

**Minutes of Meeting Held
October 11, 2007**

Present: Interim Dean Jeffres, Professors Bailey, Bathala, Beebe, Bowen, Dixit, Gatica, Karem, Meiksins, Mensforth, Oprea, Rudd, Simon, Smith, Sola, Thornton, Weyman

Guests: Giannina Pionalto, Alan Weinstein

Absent/Excused: Professor Forte, Mason, Weyman, Bayachou

Dean Jeffres opened the meeting at 1:03 p.m. He informed Council members that with their permission he had two additional items to add to the agenda.

Announcements and Communications:

Graduate Faculty Travel Awards:

Dean Jeffres reported that 27 people applied for the Graduate Faculty Travel Awards. Cheryl pulled 20 names out of the hat. This was a good cross-representation across the colleges. Email notifications were sent to those chosen. The rest of the names were pulled and listed in rank order in case someone who was chosen did not use the travel funds. He is hopeful that the money will be available for the next round. When the new Vice President for Research he will negotiate this with him since the money comes from the research side.

Committee Reports:

Faculty Senate Representative:

Robert Mensforth reported that the last Faculty Senate meeting was canceled due to lack of agenda items. The meeting before had two related items discussed. The Provost discussed the reorganization at the State level. Eric Fingerhut is the new Chancellor. He anticipates a few changes. They are going to establish the University system of Ohio. The Graduate Programs will play a major role in this process. Each school must establish a statement of Mission Differentiation. This means that we have to identify what makes us special and unique. We have to define specific areas of excellence, and we have to add urban economics to the needs of the community such as research and development in the areas of health and economic development. CSU does have a very large number of graduate students compared to other Ohio universities.

Sheldon Gelman, the President of the Faculty Senate, is a representative on one of the new committees to develop Ohio research funding program. A guest speaker, Brian Rigg, said the state is moving very quickly to boot up with 150 million dollars of research to support programs such as STEM, bio-med, practical and applied research grants. These would be highly competitive state grants. As well, they would fund scholarships such as Choose Ohio Scholarships, and Research Scholars awards. Harry Andrist commented that these are intended to generate competitive grants and create clusters of excellence. This is an Ohio Link model for state research funds. The major point is that this is intended to spur change and the development of this is moving very fast. Robert Mensforth recommended that Graduate Council invite Brian Rigg to give a 10-15 minute presentation. It is going to be the Graduate programs that are going to define this Universities areas of excellence. It is going to be a very good opportunity because we have several very strong graduate programs that are moving on this.

Dean Jeffres stated that the differentiation statement is what differentiates CSU from the others with or without Akron. One criterion is the focus on graduate and professional students. 27% of our FTE is at the graduate level. The next public institution is at 17%. CSU is the driver for professional leaders in this area. We need to focus even more on graduate education. The statement is being developed. The President stated that if we do not make our statement the state would do it for us.

The Ohio First Scholarships has a deadline in November in November for letters of interests. It is 100 Million dollars to attract students to the programs. There is a team working with the provost putting proposals on the table and trying to determine what we are going to do.

University Admissions & Standards Representative:

Peter Meiksins reported that there were no actions acted on that affected the Graduate College. The one item of interest that may come before the Graduate Council was the Law College proposal to change grading categories and add minuses. Admissions and Standards recommended that this should be reviewed by Graduate Council. They were proposing a C- and no other program at Cleveland State has a C-.

University Curriculum Committee Representative:

Mieko Smith reported on past decisions of the University Curriculum Committee. P-6 Specialist in Education, the Museum Studies Track, Master of Urban Secondary Teaching that includes Foreign Language and Art were all approved. The move of the MPH program from the College of Business to the College of Education was approved and will go to Faculty Senate for consideration. In addition, the BA/MPA 4 +1 proposal there was a discrepancy between the BA hours and accelerated hours. It is 120 versus 128. The Curriculum Committee recommended that students accepted to accelerated program would not receive their BA until they finish total hours. They can be admitted to the Master's program but still have to complete required hours for BA. This was agreed to and the UCC is waiting for a letter from the Dean's office making this change. Once this letter is received, it will be approved.

