus, with exceptions upon petition. Form signed off at different levels. Not SAT or GRE on which can cheat in same way.

Students, chairs, committee members, and also a room open to public.

Can students defend remotely? There are both models that allow (e.g., UCF, Portland State) and don't allow (e.g., UCLA) students to defend remotely, though more seem not to allow a student to defend remotely.

Remote defenses for chairs: Are also models that allow and don't allow a chair to participate in a defense remotely.

Remote defenses for other (non-chair) committee members are variable, with some models not allowing this, and others allowing some non-chair committee members to participate remotely. It was suggested that the Grad College rep should be present to serve as an arbitrator of fair play. As places

like UCLA message, someone (e.g., committee member) cannot miss out of convenience but of necessity. The committee emphasized the importance that remote participation by any individuals, whether students or committee members, must be under extreme circumstances with legitimate reasons articulated for remote involvement.

Technology and other logistics such as a space for a public audience to view a defense must be worked out too. Google hangout is an option. Software expenses should be considered depending on audience size and number of remote individuals involved. Skype can handle this number of people. Webex. Bandwidth a possible consideration. There is also consideration over the legality of software use for a defense (e.g., does license allow a public defense?). Continuing Education already has Webex. Handshake \$30K software: Raelynn Lee. Other colleges could also use that software. Would it be cheaper if university bought most pertinent software for all programs?

The committee recommends that UNLV Graduate College policy allow remote defenses in principle. To constrain how these are structured and how frequently they are employed, the committee suggests allowing at most two remote connections (e.g., a student and a committee member would count as those two maximum remote connections) for a defense. A Grad College representative must be present. The committee also recommends a form be created that specifies who will be involved remotely in a defense, provide a compelling rationale for remote involvement, and give details how (e.g., technology, location) the defense will take place. Signatures from a departmental and higher unit (e.g., Grad College) representative must be obtained.

What about emergencies vs. planned remote defenses? What if someone can't make a defense in person due to an emergency? The committee discussed some need for emergency, last-second flexibility for unexpected circumstances that don't have signed approval, but did not have specific guidance.

Possibly see UCF guidelines for an example. As online education becomes a bigger player, we're being proactive in allowing online opportunities. Yet it was also noted that some predominantly online programs still require on-campus and in-person defenses. Perhaps look up ASU online handbooks to see how they handle defenses.

## **2. External funding for specific units.**

This topic was discussed the previous meeting, with some brief resolution at the present meeting. Of the handful of departments discussed, some such as Engineering and Hospitality have website information that highlights scholarship opportunities, internships, and jobs. Many other departments do not have information for grad students on a departmental website. There is more general information available about graduate student funding, workshops to aid grant-writing, etc. available online in the library website, OSP, etc. The committee suggests that departments lacking such departmental-specific information might consider adding this information to their websites or perhaps some other equivalent source of information to help provide further support to grad students seeking external scholarships, internships, and jobs.

## **3. 2016/2017 OK State data and feedback. Any recommendations?**

Some comments on these OK State data: cost of living in Las Vegas relative to other places is a consideration that doesn't show up; the OK State data are composite; Engineering is often competing

internationally. With respect to stipend amounts in the OK State data, in some fields those amounts dropped between 2014/15 to 2016/17 and thus UNLV stipends “overpay.” For Criminal Justice, this amount was quite sizable, but based on a tiny sample size, so lacks clear generalizability. Stipend amounts in some other fields like Computer Science have gone up. Uncomfortable to reduce stipends. OK State data are guidelines. The committee did not reach any consensus views about possible feedback or recommendations based on looking at the newer OK State data.

End 2:02 PM.

Information on models for remote defenses that helped inform committee discussion, in addition to a few notes about departmental website information about external funding.

**Peter Gray:**

ASU (under this link, look at defense): <https://graduate.asu.edu/completing-your-degree> There's a linked set of guidelines governing under what conditions committee members may participate remotely; they require a committee chair to be present, for example, and it doesn't seem like they would allow a student to participate remotely in a defense.

University of Oregon: <https://gradschool.uoregon.edu/policies-procedures/doctoral/defense> They require the student and chair to be present but do allow some committee members to participate remotely.

Portland State University (<https://www.pdx.edu/ogs/remote-thesisdissertation-participation>) allows students to participate remotely.

Departmental information on external funding sources is provided under a student resources page: <https://www.unlv.edu/anthro/resources>

**Toni Repetti:**

Our college posts this about external scholarships.

