



Graduate Council

Minutes of Meeting Held September 13, 2006

Present: Dean Tumeo, Professors Bailey, Bathala, Beebe, Bowen, Forte, Gatica, Jackson, Jeffres, Leedy, Marshall, Oprea, Regoeczi, Rudd, Sola, Smith, Thornton.

Guests: Michelle Bowman, Barb Turner, Diane Steinberg, Miron Kaufman

Absent/Excused: Professors Simon, Hansman

Dean Tumeo opened the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

Announcements and Communications:

Welcome to the 2006-2007 Academic Year and Introductions:

Dean Tumeo introduced himself and welcomed everyone. He informed the new members that although he participates in the discussions he does not have a vote. Graduate Council is a very important body in the faculty governance structure. Members make final decisions on policies of the Graduate College. He thanked everyone for their willingness to serve. Scheduling this meeting was difficult due to everyone's availability. The time and day was chosen to maximize participation and he apologized to those who were inconvenienced.

Dean Tumeo reported that over the summer there was an Executive session of the Graduate Council that met and made the committee appointments. A copy of the Graduate College Committee appointments was included in the package that Council members received.

Dean Tumeo noted that a lot of paper was distributed approximately one week prior to the meetings. He asked Council members if they would be interested in having the meeting materials posted to a secure web page rather than having hard copies delivered to them. Dr. Leedy mentioned that for discussion of proposals the paper copies are needed. Dr. Tumeo responded that for example for the next meeting the proposal for the Doctorate in Physical Therapy that is about 100 pages. Dr. Jeffres stated that some things that require deliberation need to be looked at. Even parts of the proposal need to be in front of you. Appendices and minutes for example could be transferred to the Web site. Dean Tumeo suggested that he could post everything to the Web and those items that members would like copies of they could email him and he will print them off and bring them to the meeting. Dr. Bowen stated that he reads the proposals while on the bus or elsewhere. Dr. Spector mentioned that she would prefer copies sent to her. Dean Tumeo agreed that both could be done. He would have the materials posted to the Web and those who want a paper version will be sent one. Dr. Marshall asked how they could opt out of getting the paper copies. Dean Tumeo will send an email to everyone asking their preference. Dr. Bowen stated that a lot of the paper that is included is excellent. Dr. Leedy stated that people come to Council with different views and what one person thinks is important someone else does not. Not having the copies will make it difficult to evaluate the comments. Dean Tumeo will send an email as to personal preference.

Summary of the Faculty Senate Recommendations & Comments on Course Credit Hours:

Dean Tumeo stated the Summary of the Faculty Senate Recommendations & Comments on Course Credit hours was included in the packet and everyone should be familiar with it. This was included as an informational item.

Innovation Incentive Program Summary of Reviewers' Scores:

Dean Tumeo mentioned that included in the packet is the reviewers score sheet on the Innovation Incentive Program. This is the State program where they are asking us to redirect 1.5% per year cumulative for the next ten years of our doctoral program money to strengthen specified programs. All the universities had to put in a proposal. The draft proposals were reviewed by the RACGS members and ranked. Cleveland State was ranked in the middle. The next step is a formal proposal and an external review. Dr. Bowen asked how to interpret the summary. Dean Tumeo said the individual questions were ranked for each proposal on a one to five scale. This shows the average score of the thirteen reviews for each of CSU's answers to the questions. Each proposal had to be ranked in the top tier, the middle tier or the bottom tier. Dean Tumeo will email the list of questions to Council members. Dr. Leedy asked how the proposal was generated since it never came through Graduate Council. Dean Tumeo responded that this was a draft that was mandated by the State and it went through the President and Provost's office. The final proposal will come through Graduate Council.

Program Review Reports from CLASS, COS & Urban Affairs:

Dean Tumeo reported that the Program Review reports were in the packets. The appointed committee members will review the reports and provide Council members a summary document to be voted on. The appointed committee members will also represent Graduate Council on the upcoming year's University Program Review Committee. If anyone on council would like to serve as a reviewer or serve on the review committees for this upcoming cycle let him know.