EGT 580 exit option for the Master of Education Gifted and Talented program was approved but they are waiting for the syllabus.

Research Council Representative:

No Report

Graduate Faculty Review Committee:

Bill Bailey reported that the first batch of about 80 applications was distributed to the Committee members for review prior to their meeting next week. The deadline is October 13th and we expect another 50 or so to apply.

Old Business:

Approval of September 27, 2007 Minutes of Graduate Council Meeting:

Approved as submitted.

New Business:

Master of Legal Studies:

Alan Weinstein stated that the proposal is for a non-professional 30-credit degree aimed at individuals who would find it very helpful to gain knowledge about the system. The proposal is base on the University of Pittsburgh model. There is one new introductory course. The rest are already offered. They anticipate in the future enlarging the enrollment of graduate of foreign law schools to the Master of Laws degree, which is a

professional degree. They would be required to take the new course so the cost would be split. A council member stated that the proposal states that these students would be eligible to enroll in all first year and upper level courses provided the instructor of the course agrees to accept MLS students. Depending on your instructors, you could have a program that would not allow any students to take any courses. Alan Weinstein responded that he does not anticipate that happening. This requirement was based on his visit with Dr. Alan Miser from the University of Pittsburgh. He counseled him that having it on paper so that faculty are encouraged to participate instead of ordered to participate was better. A legitimate for not allowing a student to take a particular course would be for a student wanting to take a relatively small enrollment seminar where the instructor was concerned about the amount of discourse in the course and the student being able to keep up. A council member suggested that rather than enrollment being at the discretion of the instructor it be at the discretion of the advisor to the program. Discussion ensued on faculty having the decision-making when they are talking about the quality of discussion.

A Council member stated that the students in this program would be taking JD courses but being graded differently. What is to prevent them from stating they want a JD later on, could these credits be transferred? The response was that they could not be transferred. Under the rules of the American Bar Association, no credits earned prior to matriculation may be applied toward the JD. Essentially, they would have to retake everything. It was suggested that this be stated in the proposal. It is worth spelling out the interface of how the students will gain admission and priority to the courses in the proposal. Make it clear that MLS students in order to gain admission to upper level courses must complete all prerequisites. That text is not currently in the proposal and it could be a safeguard.

A Council member stated that the concerns of Council is clear. The section pertaining to instructors agreeing to allow MLS students in their course can be struck and Council could vote on the proposal with that elimination or Mr. Weinstein can take the proposal back to the Law Faculty with Council's concerns and change it. Alan Weinstein stated that he prefers to take it back to the faculty since this is what was approved by them. They will need to approve the changes suggested by Council and then it could be resubmitted.

A Council member stated that in Appendix A of the proposal they identify a number of proposed areas of concentration. Has there been a list of courses, core courses and elective courses identified for them. Dean Jeffres stated that this information is needed before it goes on. Mr. Weinstein responded that he had no difficulty in providing ten to twenty credits of courses that will justify the term concentration.

The question was raised as to why the MLS students will have a special final exam. If they are in the same class with JD students they should be treated the same. The explanation was that grading for JD students is different from Master's students. You can graduate from the College of Law with a 2.01 GPA. There are very specified percentages for each grade within faculty can give grades. IT is a very different grading system. Once you get past the first semester the knowledge base and experience with taking examinations that JD students have would be greater than the MLS students do and it would be unfair to give MLS students to give them identical examinations and grade them in the same way. We are doing different programs that are attempted to achieve different educational goals with these students. What we want the JD student to get out of a particular course may be different from what we are expecting the MLS students to. We may want the MLS student to have a basic conceptual understanding, appreciation of subject matters where as the JD student is expected to have a very sophisticated and technical understanding of the elements. A Council member suggested that what is needed then is cross listing of courses. When you have the same course number and different criteria it leaves you open to all kinds of issues. The response was that this has not been done at either Pittsburgh or Toledo.