<https://www.unlv.edu/hospitality/scholarships>

It is all students and not just graduate students.

I looked up UCF and here is their policy:

Graduate programs may elect to offer the option of a virtual thesis defense (student off-campus defense) upon approval of the program coordinator/director, the department, and the college. Programs that choose to offer the option of a virtual defense must develop and ensure procedures for the implementation of the virtual defense process and procedures must be published in the program's handbook. These procedures should address the form and time for the student's request for a virtual defense, the process for seeking approval, the teleconferencing facilities and equipment to be used, the availability of technical support during the defense, alternative plans if needed, and other relevant

issues. Use of a web conferencing platform like Lync or Adobe Connect is recommended as is the preparation of participants and testing of the system prior to the defense date. Students should also seek approval for a virtual defense by the time they file the intent to graduate. It is expected that at minimum the thesis committee chair will be present at the campus location of the public defense. Individual programs may add further restrictions or requirements for students to proceed with virtual defenses.

<https://www.graduatecatalog.ucf.edu/content/policies.aspx?id=5708>

**Anne Stevens:**

My department has no information about external funding.

Here are some models for remote defenses:

1. University of Rochester: "It is permissible for a member of your committee to participate in the defense remotely via Skype, with the exception of your advisor and the Chair—you, your advisor and the Chair of the committee must all be physically present in the room for the defense."

(<https://www.rochester.edu/college/gradstudies/phd-defense/before.html>)

2. University of Hawaii: "Effective 2015, the Graduate Council has approved allowing graduate programs more flexibility with regard to remote participation by the doctoral candidate and committee members for a doctoral defense. With this change, it is possible for the entire committee to attend a doctoral defense online with no members physically present on campus at UHM. However, since such defenses will continue to remain a public presentation, a physical location on the UHM campus with accessibility for viewers to an online or related type of defense (i.e., if defense is located at an off-campus location) must be made available. This information will also be required on the Dissertation Announcement that is submitted at least two weeks prior to a defense and when posted to the Academic Calendar. For any graduate program that wishes to establish their own guidelines and procedures with regard to physical presence, virtual presence, or a mixture of both for the candidate and committee members for doctoral defenses, an official memo sent via your college/school Dean to Dean Aune will be required."

(<https://manoa.hawaii.edu/graduate/content/final-defense>)

3. University of Maryland (<http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/Catalog/policy.php?doctoral-degrees>)

- **Remote Participation in a Dissertation Defense** All members of a Dissertation Examining Committee must be physically present in the examination room during the entire dissertation defense and during the committee's private deliberations following the examination. Participation by telephone is not permitted under any circumstances. Remote participation by video teleconferencing is permitted under the following circumstances:
  - Permission to conduct a remote-participation defense must be obtained by the dissertation chair from the Graduate School in advance. In making this request, the chair must indicate in writing that he/she has read the rules for a remote defense listed below.

- A competent video technician must be present at both the University site and the remote location for the entire duration of the defense in the event that technical difficulties arise.
- Only one remote site may be used during the defense.
- The candidate, the committee chair, and the Dean's Representative must all be present in the examination room. None of them may be at the remote site.
- The program must pay for all of the costs of the video teleconferencing arrangements.

**Hasan Deniz:**

I did not come across any information about external funding for graduate students in our department (Teaching & Learning) and college (Education) websites. It looks like this is something that we need to work on. In our department and college we have so many different content areas and specialties. Preparing a comprehensive list requires department wide and college wide effort.

Here are the remote dissertation defense participation policies from University of Maryland and Michigan State University.

**University of Maryland Remote Participation in a Dissertation Defense Policy:**

<http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/Catalog/policy.php?doctoral-degrees>

**Remote Participation in a Dissertation Defense** All members of a Dissertation Examining Committee must be physically present in the examination room during the entire dissertation defense and during the committee's private deliberations following the examination. Participation by telephone is not permitted under any circumstances. Remote participation by video teleconferencing is permitted under the following circumstances:

- Permission to conduct a remote-participation defense must be obtained by the dissertation chair from the Graduate School in advance. In making this request, the chair must indicate in writing that he/she has read the rules for a remote defense listed below.
- A competent video technician must be present at both the University site and the remote location for the entire duration of the defense in the event that technical difficulties arise.
- Only one remote site may be used during the defense.
- The candidate, the committee chair, and the Dean's Representative must all be present in the examination room. None of them may be at the remote site.
- The program must pay for all of the costs of the video teleconferencing arrangements