College of Education Doctoral Dissertation Assessment Issues:

Dean Tumeo stated that last year there was discussion on assessment of the Doctoral Programs and outside representation on committees. He met with the Doctoral Program Directors and they were to each provide a report to Council on how they assess their individual Doctoral Programs. Included in the packet is the report from the College of Education Doctoral Program. The bottom line is that our doctoral programs have several ways of protecting both quality and fairness. It seems like the existing policy is working.

National Research Council Doctoral Survey:

Dean Tumeo reported that the President has enrolled Cleveland State in the National Research Council's Doctoral Program Survey that is done every five years. This is the first time Cleveland State has been involved. It is what the national rankings get based on for doctoral programs. Professional doctorates such as the Ph.D. in Education and our Doctorate in Business Administration are not included in the survey. The other four are included. It is a very involved process. There is an institutional survey that is being completed. A list of the core and associated faculty in the each of the four doctoral programs that are surveyed is being generated. There are specific rules that involve committees, service, etc. Once they have been completed with the percentage of students they will be sent to the Doctoral Program Directors for review and then forwarded to the National Research Council who then send out faculty surveys and student surveys directly to the faculty members and students. This is another metric that highlights the excellent quality of our education at Cleveland State.

Committee Reports:*Faculty Senate:*

Dr. Jeffres reported that the Faculty Senate meeting was going to be held that afternoon and there was no report. The only item on the agenda to have implications to Graduate Council is the Strategic Planning Committee.

University Admissions & Standards:

Dr. Jackson reported that she was unable to attend the University Admissions & Standards meeting. The item for discussion was grade disputes.

University Curriculum:

Dr. Smith reported that the University Curriculum Committee will be meeting next week. The main issue on the agenda will be three credit hours and four credit hours. Dean Tumeo stated that also on the agenda is the advance from this body for the new Ph.D. in Psychology with Adult Aging Focus and the new Masters of Non-profit Management and Leadership. Since they are both new programs they have to go through Faculty Senate, the Board of Trustees and then for State review.

Graduate Faculty Review Committee:

Dean Tumeo reported that the Graduate Faculty Review Committee met this past summer. There are four colleges that have approved Graduate Faculty guidelines and three that do not. The Committee reviewed the faculty in the colleges with approved guidelines under their criteria and have moved for approval for five year appointments. Those applicants in colleges that do not have approved guidelines were reviewed for one-year appointments under the old guidelines of two publications in five years or one substantive book. Once guidelines have been approved these individuals will be re-reviewed under the new guidelines. Dr. Oprea asked if the individuals will need to submit a new application. Dean Tumeo responded that it depends on the criteria. If the guidelines include the previous criteria they will be automatically reviewed. If the criterion is different then they may be asked to re-apply. Two applications were returned for additional information. Dr. Forte asked that those on Graduate Council, who were on the Graduate Faculty Review Committee list, be reviewed separately so they could be noted as abstaining. Dean Tumeo stated that it was an excellent idea. He asked Council members to vote on the motion for the five-year renewal of Dr. Forte's regular Graduate Faculty status. The motion was approved with Dr. Forte abstaining. Dean Tumeo then asked Council members to vote on the motion for the one-year interim appointment pending the approval of the College of Science guidelines of Dr. Oprea's Graduate Faculty status. The motion was approved with Dr. Oprea abstaining. Dean Tumeo asked Council members to vote on the recommendation of the Graduate Faculty review committee of 21 five-year appointments and 10 one-year interim appointments. The recommendations were approved.

Dr. Leedy asked: When the Committee applied the criteria from the four colleges were the criteria consistent in a sense that one could argue those faculties were treated equally, or were there areas of inconsistencies that need to be looked at? Dean Tumeo responded that in going through the guidelines there were no great inconsistencies. The Council members did a very good job in looking for criteria to be externally vetted. Some of those are different between colleges for example the College of Engineering counts patents. That does not make sense in the College of Business or the Law College. They are very uniform in the level of external review required to show faculty are continually productive. Dean Tumeo mentioned that as a procedural note he will make sure Council members get the four approved guidelines and as the others come forward he will make sure the others are there to cross compare. It is important that there is a minimum bar. Council determined that the minimum bar for counting criteria is that there is some of an external evaluative

