



## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

GRADUATE SCHOOL

### GRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES

April 2, 2009

Attending: Kurt Baker, Randall Brown, Bret Carroll, David Colnic, Diana Demetrulias, Chet Jensen, Nathan Lovaas, Carolyn Martin, Peter Nelligan, Arnold Schmidt, Nancy Jean Smith (for Ramón Vega de Jesús), Margaret Tynan, Andrew Wagner, Shawna Young

Excused: Ann Kohlhaas, Pam Roe, Dennis Sayers

Ex-Officio: Sari Miller-Antonio (for Carolyn Stefanco), Ken Potts (for Carl Whitman), Mark Thompson

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

**I. Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved.

**II. Approval of March 19, 2009 Minutes.** The minutes were approved.

#### **III. Information and Announcements**

**A. Questions about Reports (Young).** Baker reported that RSCAPC reviewed the UIRB changes to the IRB thesis approval process. He raised the concern that there may be a perception that programs might not be complying with IRB policy which states that the IRB letter approval must appear in the bound thesis document. The Council discussed that we have previously determined that the faculty committee's signatures on the Certification of Approval page certifies that all requirements, including IRB approval, have been met. Resulting from that earlier discussion in the fall, in consultation with former Dean of Library Carl Bengston, it was determined that the Dean of the Library would draft and distribute a memorandum to faculty emphasizing the importance of IRB approval and that the signatures on the certification page represent that IRB approval, when necessary, was obtained. With the transition of leadership in the Library, the memorandum has not yet been distributed. Young has followed up with Whitman several times. The Council can emphasize the importance of the distribution of the memorandum at the next meeting when Whitman will be present for presentation of electronic theses/dissertations.

Further questions were raised pertaining to who is responsible for determining whether or not IRB clearance is needed. Since it is the faculty chair's responsibility, it was proposed that Whitman's memorandum include a reminder of that fact.

**B. Student Research Funding (Young).** Young reminded the Council of an email recently sent to the campus community from the Office of Research in Sponsored Programs advertising funding opportunities for student research. The Student Research Council provides up to 12 awards of \$300 each to fund research, scholarship, and creative activity. The deadline for students to apply is April 10, 2009. Council members were asked to share this opportunity with students and faculty.

#### **IV. Discussion**

- A. Alumni Survey Update (Colnic, Young).** Colnic summarized his and Young’s conversation regarding the Alumni Survey. The Survey is issued 3 years after graduation by Institutional Research. Colnic proposed that the Council may want to review the survey in use and offer revisions to make it better fit the purpose of demonstrating our collective effectiveness and assessing whether we’re meeting student and community needs. Demetrulias clarified that the current survey was revised and approved previously by Graduate Council, and that some individual programs implement their own alumni surveys. Young proposed that, while we may indeed want to review and revise the survey, perhaps it should wait until after the next WASC review, and until after the action planning process is further along so we have a clearer understanding of our goals and mission as a Council. It was agreed that this discussion would be deferred and revisited at a later date.
- B. Graduate Education Action Planning (Young) – Attachments #0809-25 and #0809-26.** This discussion was continued from previous meetings (see the minutes from March 19, item IV F). Council members were asked to review the two attachments to determine which goals set in 1998 have been reached; which have not been reached but should still be considered goals; which, if any, are no longer relevant or appropriate goals; and what new goals/actions are needed.

The Council first discussed Attachment #0809-25, the 1998 proposal submitted by the Council to the Master Academic Planning (MAP) committee. Particular areas of focus included the “recommendations” listed on pages 5 and 6, and the “specific recommendations” listed in Attachment A.:

*Page 5, Recommendation 1: Change the name from an Office of Graduate Studies to a School of Graduate Studies.* This goal was met, and there is now an organizationally centralized unit, the Graduate School. It was noted, however, that some of the rationale listed in support of this recommendation might also be used as arguments for the reinstatement of a graduate dean, should the Council choose to pursue that goal.

*Page 6, Recommendation 2: Maintain and support quality graduate programs now in existence.* It was generally agreed that this is a very broad recommendation that is clearly still relevant, but that perhaps further clarification, breaking it down into more specific recommendations, would be useful. It was noted that the “specific recommendations for support of graduate studies” (Attachment A of the MAP document) seems to serve this purpose to some extent. Item 2 of that attachment, “create graduate fellowships and provide increased financial support for graduate students,” was of particular importance. The Council agreed that Graduate Assistant/Teaching Associate support and funding was an extremely high priority. In addition, greater institutionalization of the GA/TA award process would be beneficial to programs and students, allowing greater consistency and predictability in the awarding and funding of these positions.

*Page 6, Recommendation 3: Meet increased demand in the region for graduate education by increasing the number and support of graduate programs so that graduate students (headcount) approximate 15% of the campus student body.* This is an enrollment management goal. It was generally agreed that we have grown since 1998, raising the percentage of graduate students on campus. It was also pointed out that the number of programs has grown considerably, with more being considered now. Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management Roger Pugh is updating an overall enrollment management report which will address these issues, and we should have a clearer picture when that becomes available.