**Michigan State University Department of Kinesiology Remote Participation in a Dissertation Defense Policy:**

<http://education.msu.edu/kin/resources/PHD%20Dissertation%20Policy%20update%203-30-12.pdf>

Remote Participation in a Dissertation Proposal and/or Defense - A majority of the members of a Dissertation Examining Committee must be present either remotely or physically in the examination room during the entire dissertation proposal and/or defense and during the committee's private deliberations following the examination. Participation by telephone/video conference/Skype is permitted for 2 of the 4 committee members. Remote participation by either telephone/video conferencing/Skype is permitted under the following circumstances, although all parties should be present if possible:

- Permission to conduct a telephone/video conference/Skype proposal and/or defense must be obtained from the dissertation chair in advance.
- All parties involved should make sure that the technology needs are in place and working prior to the start of the proposal and/or defense.
- The candidate must request permission from the dissertation chair to participate remotely in the examination.
- The dissertation chair may be at a remote site, however another on-site committee member must assume role of facilitator during the candidates oral presentation and questions from the guests.
- If costs are involved, the Department will assume responsibility.
- It is the responsibility of the candidate to inform the Graduate Secretary as to the date and time and to initiate the procedure to obtain electronic signatures from all participants.

**Aya MacDonald:**

Some information concerning graduate committee remote participation from UCLA

<https://grad.ucla.edu/academics/doctoral-studies/minimum-standards-for-doctoral-committee-constitution-effective-2016-fall/>

Canadian university permits candidates remote defense IF all committee members are present in the flesh.

<https://uwaterloo.ca/arts/faculty-staff/doctoral-dissertation-procedures>

## **Top Tier Subcommittee: Graduate Faculty and Student Support**

January 16, 2018

SU 213, 1:00-2:00 PM

Present: Jaci Batista; Anne Stevens; Peter Gray; Matt Martinez; Val Burke; Toni Repetti; James Mah; Josue Epane

Absent with advance notice: Seong Park; Aya MacDonald

Absent without notice: Hasan Deniz

### **I. Remote defenses**

We discussed finer details of remote defenses, both touching on plans for specific language that could be considered for incorporation in the Graduate Catalog and a related form to be completed when requesting a remote defense.

Peter will work with Matt Martinez on text for the Graduate Catalog, and Toni with Matt Martinez on the appeal form. We anticipate use of an existing appeal form but with some cover letter or other guidance in the Graduate Catalog. Use of appeals form communicates that it's an exception (i.e., "appealing" for a remote defense) to the norm. Peter has undertaken an initial draft provided below of possible language to include on remote defenses in the Graduate College.

James suggests checking with the UNLV Video surveillance committee. Maybe ensure that students and others are reminded (assuming this is indeed the case) they cannot record the defense. See UNLV policy: <https://www.unlv.edu/news-story/reminder-video-audio-recording-policy> Note precautions about sensitive information. Brian Doyle is that committee chair—Peter will reach out to them. Does the university have preferred platforms that should be used for remote defenses?

### **II. Graduate professional development discussion**

Valarie: grad student programming. Spring 2017 grad survey elicited some ideas for workshops such as writing boot camp. She asks us to consider WAGS in spring 2018.

Exit interviews with an administrator at time of earning degree? May already be required for accreditation. Salesforce. Phone number for text messaging and non-UNLV email...if that could be required then Grad College could reach out subsequently. Required survey for graduation in which ask for any last information.

On tracking grad student alumni... Anne developed an information database from last 10 years regarding alum tracking....she used theses (i.e., from library), google, solicited committee chairs, etc. to follow up on alums.

Maybe some more programming targeted to sub-communities like Humanities. This rather than to broader sweep of all grad students and general. Some of the broader questions/scopes didn't work for a

specific discipline. But attendance just modest anyway so would there be enough people for a specific sub-specialty? Most of Hospitality Career Services is oriented towards undergrads rather than grads. Adding more responsibilities and alumni engagement/volunteer.

UNLV email disabled for graduates after 3 months-5 years but not certain when. Combo of dept/college level vs. grad college level for support with career/professional advice and tracking. Career coordinator for grad students possible in future? UNLV Career Services limitations in staffing and space. Engineering employed Facebook, LinkedIn, phone calls to contact alums 5 years after graduation.

UNLV Connect is currently the key alumni push rather than LinkedIn. It's costly (storage, spacing) to have UNLV email addresses after graduate, apparently. So that's a challenge. Maybe have Chad of Alumni Relations come visit in a future committee meeting?

