

Colleagues,

On behalf of the GPC let me first thank you all for your patience and continued efforts toward implementation of our new Graduate Faculty Status policy. While technically this new policy has already gone into effect, the old processes (DDS) may still be followed until implementation of the new policy is complete (i.e. all criteria are in and approved). It is imperative that this implementation process be completed before the end of this semester.

Based on the criteria submitted by a goodly number of units across campus, a subcommittee appointed by the GPC to screen these criteria has noticed a number of trends, and offers several suggestions for clarification and a modicum of uniformity.

First, it should be noted that the GPC subcommittee (like the GPC itself) is charged with screening and approving these criteria with an eye only to correcting inaccuracies and potential conflicts with the policies already passed by the GPC and the Faculty Senate (refer to memo). We are not engaged in detailed quality control, as this is the remit of each individual unit/program, and should be reflected specifically in the section of the criteria that deals with limitations and restrictions.

Second, it should be pointed out that GFS is not identical with what used to be known as DDS, and that there is no mechanism for revoking or losing it. GFS has existed for quite sometime at FSU, and was never subject to revocation in the past. Equating it with DDS, and thus including clauses that allow for its being taken away by departments or colleges is inappropriate; GFS resides at the top of the University, and is not granted by the departments.

Rather, if departments/units wish to account for situations in which a colleague may fall short of the expected level of activity that graduate education entails (see standard ¶ in section 3, below) they should include in their criteria limitations that reflect this, as well as language addressing the level and frequency of review of an individual graduate faculty member's performance (i.e., the colleague is reviewed, not GFS).

While we recognize that each department/unit's GFS criteria document will in many ways be unique, reflecting the diversity of our disciplinary cultures, we suggest that the following conceptual structure may prove helpful in revising these documents.

The GFS criteria document should have at least three distinct parts:

1. **A definition of GFS** as reflected in the policy passed by the GPC and approved by the Faculty Senate in Spring, 2008. Here is the standard paragraph:

Membership in the Graduate faculty authorizes faculty to teach all graduate-level courses, to sit on all graduate-level committees, to chair all graduate student

dissertation committees, and to participate fully in all components of graduate education, research, and service. Limitation or removal of any of these authorizations from individual GFS-faculty is delegated to the unit level authority where such assignments are made.

2. Nomination criteria: details concerning the terminal degree required, any post-doc or graduate student mentoring experience required, etc. Keep in mind that until such time as the candidate fulfils these nomination criteria, he or she will NOT be authorized to teach graduate courses or serve on graduate committees. Here is the statement of the University minimum requirements:

Subject to consideration of special circumstances, minimum qualifications are: (1) completion of the doctorate or its equivalent and (2) proven expertise in the teaching area.¹

3. Limitations/Restrictions: this is where departments should provide details about any conditions that must be met for specific situation: directing doctoral dissertations, teaching different levels of grad courses, etc. These should be preceded by the following Standard Paragraph 2:

Faculty holding GFS are expected to actively engage in graduate education through teaching, mentoring and research supervision. They should show evidence of research-based scholarship and/or creative work resulting in peer-reviewed publications or equivalent work.

Further language referring to local evaluation of performance (not GFS) and limitations to/revocation of said privileges (not GFS) can go here, as well, but as per the policy passed by the GPC and approved by the Faculty Senate in Spring 2008, this will not be overseen by the University.

We would ask that units revise their GFS criteria documents accordingly, and submit them to the Chair of the GPC (for distribution to and review by the GFS sub-committee), not later than **Friday, March 6.**

Respectfully,

David F. Johnson

Chair, Graduate Policy Committee
