



## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

GRADUATE SCHOOL

### GRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES

February 19, 2009

- Attending: Kurt Baker, Randall Brown, Bret Carroll, David Colnic, Diana Demetrulias, Chet Jensen, Ann Kohlhaas (also proxy for Pam Roe), Nathan Lavaas, Carolyn Martin, Peter Nelligan, William Potter, Arnold Schmidt, Margaret Tynan, Andrew Wagner, Shawna Young
- Excused: Dennis Sayers, Ramon Vega de Jesus
- Ex-Officio: Sari Miller-Antonio (for Carolyn Stefanco), Ken Potts (for Carl Whitman), Mark Thompson
- Guests: Lisa Bernardo

Shawna Young called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

**I. Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved with the following revisions:

- A. Add item III A. Welcome New Members (Young).
- B. Add item III E. IRB Memo Status (Young).
- C. Add item III F. Spring Schedule (Young).
- D. Add item III G. IS Director Update (Young).
- E. Add item IV B. Candidacy Approval Forms (Schmidt).

**II. Approval of January 29, 2009 Minutes.** The minutes were approved.

**III. Information and Announcements**

- A. **Welcome New Members (Young).** Nathan Lavaas, newly appointed Associated Students Graduate Senator, and Alyssa Mazzina, interim Graduate Council Recording Secretary, were introduced to the Council.
- B. **Questions about Reports (Young).** There were no questions.
- C. **Update on Petition/Appeal of University Requirements Policy (Young).** S. Young distributed a handout outlining revisions recommended by the Academic Senate to the Petition/Appeal of University Requirements & Course Substitutions (Graduate) policy and form (revisions made to Attachment #0809-6, previously distributed).

In addition to the proposed revisions, M. Tynan suggested that the form be made available online in an editable PDF format, allowing users to complete the form electronically. After some discussion regarding the best time to submit the completed form to the Graduate School, L. Bernardo clarified that the form must be submitted to the Graduate School immediately upon completion (as opposed to holding completed forms

in the student's departmental file until the student applies for graduation). The Graduate School also keeps a paper file on each graduate student, and the Petition/Appeal of University Requirements form contains information needed by the Graduate School prior to the student's graduation; therefore, the forms should be submitted in a timely manner and housed in the Graduate School's file.

A motion was made by M. Tynan to accept the proposed revisions to Attachment #0809-6. C. Jensen seconded the motion. The motion carried.

- D. **Graduate School Admission Requirements (Bernardo).** The Council was informed of a change to Title V policy in regard to the grade point average considered by the University in graduate student admission decisions. The revised policy allows the University to consider either the GPA of the student's last 60 units, or the cumulative GPA from the student's bachelor's degree program. L. Bernardo stated that she would follow up with graduate program coordinators on an individual basis to determine the best way to evaluate a prospective student's GPA for each graduate program.
- E. **IRB Memorandum Status (Young).** K. Potts stated he would ask Carl Whitman for the status of this memorandum, which the Library is planning to distribute reminding faculty of the importance of IRB clearance and alerting faculty to the change in the Reader Review form.
- F. **Spring Schedule (Young).** The Council agreed to revise the meeting schedule as follows: The meeting originally scheduled for April 30<sup>th</sup> will be rescheduled for April 23<sup>rd</sup>, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. (location T.B.A.) The May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting will be canceled. Revised schedules will be distributed to the Council members.
- G. **I.S. Director Update (Young).** S. Young shared an email from D. Sayers stating that the Committee on Committees has named the I.S. Committee as the search committee for the vacant I.S. Director position. The search committee has set a March 23 deadline for applications and expects to interview candidates and make a recommendation to the Vice Provost prior to spring break (the week of April 13<sup>th</sup>).

#### IV. Discussion

- A. **Academic Program Review (Demetrulias)— Attachment #0809-16, previously distributed, and Attachment #0809-16 Addendum.** The Council discussed possible changes to the Academic Program Review process. S. Young distributed information about WASC requirements for the conduct of academic program reviews, including the section of the WASC team report in which the team indicated the need for improvements in the process, especially for graduate program reviews. Key discussion points, based on the numbered items outlined in the attachment, follow:

*Item 1, Timeline:* Proposed changes, as described in detail on page 3 of Attachment #0809-16, will shorten the overall timeline of the APR process from 7 terms to 6. The Council agreed to support these recommendations, with the revision to include winter term for completing the self study and submission to the dean in February.

