



GRADUATE COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting Held on November 12, 2008

Present: Dean Vogelsang-Coombs, Professors Medina-Rivera, Bathala, Ingersoll, Goodell, Simon, Belovich (substituting for Professor Chatzimavroudis), Smith, Bowen, Chieh-Chen Bowen, Delgado, Thornton, Bailey

Absent/Excused: Professors Karem, Dixit, Weinstein, Holcomb, Weyman, Rudd, Mensforth

Guests: Provost Mary Jane Saunders,
Dr. Paul Lin & Dr. Joanne Belovich, College of Engineering

Dean Vogelsang-Coombs called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Staff introduced themselves around the table and Provost Saunders was welcomed.
Dean Coombs added one item to Agenda item 5, a motion to approve on a trial basis
Electronic Vote Balloting for spring 2009.
2. The Council approved the minutes of the May 6, September 9, and October 7, 2008 meetings, with one change to the October minutes.
3. Dean's Remarks:

Congratulations were extended to Professor Ingersoll for receiving the CSU Distinguished Faculty Teaching Award at the Convocation.

Kudos also to Professors Delgado, Simon, and Goodell for the President's acknowledgment and recognition from the Podium of the Convocation.

The Dean responded to questions raised at the October meeting about Graduate Assistantships and a policy. Through researching the archives and the University Faculty Greenbook, information was established that there is a formal University policy regarding Graduate Assistantships. Data tables were shared regarding GA contract numbers broken down by academic college, graduate program, semester, and source of funding. Academic colleges used all types of Assistants, but appear to have shifted more to teaching assignments in 2008. Data do not indicate what led to the shift.

The Council may wish to consider policy questions about Graduate Assistantships:

1. Should CSU have Administrative Assistantships given the findings of the Ad Hoc committee that our peer institutions do not have these types of GA's?
2. Looking at the duties of the GA's across all three categories, the academic colleges have "mixed" types. Many GA's are performing multiple duties falling in different categories. Should CSU modify current GA classifications?
3. Should CSU increase stipend levels? RACGS colleagues have been asked to report on their stipend amounts.

In reviewing the by-laws the Dean suggested "chunking" out piece-by-piece items instead of the entire document at one meeting. Program Review was picked as the first topic.

Questions to consider—how to make program reviews more meaningful for graduate program directors & graduate students in order to strengthen programs. Program review becomes more meaningful when it results in not just a report but when its recommendations are implemented.

- A.) How are graduate programs using Graduate Assistants?
 - B.) How Graduate Council can work as a full partner with the Faculty Senate on this process.
4. Provost Saunders thanked the Council for the invitation and stated that she will be glad to attend meetings at any time for an on-going dialogue. An article from the Chronicle of Higher Education Chancellor Fingerhut was interviewed was distributed to members. The Provost feels the article truly reflects recent events and his vision for having institutions move toward having an impact on economic development in their area. There is also an article in Crain's Business and other press about the movement of urban universities' missions and economical development. Since the Chancellor canceled his visit to CSU in November 2008, he will be rescheduled to speak with faculty & students in January 2009. Graduate Council's input will be welcomed.

The Provost served on the Chancellor's subsidy consultation group in summer 2008. It is not known whether the Chancellor has accepted the Report proposed by this group. Provost Saunders elected not to sign the Report because she felt some of the findings were detrimental to CSU. She heard that the Chancellor liked the report but with an accelerated time-table.

Subsidy changes:

- ❖ The most current model is a reimbursement model for what has been taught in student credit hours at the end of each semester.
The Chancellor does not feel this model gives him discretionary money, and it is not an outcomes model.

- ❖ It is now proposed that over the next 10 years funding will move from this model with a percentage moving off each year until at the end when a different model is fully implemented. A portion always will be reimbursement for taught courses with the exceptions of registrations where students earned “W,” “F,” and “I” grades. The Provost and the President protested against this feature, but did not get support. Since CSU tends to give more “F’s” than other institutions, this part of the new model will adversely affect us.
- ❖ Another piece of the formula will be “degree attainment.” This focuses on degree completion within 6 years for first-time, full-time freshmen (CSU 34%). A previous OBOR report comparing graduate students’ projected/expected graduation rates provide a better measure. The OBOR report uses factors more reflective of our student body.
- ❖ The Provost does not believe that there is a push by the Chancellor to merge CSU with Akron. There has been flat-funding to every institution in the state. The new degree attainment model looks like a move to fund elite public institutions at a higher rate.
- ❖ For Cleveland State’s population, first-time/full-time students are our weakest academic group. In addition, we have more transfer students than anyone else in the state—and they graduate. We also have a higher percentage of graduate students. These student successes are not included in the new outcomes model. The outcome model is just based on freshmen success.
- ❖ The Chancellor wants to keep up to 10% of the total amount of subsidy in his hands for excellence purposes. He wants to have centralized control over funding institutions moving in his new direction. He wants to create a reward system for those institutions that meet their goals. There is no new money for this; it will come from the pool of subsidy money. We need to be moving in a direction so that CSU can compete for our fair share.

