

California State University, Stanislaus
Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
October 16, 2014

Present: K. Baker, R. Brown, D. Colnic, R. Esau (recording), P. Garone, K. Kidd, A. Matravers, K. McKenzie, G. Morris, S. Neufeld, T. Perrello, R. Ringstad, M. Winter, S. Young

Excused: M. Cover, C. Martin, J. Tuedio

Guests: L. Bernardo, K. Olivant, J. Tillman

- I. **Call to Order.** G. Morris called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.
- II. **Approval of Agenda.** The agenda was approved as distributed.
- III. **Approval of Minutes.** The minutes of September 18, 2014, were approved as distributed.
- IV. **Information, Announcements, and Reports.**
 - A. **SAGE Report (J. Tillman for H. Stanislaw).** J. Tillman joined the Graduate Council to share a report prepared by the Subcommittee for Assessment of Graduate Education (SAGE). Last spring 2014, V. Luevano and J. Tillman gave a presentation to the Graduate Council regarding the creation of a database that will be used as a benchmark for evaluating the effects of the CEGE activities. Following that presentation, there was discussion centered on how to calculate time-to-degree for graduate programs. It was communicated that 1) the expected time to graduation for graduate programs varies, and 2) it is difficult to determine when students actually begin the program. Some programs consider the start of the program to be when students begin to take graduate-level courses, while other programs consider it to be when the students receive classified status. J. Tillman reported that H. Stanislaw will be asking each facilitator to provide the following information to make sure that CEGE has the proper foundation for determining benchmark: 1) the point at which students are considered to begin the program; 2) the culminating experience of the program; 3) program structural features such as the cohort model, how course are scheduled to meet student needs [fixed, free-flowing]; 4) any other factors that may impact completion time for students.
 - B. **Institutional Data for Graduate Programs (G. Morris).** G. Morris meets regularly with the Provost. He has found that data is very important when discussing issues with him. He printed out the "First-Time Graduate/Postbaccalaureate Applications, Admissions, and Enrollments by College and Degree Program/Major" for fall 2008, fall 2009, fall 2010, fall 2011, and fall 2012. In looking at those numbers, there is a downward trend across the board. It was noted since some programs only admit in the fall, while others admit spring and fall, the data misrepresents total applications. J. Tillman responded that this data represents the reporting requirements from the Chancellor's Office. If a different data set is needed, it can be requested from Institutional Research. It was felt that the numbers indicated on the report were not accurate (e.g., K. McKenzie from Educational Leadership knows they had more than zero students admitted in fall 2010). It was mentioned that, typically, overall enrollment numbers go down when the economy is better. People return to school, especially graduate education, when the economy weakens. It was questioned if there is data going back to the

time before the Graduate School was dismantled, perhaps providing a picture in numbers indicating the effect of dismantling and decentralizing the Graduate School. G. Morris will work with Institutional Research to request data for all graduate programs going back to 2006. Discussion will continue at the next scheduled Graduate Council meeting.

V. Old Business

- A. **Deadline for Theses.** R. Rodriguez, Dean of the Library, proposed new theses submission deadlines for 2014/15 and beyond. After discussing the deadlines with Library personnel, he is suggesting that the theses, projects, and dissertation deadlines be the last day of instruction for the fall and for the spring semesters. For 2014/15, deadlines would be 12/9/14 and 5/15/15. Following discussion, it was moved by K. Baker, seconded by S. Neufeld, and voted unanimously to approve that the Thesis, Project, Dissertation deadline dates be set for the last day of instruction for the fall and spring semesters every year.
- B. **APR Process and Timeline.** See discussion under item VI. C.
- C. **Strategic Plan and Priorities for Graduate Education.** Deferred.
- D. **Graduate School Dean / Prioritization and Institutionalization of CEGE.** Provost Strong joined the Graduate Council to discuss the status of the recommendation to hire a Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. The request was added to the University Budget Advisory Committee priorities, but he is not optimistic that it will be funded for 2014/15. If it isn't funded for this year, it can be requested again for next year. If there is consensus that this should be a high priority for Academic Affairs, then attention will need to be given to identify open vacancies or elimination of program(s) or some other cost-saving measure in order to earmark existing funds to recruit for a dean position. The most realistic thing that could be done is to ask each of the colleges if they think hiring a dean and re-establishing a central office for graduate education (shared with Research and Sponsored Programs) is important enough and if they would want to give up some funds in order make it happen. This would mean approximately \$70,000 needed from the 4 colleges in addition to the salary savings from the director of Research and Sponsored Programs (base budget) and remaining grant monies from CEGE dedicated to graduate leadership (one time grant funds) for the dean position, and another \$40,000 for a staff support position. It was suggested to offer assigned time to a faculty member to be a graduate dean, akin to what is currently done for the Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. It was also mentioned that J. Tuedio was given the role of Acting Dean of Graduate Education but that role has been undefined and not formalized. J. Strong concluded the discussion by suggesting that Graduate Council defers further discussion until the final UBAC recommendations are received from the President. J. Strong will discuss with the college deans the feasibility of identifying monies from each college that could be used in support of a Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the establishment of a centralized office that would combine Graduate Education and Research and Sponsored Programs.
- E. **Graduate Learning Goals.** Deferred.

VI. New Business

- A. **Academic Program Review: Master of Public Administration (Substitution of the Specialized Accreditation Self Study for the Academic Program Review Self Study).** Deferred.
- B. **Culminating Experience Policy.** Deferred.
- C. **Academic Program Review Workgroup.** The Academic Program Review Workgroup (D. Colnic, P. Garone, T. Perrello) drafted and distributed the “Guidelines for Graduate Council Academic Program Review.” The main goal of the workgroup was to redefine the procedure by which the Graduate Council participates in the APR process. The current process is defined in the document “Guidelines for the Graduate Council’s Evaluation of Academic Program Reviews for Master’s Degree Programs” which contains 8 topics and 26 different prompts for evaluating APRs. It was felt by the Graduate Council that this document is not effective and equates to busy work for council members. Instead, the workgroup desired to move in the direction of finding a way to provide guidelines in order to write a more holistic review. The draft guidelines touches on three issues: 1) the way reviews will be written in the future, 2) the timing of the role of the Graduate Council review, and 3) how to more equitably distribute the work for these reviews. It was suggested in a previous Graduate Council meeting to allow the Graduate Council to review the APR prior to the College Curriculum Committee and the Dean conducting its review, in order to have more formative input earlier in the process. The Graduate Council could write a holistic review that touches on topics broadly, but also give specific points that would be relevant to the program, leaving it up to the reviewer to touch on the points. The Graduate Council would provide a summary of its evaluation of program quality; commendations; recommendations for program improvement beyond those identified by the program, if any; and an overall recommendation for either program continuance, continuance with specified conditions, or discontinuance. It was suggested that a lottery be used for assigning Graduate Council members to serve as reviewers of the academic program reviews, just so all members get the opportunity to review them. Another suggestion was made to allow members to volunteer first and once all volunteers have served one time, then use a lottery system to assign other council members. Discussion will continue at the next scheduled Graduate Council meeting.

VII. **Other (information only).**

VIII. **Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randi Esau, Recording Secretary

:rle