*Item 2, Initiating the APR Process:* The Council agreed that ideally, deans should attend the centralized workshop and then disseminate that information to the departments at college workshops. It was noted that while college guidelines should not supplant or contradict the University-wide guidelines, the deans and college committees may wish to refine and emphasize certain aspects to meet each individual college's mission. In particular, it was noted that accreditation documents, if they meet the criteria for APR's, can substitute for APR documents.

*Item 4, External Reviews:* The Council discussed the issue of changing the language regarding use of external reviews in the APR process from "optional" to "strongly encouraged" or "required." After discussion, it

was agreed that while external reviews may be valuable, limited resources do not always make them feasible, and so it was generally agreed that they should be encouraged but not mandated.

*Item 5, Students' Participation:* It was agreed that while student participation in the APR process is valuable, it is often difficult to recruit students to participate. It was agreed that student participation should be encouraged but not mandated.

*Item 7, Graduate (Master's) Programs:* The language as it stands now gives programs a choice between using separate APR documents for undergraduate and graduate programs or integrating the two into a single document. The Council agreed that, as the needs in this area vary by department, the language should be left as is to allow each department to choose the format that best fits its programs. The issue may be reexamined at a later time.

The above feedback will be shared with UEPC.

- B. Candidacy Approval Forms (Schmidt).** A. Schmidt expressed concern that programs were not given enough notice from the Graduate School when Candidacy Approval forms were due to clear students for graduation. He requested that emails be sent several times leading up to the due date, and that both the graduate coordinator and the program staff support person be copied on these emails. L. Bernardo stated that she would confer with Graduate School staff to determine the current procedure and improve it as necessary.
- C. WASC CPR Site Visit Team Report (Demetrulias).** Deferred.
- D. Graduate Assessment—Graduate Culture (Demetrulias)—Attachment #0809-4 previously distributed.** The Council resumed discussion of graduate culture in response to the WASC standard regarding how a graduate academic culture is created and supported at our institution. M. Tynan suggested the possibility of a hooding ceremony to honor all master's and doctoral degree recipients. The MSW program already holds such a ceremony, and extending that tradition across programs might contribute to the overall graduate culture on campus. The ideas of either holding a separate ceremony or incorporating some special recognition into the existing commencement ceremony were discussed. It was decided that Council members would take these ideas back to their departments and gather feedback, and discussion would resume at the next meeting. If feedback is good, after some more concrete ideas are formed the Council will consider approaching the Commencement Committee with a proposal.
- E. Graduate Education Strategic Plan (Young).** S. Young related a discussion between the WASC team and the Council wherein WASC posed the question of where graduate education is headed on our campus. S. Young feels it would be good to have some cohesive, substantive response in writing for that question, an overall idea of the direction of graduate education on campus. She noted also that the Council in the early 1990s had planning documents, and these may be helpful as we think about the future of graduate education within the context of the University's Strategic Plan. The issues of a centralized versus decentralized model for graduate education were discussed. Discussion indicated that a separate Strategic Plan for graduate education may or may not be needed, and perhaps it would be more appropriate to develop strategies to achieve the strategic priorities in the University Strategic Plan that relates to graduate education. At its next meeting, the Council will identify and prioritize graduate education goals and discuss how graduate education contributes to the fulfillment of the mission and vision of the University.
- F. Policy on Graduate Academic Advising (Young)—Attachment #0809-14 previously distributed.** Deferred.
- G. Graduate Assessment—Alumni Survey (Colnic, Young)—Attachment #0809-12 previously distributed.** Deferred.

**H. CGS/Peterson’s Award for Innovation in Promoting an Inclusive Graduate Community (Demetrulias).**  
Deferred.

**I. GA/TA Fundraising (Young).** Deferred.

Shawna Young adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.  
Respectfully submitted by Alyssa Mazzina