nature. That is why Council determined that serving on a Committee as a Chair does not count. The criteria are on the Graduate College Web. Dr. Marshall stated that the basic underlying question is if anyone compromised academic integrity. Dean Tumeo stated that the trend in the Colleges is not to make it overly difficult and there has been an attempt to recognize forms of creativity and scholarship that publications are not sufficient for. The two publications in five-year base has been the base the four approved guidelines have been built on. The extra layer of evaluation that was added that was brilliantly discussed is that for whatever criteria used as a substitute there is the external review concept to it. It gives flexibility to show their scholarly activity in different ways.

Dr. Oprea asked Dean Tumeo if he was in contact with the College of Business, Science and CLASS about creating criteria so it gets done this semester. Dean Tumeo mentioned that CLASS is working on it extensively and his understanding is that the College of Business was close at the end of last year but had to go through faculty votes. Dr. Marshall stated that they are in the process. Dean Tumeo will contact the Dean's offices again and offer to meet with them.

Old Business:

Approval of Minutes of July 31, 2006 Executive Graduate Council Meeting

Dr. Leedy commented that the minutes do not reflect the richness of the discussion having to deal with the Master of Non-profit Administration. There was a very extensive discussion of the entrance requirements and the minutes do not reflect that discussion. Dean Tumeo noted that due to the failure of the tape recorder the extensive discussion was not recorded. The minutes will be modified to reflect that there was extensive discussion on the entrance requirements. The minutes were approved as modified.

New Business:

Request for Graduate Program Director appointment without Graduate Faculty Status:

Dean Tumeo stated that being committee chairs or Program Directors are rights that are accrued to the Graduate Faculty. Philosophy is submitted a request for an appointment of an individual as a Graduate Program Director who does not hold Graduate Faculty status. Diane Steinberg, Chair of the Department of Philosophy, stated that the previous Graduate Program Director Jane McIntyre had been in that position for at least 25 years. She did a wonderful job. No-one has stepped forward since her retirement in June. Dr. Steinberg stated that Professor Samuel Richmond is an active researcher and has been heavily involved in program development in the last few years. CLASS has not formulated their criteria for Graduate Faculty status but she feels confident that he will qualify for Graduate Faculty status once the criteria are approved. She feels that someone other than the chair should be the Graduate Program Director and he is very qualified.

Dr. Leedy stated that the rationale that no-one else has come forward is pretty feeble. When you have a Graduate Program you have a responsibility to participate in that program. If you have other people who are qualified why are they not stepping forward? Dr. Steinberg responded that the Department of Philosophy is in transition. The majority of the faculty have more than 30 years and are looking at retirement. They are not enthusiastic to take on extra work at this point. Assuming positions are approved new faculty will be hired. There are twelve faculty in the department and of those twelve seven or eight have Graduate Faculty appointments. Dr. Marshall asked if there was a precedence for appointing someone as a Graduate Program Director who does not hold Graduate Faculty Status. Dr. Bailey replied that there has not. Dr. Leedy responded to the comment about the people who are nearing retirement. They are still getting paid. Dr. Steinberg stated that they do not have the same incentive. Dr. Leedy stated that he knows Dr. Richmond and

one of his publications is in an extremely important journal that is very difficult to get in. He would bring to the job a lot of experience and deep knowledge of scholarship. Dr. Forte stated that exceptions can either change the rule or prove a rule. What is in front of Council is a person who is well qualified functionally and is willing to do it and for us to say he is not one of the club is an insufficient excuse not to appoint him seeing that others in the faculty who have the status are unwilling to do the job. This is an appropriate exception. Dr. Jeffres stated that in part it is because CLASS does not have approved guidelines. He asked if this could be contingent on him submitting and being approved for Graduate Faculty Status. Dean Tumeo replied that we could make it a one-year appointment and then let him move through the approval process.