These are the basic changes. The Chancellor wants to accelerate this quicker than the original 10-year road map. It’s important for CSU to put all of its energy into undergraduate tutoring, working with cohort class, supplemental instruction, and trying to align activities for student success.

A Council member suggested working/recruiting the best students from high schools, approaching high school teachers and letting them know what our standards are for admission. The Provost said our new general education & admissions standards should help. The Ohio core should help. But the Provost noted that CSU only requires a 16 on the ACT.

A Council member wanted to apply this new model to graduate funding. The Provost said that Master’s funding is part of subsidy reimbursement, and will be down to 60% in 10 years—the same as for undergraduate courses/programs, based on student credit hours.

The Doctoral subsidy pool was capped in 1999. As more doctoral programs are added, there is no more money beyond the original allocation. CSU does not get its fair proportion compared to other institutions. We have grown, whereas others may have eliminated some graduate programs. The conclusion is that graduate funding, especially Doctoral programs, is changing very little. The Provost feels the entire subsidy change may be a step towards “tiering,” with elite institutions benefiting most.

Dean Coombs mentioned that at the last RACGS meeting in Columbus some colleagues mentioned that their institutions increased graduate admissions standards as a response to the funding changes.

The Provost handed out information about the NEOUCOM partnership. Local businesses are excited about this prospect for an urban/community health focus. The appeal for funding these extra seats is difficult. In spite of a local need for doctors, some Ohio institutions are paid for “empty seat” buffers. This money could fund NEOUCOM students, which is \$23,000/student/year.

The Provost feels that there was a miscommunication about the duties of Graduate Assistants and the Ad Hoc Committee Report. She feels it is essential that GA's move more towards teaching and helping undergraduates. It is also important to use assistantship monies to recruit the best students early, **not** after the students are already here.

A Council member who served on the Ad Hoc Committee clarified the group's findings in terms of the Assistantship policy—duties are very diversified and individual departments know their needs best. There must be an ‘apprenticeship’ standard to keep the value of the graduate assistantships.

The Provost feels it is important to move Graduate Assistants out of the Administrative category, especially if they are merely fulfilling a secretarial position. Discussion occurred on the possibility of reviewing/revising the Assistantship Policy to move away from the Administrative category. The data show a *mix* of duties and classifications.

The role of graduate assistants should also be incorporated in the program review process. Provost Saunders feels the program review process has improved, but it is migrating towards just reviews of teaching capacity.

Are program revisions looking at scholarship and promoting serious academic dialogues? The Graduate Council may want to take on this role, instead of coming in at the eleventh hour of the process, as is the current practice.

5. Discussion of the Program Review process will be deferred until December's meeting.
6. Electronic ballot for the 2009 election: Dean Coombs asked Council for a motion to waive the section of the by-laws stipulating that balloting needs to be by paper. The motion was approved.

7. Professor Belovich presented information on the proposal for an MS in Biomedical Engineering. Feedback issues from the preliminary proposal were addressed. A Council member asked if this would be a terminal degree—no. If students were involved in a patent, would students receive compensation? Dean Coombs suggested that Dr. Belovich consult with Vice President Steiner on this issue. Dr. Bailey asked if graduate assistants could be added to make the program more competitive. The FPP proposal was approved by Graduate Council with two provisos: 1) having the College of Engineering to match the Graduate Studies College allocation of four 10-hour tuition grants over a 30year period to jumpstart the program and 2) checking on the patent process with V.P. Steiner.

8. Committee Reports:

- a. Curriculum Committee--Applied Statistics program in Mathematics was approved.
- b. Program Review-- Dean Coombs sent the Graduate Council comments on our 2008 program reviews to Vice Provost Kaul.
- c. Graduate Faculty Review—66 applications are ready to be reviewed, but there has been difficulty in getting a quorum. There is a sense of urgency since the Committee did not meet in the summer.

A motion was proposed to relax the Committee's quorum to 5 of 11 members, with an amendment that feedback be solicited from the members that cannot be present, *before* the meeting if possible. The motion was approved, with one abstention.

9. Announcement of the Program Director's Network Meeting on December 2nd.

A request was made to have GA contracts online. Dean Coombs shared that this is happening and will be shared with the Program Directors at their meeting, as well as drafts of templates for Admission letters.

An Appreciation Event for graduate advisors and support personnel will be held on December 9th, and the online GA contracts will also be discussed.

10. The next Council meeting is scheduled for December 8th at 2:00 p.m. in Room 200 of Parker-Hannifin Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.