*Centralized vs. decentralized models of graduate education.* The idea of moving back from a decentralized to a centralized model for graduate education was discussed again, with the general consensus being that, in the view of the Council, the decentralized model has not worked as well as the centralized model. Concerns were raised of what will happen after the Council completes the Action Planning document and sets goals: who will spearhead the process of actually reaching those goals? Who will speak for graduate education with high-level administrators if there is no administrator representing graduate education? It was agreed that while a number of items can be considered priorities, a high priority of the Graduate Council at this

juncture is to advocate for the institutionalization of support for graduate education by exploring the possibility of reinstating the position of Graduate Dean, or creating another position which can serve the same functions. Several ideas were discussed, including encouraging college deans' participation in the discussions and recognizing their important role in support of and advocacy for graduate education.

It was further noted that a movement towards installing a new dean may meet some level of resistance from faculty and the general campus community, especially during the current budget climate. It was agreed that more research is needed should the Council pursue the idea of returning to a centralized model in order to address faculty concerns with sensitivity and openness. It was ultimately agreed that the best route might be to first draft a document outlining the Council's basic goals, and then use that document to support the need for a centralized leader, whichever form that leader may take, and whichever avenue the Council may pursue to reach that goal.

*Attachment A, item 1: increase budgetary support for graduate students, faculty, and programs.* It was agreed that this is still a relevant goal.

*Attachment A, item 2: create graduate fellowships and provide increased financial support for graduate students.* This item describes a specific mechanism for allocating funding for graduate fellowships. While the mechanism is no longer relevant due to changed policies and revised language, it was agreed that a mechanism like this would be beneficial. It was again noted that GA/TA funding remains a top priority to the Council.

*Attachment A, item 3: support faculty so they may serve a critical and central role in the recruitment and retention of graduate students.* This item proposes both a specific mechanism for compensating faculty members for time spent recruiting and the hiring of a "graduate recruiter" to support and complement faculty recruitment efforts. Most programs include recruitment in the responsibility of the program director/coordinator and do not currently employ a mechanism to compensate faculty for recruiting; however, there is now a Graduate Recruiter position in the Graduate School. In general Council members agreed that they would like more support for their recruitment efforts within their individual programs. It was also noted that if growth is to be a priority, recruitment (and funding for recruitment) must also be a priority.

*Attachment A, item 4: delivery quality graduate programs at off-campus sites (Stockton)...* Council members agreed that this is still a priority and still an area in need of improvement, as resources are scarce on the Stockton campus. It was noted that as an institution, especially with regard to our teacher education programs, we have much more competition in San Joaquin County than we do anywhere else. Chapman, National, and the San Joaquin County Office of Education all offer similar programs, and they recruit very heavily in the Stockton area.

*Attachment A, item 5: increase support for faculty scholarship.* While the general feeling is that this is an area in need of improvement, it was noted that since the writing of this document in 1998, much improvement has been made. It was agreed that more support for faculty scholarship continues to be a priority.

*Attachment A, item 6: increase graduate degree enrollment to represent 20% of the university's FTES.* It was agreed that we have met this goal. However, continued growth continues to be a long-term goal. This item is tied closely to item 3, increased support for recruitment efforts.

*Attachment A, item 7: increase the number of quality graduate programs in the disciplines that support the university's mission and that complement its undergraduate liberal arts and professional programs.* Discussion on this item centered on an informational handout distributed, an internal planning document listing projected new programs. Quite a few new programs are currently being considered, and we've added several programs since the writing of this document in 1998.

*Attachment A, item 8: increase support and expectation for the assessment of student learning in graduate programs.* It was agreed that great progress has been made in this area with university infrastructure support. However, processes for assessment plans and reports for individual graduate programs need to be more structured and tied to academic program reviews.

*Goals/Next Steps.* It was agreed that Young would take the results of this discussion and use them to draft a new, 1-2 page document, which will be the starting point for an internal Graduate Council Action Plan. The frame of the document should be the idea that a major goal is the institutionalization of support for graduate programs, with specific goals including GA/TA funding, Library funding, and others. Young will distribute the drafted document with the next agenda, and discussion will continue at that time.

- C. **Commencement—Council Members’ Student Survey Results (Young).** Deferred.
- D. **Thesis/Project Review (Demetrulias).** Deferred.
- E. **Doctoral Education (Demetrulias)—Attachment #0809-24 previously distributed.** Deferred.
- F. **APR Subcommittee Report (Young, Demetrulias).** Deferred.
- G. **GA/TA Fundraising (Young).** Deferred.
- H. **CGS/Peterson’s Award for Innovation in Promoting an Inclusive Graduate Community (Demetrulias).** Deferred.

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