Dr. Bowen stated that if Graduate Faculty status is to mean anything we should very interested in applying it to people on an impartial basis. In this case, in principal, appointing a non-graduate faculty member as a Graduate Program Director is the same as having a non-PhD chair a dissertation committee. It seems that if we go down the path of making exceptions that we end up lowering our standards. If this university is ever to achieve its potential we should keep our tuition low and our standards high. Dr. Rudd stated that the one-year appointment makes sense considering that CLASS may have the criteria that he may already have met. Dr. Oprea stated that the analogy is not exact. A person who does not have a PhD does not have the experience of what it is to go through a PhD. The status of Graduate Faculty has no functional relevance to this job in term of his qualifications. Dr. Bowen stated that the question is: are we producing enough scholarship currently to give us the current status that we ought to have to participate in graduate programs. Dr. Jeffres stated that there is a difference between advising students and being the Graduate Program Director. Dr. Oprea asked Dr. Steinberg if the Graduate Program Director advises graduate students. She replied yes. Dr. Oprea mentioned that someone who doesn't have Graduate Faculty status is saying that they have not been active in the last five years. How can they advise graduate students? Dr. Steinberg stated that is why she documented Professor Richmond's activities. Dean Tumeo asked what happens if Council says no. Dr. Steinberg responded that she would continue as Graduate Program Director until someone steps forward or Dr. Richmond qualifies for Graduate Faculty Status. She stated that this responsibility should not fall to the chair. Other people should have input and influence into what is going on in the department. Dr. Forte suggested a compromise of calling him interim director. It was suggested that he be appointed as an interim director for the term of a certain period of time with the continuance contingent on his achieving graduate faculty status.

Dr. Leedy expressed his concern that the implication of saying that no-one else will do it is that there does not appear to be enthusiasm for the Graduate Program. Without enthusiasm the question then becomes why do you have a graduate program? You have to impress upon your colleagues that this throws everything into question. Dr. Steinberg responded that a lot of the new faculty are spending their energy on the development of the Bioethics program. Dr. Bowen stated that Dr. Forte's suggestions of an interim appointment for a year and making continuation contingent on receiving Graduate Faculty Status makes a lot of sense. Dr. Bathala asked how large the Graduate program is and what are the incentives for taking this job. Dr. Steinberg reported that the incentives include one course release every two years and teaching the research methods course which is somewhat of an easier course to teach. There are twenty students in the program. A motion was made to approve Dr. Richmond's appointment for a one-year term as interim Director. The motion was seconded. Dean Tumeo asked for a vote by a raise of hands. The motion carried by a count of nine to one.

Change in International Chart:

Dean Tumeo stated that the change to the International chart was brought forward by Barb Turner and Michelle Bowen. Barb Turner mentioned that the chart was created around ten years ago. There are five programs on the chart that have separate and additional criteria for an international applicant. This could be

viewed a discriminatory and was brought up by a student this past summer. Barb Turner distributed copies of the chart. She informed Council members that Dr. Bailey looked up when the chart was originated and it was in 1989. Education criteria for domestic students' states if the applicant has a 2.75 or higher they are exempted from taking MAT or the GRE but based on the chart International applicants are required to take it. Music states the GRE is required and they have told her they do not want to see a GRE. Dean Tumeo stated that the more we can simplify the better off our students are. The admission requirements should be listed under the program. The elimination of the chart is a structural change. The change of admission criteria needs discussion of the Council. Barb Turner spoke to the College of Education and they were not aware of this chart and when they were doing admission decisions they treated International and domestic students the same. Dean Tumeo stated that programs have stated requirements in the catalog but as a matter of practice do not follow them. The programs by practice have made changes and given waivers to admit students who do not meet the program requirements that were previously approved by the departments and Graduate Council without going through the formal process. Dr. Forte stated that this should be referred to the Graduate College Admissions and Standards Committee with the charge to make sure they clarify the admission requirements for all programs and that they are in harmony with the Graduate requirements. Dean Tumeo added that if a program wants to change the requirements they go through the formal process of changing it. He also asked Council to put Barbara Turner on the committee to work with them on this. He asked Barbara to sheppard this through to resolve all of the issues and bring it back for the required formal vote to make any changes necessary.

