

California State University, Stanislaus
Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
April 18, 2019

Members: M. Cover (chair), U. Ghuman (chair-elect), D. Avalos, K. Baker (via Zoom), D. Bukko, V. Cortez, J. Garcia, P. Hauselt, C. Martin, S. Neufeld, R. Weikart, S. Wood, S. Young

Ex-Officio: J. Bell, D. Evans, C. Nagel, R. Rodriguez

Guest: L. Bernardo, S. Schraeder (recording), S. Wooley

Excused: R. Bhaduri, K. Kidd, A. Dorsey

- I. **Call to Order.** M. Cover called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda of April 18, 2019 was approved as distributed.
- III. **Approval of the Minutes.** The minutes of March 7, 2019 were deferred.
- IV. **Information, Announcements, Reports**
 - A. **Outreach, Marketing, and Recruitment for Graduate Programs.** M. Cover shared a graduate education at Stanislaus State trifold pamphlet which was created with the help of Communications and Public Affairs. Any edits or changes should be shared with Cover, who will pass on the edits to Communications and Public Affairs, who have the original file. Cover requested that any member interested in participating in helping strategize about outreach, marketing and recruitment should contact him. K Kidd has a meeting with N. Gonzalez and G. Kaul to primarily discuss the MBA programs, but more input is needed from other graduate programs. The committee will need to further consider if these discussions require a workgroup or if the discussions should occur in Graduate Council.
 - B. **Master in Biological Sciences Pilot Program Proposal.** Cover shared that the committee voted electronically to review the M.S. in Biological Sciences program shared that it was approved and the proposal will shortly be a second reading item at Academic Senate.
 - C. **Graduate Equity Fellowship.** There were about 25 applications received but a number of programs did not have applications so Cover reached out to the program coordinators/directions and extended the deadline.
 - D. **Other announcements.** S. Young shared that August 19, 2019, the first instructional date for fall 2019, will be the date for the Graduate Welcome Event. Normally, this event has different representatives from all programs present, so members were asked to save the date. M. Cover and S. Young will have more materials at the next scheduled meeting and will these also be included in communications over the summer.

The WASC Reaffirmation of Accreditation visit was April 2-5, 2019 and Young shared it can be characterized as an effective visit. The visit team learned about the lines of inquiry and reason for effectiveness as participation from stakeholders across

campus was broad. Over 300 participants joined meetings at the Turlock and Stockton campuses. Participation at the Stockton campus was particularly high for those who drove or joined via Zoom. The three commission commendations were regarding the strategic plan; the work on campus regarding research, scholarship and creative activity addressing RPT issues; and shared governance. As an institution, the University successfully and effectively addressed issues from last visit. Two issues identified were identified as follows: 8% over enrolled; questions about over enrollment impact for service to students and on the learning, but the larger concern was related to the Stockton campus. The concerns around the Stockton Campus were not regarding the delivery of a specific program. The overall, co-curricular, and student services that occur at the Stockton campus were the main point of their concerns. The recommendation calls for a clear, sustainable plan for the Stockton campus, specifically asking for a financial plan. Ghuman noted that for their specialized accreditation they are regularly asked for clarification about the courses offered at the Stockton Campus and that it is not a separate program. Young shared that in the written recommendations we might be asked to provide a detailed financial plan but also tracking learning outcomes being met separately for the Stockton Campus. An important conversation may be the need to consider graduate programs and the Stockton campus. Ghuman and his program are meeting with Dean Faimous Harrison from the Stockton Campus in May to consider an event about their program at the Stockton campus. It was discussed that it might be acceptable that the experience is different at the Stockton campus, but that the program should be in charge of identifying how the programs are delivered at the Stockton campus.

S. Young shared that she had a conversation with the Chancellor's Office about the catalog language that "at least 70% of the courses must be designed primarily for masters degrees." In the Academic Resource Guide, it says 50% and in a recommendation document it says 70%. The CO's says it has never been officially implemented. The other follow up item was regarding the 3000/4000 level debate which also appears in the catalog as 4000 but there is no CO policy to back this up but they identified areas of concerns. She indicated that 3000 and 4000 level designations are sometimes quite arbitrary. The Academic Senate office will provide an update if a policy exists on campus.

V. Old Business

A. Graduate Education Institutional Assessment DRAFT Report. The new draft report addresses the concerns shared by the Graduate Council at the previous meeting. K. Kidd indicated that the reaccreditation of MBA program should be noted, but S. Wooley shared that he discussed this with her and indicated he did not feel that this sort of information was not the intent of the report but rather there was a focus on how programs are assessing their programs. The intent of this report is to provide a university view of assessment. If the committee is ready it could be approved by a formal vote. K. Baker motioned, J. Garcia, and the committee voted unanimously to approve the Graduate Education Institutional Assessment Report. The document will be shared with Academic Senate.

- B. Academic Program Reviews (APRs).** The Social Work APR report is not ready for review but will be discussed at the next scheduled meeting. The process for Graduate APR review was discussed and suggested that perhaps there should be a different review for accredited and non-accredited programs. Because the reaccreditation process can take a year or more, and because the information shared with external bodies might be different than that shared internally, the committee considered if a revised substitution document might include a space for information about things that have been addressed after the visit and any needs not addressed by the document. The committee discussed closing the assessment loop and having meaningful assessment. Some voiced that the current substitution form is too labor intensive and not useful, while others felt that the substitution form was helpful for reviewers to quickly find relevant information. Discussion will continue about whether there should be a different GC review process, and S. Wooley will meet with O. Myhre and K. Baker to hear recommendations for a revised APR substitution process.
- C. Re-Certifying Graduate Writing Courses.** Graduate Council reviewed discussions from past meetings about the graduate writing courses. There was not strong support to review all courses for recertification. The suggestion was made to make an information collection step to request syllabi and have programs submit those and then those documents would be available to the Graduate Council. It was suggested to enlist some help to look for trends amongst those courses to see which themes emerge. A suggestion was to have the Office of Assessment help in the process and if we were to go through a review process, this could serve as a starting point to talk about graduate writing courses to begin to see some differences and similarities. Afterwards the committee could begin by talking about if there needs to be a process and what that process should result in. S. Wooley said that this might be something the Assessment for Student Learning Subcommittee of the UEPC might work on as a governance committee. The committee discussed if the APR process should be the place where writing certification is required. There was a need for improved writing for graduate education. The committee considered setting aside the certification process and instead just talk about writing and reviewing of what is currently in place and subsequently review how the process needs to be defined. Faculty would be best to make that determination since writing across programs and there might be valuable to review different ways different programs are approaching writing. The mode of writing would be assessed depending on programmatic preferences.

D. Graduate Education Action Plan. Deferred.

VI. New Business

A. Graduate Council Meeting Schedule for 2019-2020. Deferred.

VII. Tabled Business

A. Course Time Module Scheduling Policy Review. Tabled until further campus discussion.

VIII. Other. The next Graduate Council meeting is scheduled on May 2, 2019 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. in MSR 130.

IX. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.

X. Action Items

Description	Assigned To	Notes
Update Graduate Education Action Plan/Progress Chart for further discussion and share any additional feedback regarding revisions.	S. Young and Program Directors	

MC:ss