Content for exit survey. Josue and Jaci have examples from their campus units they can share plus check with Lyndsey Cousins for a general one used for undergrads. Could help communicate across colleges. University of Chicago graduate survey....NSF system....NORC system.

What kinds of information would be sought from an exit survey? Consider department, college, and university needs, including for accreditation purposes. Job placement; staying vs. leaving Las Vegas; forwarding email address; job placement in area of study or not; how many years taken to complete; THE SHORTER THE BETTER; salary range; outcomes that help contribute to demonstrated IMPACT of graduate training. Community service. Where they are, what are they doing, are they using UNLV education?

Students may see benefits of alumni association...University needs to find ways to make it be attractive to join alumni network. Maybe alumni can be part of placement for say hospital positions, as Josue notes. Instead of doing another survey, could you incorporate those units which already exist rather than duplicate? Maybe pull from already-existing surveys where exist. Grad College could say we'd like you to collect this; would need to coordinate via IT.

Struggle with managing existing data. In long run will need system to keep.

End: 2:02 PM.

Draft Graduate Catalog prose concerning remote defenses. See Nov 27 meeting minutes for more models and discussion that helped inform this draft language.

Remote defenses for other (non-chair) committee members are variable, with some models not allowing this, and others allowing some non-chair committee members to participate remotely. It was suggested that the Grad College rep should be present to serve as an arbitrator of fair play. As places like UCLA message, someone (e.g., committee member) cannot miss out of convenience but of necessity. The committee emphasized the importance that remote participation by any individuals,

whether students or committee members, must be under extreme circumstances with legitimate reasons articulated for remote involvement.

The expectation is that thesis and dissertation defenses will be conducted on campus and with the defending student, committee chair, and other committee members present. However, under extenuating circumstances a student may submit an appeal for remote involvement of the student or committee members to take place. Such circumstances might include a faculty emergency or undue hardship on a student related to international travel. At most, two remote connections (e.g., a student and a committee member would count as a maximum of two remote connections) may be allowed at a defense. A Graduate College representative must be present in person. The defense location must have the necessary technical capacity to allow a remote defense. If technical problems prevent being able to successfully conduct the presentation and discussion, the meeting must be rescheduled. An appeal form (LINK) must be submitted and approved by the graduate committee Chair, departmental Chair and Graduate Dean for a remote defense to take place. The appeal form should be submitted at the time the defense is scheduled. The appeal form must specify the reason for the request for up to two of the student and committee members to participate remotely. How and where the defense will take place must also be specified; this includes technical capacity and support.

Note UCF guidelines as one of several models previously considered and linked to in Nov 27 minutes:

Graduate programs may elect to offer the option of a virtual thesis defense (student off-campus defense) upon approval of the program coordinator/director, the department, and the college. Programs that choose to offer the option of a virtual defense must develop and ensure procedures for the implementation of the virtual defense process and procedures must be published in the program's handbook. These procedures should address the form and time for the student's request for a virtual defense, the process for seeking approval, the teleconferencing facilities and equipment to be used, the availability of technical support during the defense, alternative plans if needed, and other relevant issues. Use of a web conferencing platform like Lync or Adobe Connect is recommended as is the preparation of participants and testing of the system prior to the defense date. Students should also seek approval for a virtual defense by the time they file the intent to graduate. It is expected that at minimum the thesis committee chair will be present at the campus location of the public defense. Individual programs may add further restrictions or requirements for students to proceed with virtual defenses.

<https://www.graduatemanager.ucf.edu/content/policies.aspx?id=5708>

## **Top Tier Subcommittee: Graduate Faculty and Student Support**

April 17, 2018

SU 213, 1:00-2:00 PM

Present: Anne Stevens; Peter Gray; Matt Martinez; Toni Repetti; James Mah; Josue Epane; Hasan Deniz; Jaci Batista

Absent with advance notice: Val Burke; Seong Park

Absent without notice: Aya MacDonald

### **I. Remote defenses**

Discussion and approval of proposed Graduate Catalog prose. Here is the prose to suggest be included in the Graduate Catalog

**Revised prose for Grad Catalog, to be inserted under "Oral Defense" following the first paragraph, in which the last sentence of the first paragraph is removed.**

The expectation is that thesis and dissertation defenses will be conducted on campus and with the defending student, committee chair, and other committee members present. However, under extenuating circumstances a student may submit an appeal for remote involvement of the student or committee members to take place. Such circumstances might include a faculty emergency or undue hardship on a student related to international travel. At most, two remote connections (e.g., a student and a committee member would count as a maximum of two remote connections) may be allowed at a defense. A Graduate College representative must be present in person. The defense location must have the necessary technical capacity to allow a remote defense. If technical problems prevent being able to successfully conduct the presentation and discussion, the meeting must be rescheduled. An appeal form (LINK) must be submitted and approved by the graduate committee Chair, departmental Chair and Graduate Dean for a remote defense to take place. The appeal form should be submitted at the time the defense is scheduled. The appeal form must specify the reason—the undue hardship or emergency—for the request for up to two of the student and committee members to participate remotely. How and where the defense will take place must also be specified; this includes technical capacity and support.