Dr. Oprea suggested that instead of eliminating the chart it should be part of the annual report of the Graduate Admissions and Standards Committee to Graduate Council. This could be a tool that would be useful to do analysis. It was suggested that the chart show both domestic and international requirements and the Admissions and Standards Committee would need to contact the departments to determined their criteria. Dean Tumeo stated that there are valid academic reasons why an international student may be requested to demonstrate proficiency in a different way than a domestic student.

College of Education Change in Student Teaching Praxis II Requirement:

Dean Tumeo stated that he received this from the College of Education. Some time ago they had a requirement that before a student would start student teaching they would pass the Praxis II exam. This is not a change to the requirements. There is a timing issue and they would like to change this requirement. He informed them that Graduate Council does not vote on individual programmatic things. They wanted him to notify Council to see if there were any concerns or question.

Proposal for a Physics Optics-Medical Imaging Specialization:

Dean Tumeo stated that he worked with Dr. Kaufman to get the proposal prepared for Graduate Council. It is an excellent idea. Dr. Kaufman stated that Dr. Brian Thomas told him that one of the pre-requisites to get into their Doctoral Program in Biomedical Engineering is a master's degree in science. They put together a list of courses that would help those students who already have an undergraduate degree in engineering to do a master's in optics and medical engineering and then be candidates in the doctoral program. All of the courses are already scheduled for the program. They will not be offered more often. The hope is to get more students in the Physics Program and help the Engineering Program. Dr. Bathala asked how it is different from the current program. Dr. Kaufman responded there are two courses that are different. Some of the materials type courses are replace by medical type courses. Dr. Gatica asked if the diploma would note this specialization. Dean Tumeo stated that once Graduate Council approves the specialization it can be noted on the diploma. The department will need to note this on the Notice of Completion. The Diploma will show Master of Science in Physics and the line underneath would say concentration or specialization in Optics-

Medical Imaging Specialization. A motion was made to approve the Physics Optics-Medical Imaging Specialization. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Urban Studies Nomination for Representatives to Graduate College Committees:

Dean Tumeo stated that there were no representative from the Urban College on the Graduate College Committees. The faculty met and have nominated three members of their faculty for committee assignments. It is up to Graduate Council to appoint them. For Petitions they nominated Norm Krumholz. For Grade Dispute they nominated Jennifer Alexander, and for Faculty Review they nominated Helen Liggett. A motion was made to approve the appointment of these three individuals. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Glenda Thornton distributed flyers on Constitution Day. She stated that it is a Federal mandate that we celebrate Constitution Day. If we do not we do not get funds for various grants, etc. The Library takes on that responsibility. Today at noon Kevin O’Neal is speaking on Odysseus. There is a contest for students to enter and test their abilities to use the library. It deals with the Constitution. Almost 300 students entered the contest. There will be a drawing for an iPod and other prizes.

Dean Tumeo reported that Joe Fontes who has been a member of Graduate Council and the representative to Research Council has accepted a position at another university and will be leaving at the end of this semester. He has officially resigned his position from Research Council and will formally resign from Graduate Council. Currently we do not have a representative on Research Council. Council needs to appoint a liaison to Research Council as a voting member of that Council. We can wait for either the new Science person to be nominated or we can select a representative to that Council from the current Graduate Council. Dr. Rudd asked how often they meet and what do they do. Dean Tumeo responded that they meet every six weeks or so. They have two major functions. The most important and time intensive is to review the internal development grants that are given \$15,000 each as a maximum. As a committee they review and rank them and make recommendations for funding. The proposals are due in February and decisions are made in April. The other major function is that they are the faculty policy review for research issues, such as research policy, how we give out graduate faculty money, what are the procedures, what are the criteria, they will look at the Innovative Incentive Program make comments, they take a look at indirect process and if they can be approved. Any official policy decision they make comes to Graduate Council since this is the elected body. Dr. Rudd nominated herself as the Graduate Council Representative to Research Council. Her nomination was approved by acclamation.

Dean Tumeo thanked everyone and stated that this is going to be a very good year.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

(Minutes were approved by Graduate Council on October 11, 2006)