### **II. Graduate faculty status and mentorship**

What are some discussion items concerning faculty mentoring of graduate students? Consider factors such as minimal requirements for scholarship; recommendations for points for more productive advisors (offer carrots); P&T workload: publishing/productivity--should also be grad mentorship; etc.

P&T Ark committee: edits are underway. James is on the ARK committee. Very broad guidelines with much less at the local unit. Consider for mentorship of grad students: numbers of students, level of students, and placements. For some faculty, grad faculty status is a status consideration but not upholding spirit (e.g., not teaching grad classes or mentoring grad students) of grad faculty status. Some grad student outcomes may not yield outcomes for which mentors are rewarded, which does not incentivize grad faculty mentoring. Toni in Hospitality has some thoughts.

How to acknowledge the time commitment required for successful mentoring? Some faculty not doing some of the work, which puts more work on others. Any guidelines would need to acknowledge faculty such as variable faculty unit sizes, variable types of graduate degree requirements. There are also some departments without graduate programs, yet some of their faculty may serve as the Grad Faculty rep. Also variable number of grad committees served on. May need to reflect college or departmental-levels given variable expectations.

Another lever could be faculty workload, in which grad faculty loads adjusted to reflect differential workload.

Could do some systematic work on peer and aspirational peer institutions for models.

Could undertake revisions to Graduate Faculty Status requirements and expectations.

See: [https://www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/page\\_files/27/graduate-faculty-status-guidelines.pdf](https://www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/page_files/27/graduate-faculty-status-guidelines.pdf)

### **III. Graduate professional development discussion**

Valarie, in following up from previous discussion, will share a brief update on a project related to Alumni Tracking, plus an update on SALT.

SALT is no more. Was in the process of being implemented as a resource for grad financial literacy or such but no longer exists.

Grad College is working on a database for alumni tracking. MIS students for a capstone project putting together a database for alumni. Some data scraping from LinkedIn. Some progress. An access database. What information is needed? First employment after graduation, and then could fill out info year-after-year. Also working with campus partners who are already doing alumni tracking plus Alumni Association.

Hasan in education, Jaci in engineering as examples of units doing some grad tracking. UNLV Foundation may have best database at this time. Alumni tracking vs. alumni tracking and surveying. Why tracking—what asking from them (such as time, expertise, funds)? Accreditation purpose as a reason for tracking, including that teaching is relevant.

Matt shared some research and ideas about grad alumni tracking generally. CGS report from a few years ago on grad tracking in which they offered best practices. Their recommendation was to create an internal survey to benefit info collection for students own purposes. Web scraping can lead to privacy concerns. Also missing data issues. Often want a time walk such as first thing done after degree and then follow subsequently. Try to get buy-in from alumni. Are ways of automating data collection with LinkedIn profiles or other info. Matt has crafted a report on grad alumni tracking that summarizes some of key points. Might also have data on placement and wages for graduates that could be used for advertising purposes.

How to identify those who received grad degrees? Library resources like theses in library. Programs with degrees conferred. Gail Griffin as possible source, as she might need for other tracking purposes?

Discussion highlights that many units are already doing some kind of alumni tracking for good reasons (like accreditation). Monetizing one's data from LinkedIn or otherwise?

#### **IV. Doctoral Summer Fellowship Program.**

We briefly reviewed the experience of reviewing Summer Doctoral Fellowship applications. Criteria for eligibility. Rubric for scoring. Could be reconsidered from the very minimal 1-10 scoring system employed these initial two years of the Fellowship Program. Variation in programs in which earn MA en route to getting PhD yet might be eligible: should they be eligible? Recommendation: Better to have full committee have a discussion about criteria at an in-person meeting then proceed with evaluations, as this will help identify clearest criteria to employ. People coming from quite varied programs and evaluating quite variable programs. What could a student do to do better next year? If received previously what did you do with award.

End: 2:04 PM.