Alan Weinstein stated that he viewed this proposal as a conceptual plan and once the concept was agreed to he then would move forward and prepare a full operational plan that would get into the level of detail that is being requested. If Council does not feel comfortable with the conceptual plan and need something that is clearer on how it is operationalized he will do so. Dean Jeffres asked Council members what point they want the Law faculty to reconsider. A Council member stated it is a great idea. It provides an option to people who do not want to be lawyers to study the law and learn. Mr. Weinstein will bring the proposal back for Council consideration once the recommendation have been approved by the Law faculty.

Certificate Title Change from Data Driven Marketing Planning to Marketing Analytics:

Dean Jeffres stated that the request has been made for a change in the title for a certificate. The request is that Data Driven Marketing Planning be changed to Marketing Analytics. A Council member stated that Jae Won Lee stated that when a program title is changed it has significant implication. OBOR has to be consulted. Dean Jeffres responded that since this is a certificate that is under the credit limit for approval by OBOR this can be approved at the University level. A motion was made to approve the title change from Data Driven Marketing Planning to Marketing Analytics. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved. This needs no further approval.

Dean Jeffres reported that he had a meeting with the four 4 + 1 Program Directors. One point made was that this program is designed for students who are continuously moving from the BA to the MA. That language is not in the recommendation to the UCC. They suggested that this be added to the guidelines for all accelerated programs. "Students must be in continuous registration for the transition from the BA to the MA." They cannot stop and come back a year later or so. They may take one semester break because of illness or whatever and come back but here must be continuous registration. This was the intent. He asked Council to consider this addition to the guidelines. It would then be sent to the UCC. A motion was made to approve the addition of the statement "Students must be in continuous registration for the transition from the BA to the MA" to the guidelines. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Discussion Items:

Master's Track and Specializations

Dean Jeffres stated that he has concluded that the only time faculty consider changes is when they are forced to with program review when it is a question of resources. Under the current environment, it might be to our advantage to think proactively "what can we do" rather than simply saying we do not have the resources so we cannot do anything. If you can make a case that there is a market or a need that can be served for a particular time period and fill some empty classrooms in your program that we think about what can be done. Specializations and tracks can be added without going outside the institution. How you advertise those specializations is probably the key to whether or not you have students. If we are moving toward a climate where graduate programs are even more important we need to consider specializations. A Council member stated that while he does not see a problem with departments creating tracks and specializations, there is a danger that you will reproduce the experience we had with certificate programs. Dozens of certificate programs were created and most of them have zero students. Departments need to be asked not to simply say that this is a cool idea but to demonstrate that there is a legitimate market for it and there is a population of students that has been identified. Dean Jeffres responded that another part of that is getting rid of stuff that is not working. Programs have to think about reinventing themselves at times. Sometimes there is good case to be made for asking departments that have successful tracks to make the transition to degree programs. The case becomes stronger if you have the experience of doing a track first because you can then actually show that there are students who want to take this and we are good at it. Dean Jeffres stated that he

wants people to think about this. We do not know what is going to happen in the next year or so. If the graduate enterprise becomes front and center there is going to be more efforts. The Provost has already said there needs to be evaluation and assessment of what we have and what we are offering. Council should be thinking about this in advance.

Graduate Faculty Criteria Comparison

Bill Bailey reported that in 1985 the Graduate Council got a directive to reconstitute the Graduate Faculty. A generic review committee was put in place and each unit that had practitioners, artists, etc. were invited to put forth statements as to what constitutes achievement and recognition in those units. These became the vehicle for evaluating the practitioner applicants. They were not reviewed by the generic committee but by specialized committees that had representatives from their home department, a representative from a cognate unit and an off-campus expert. Dr. Bailey mentioned to Dean Jeffres that they might run into a situation with the first batch of applicants where the generic committee does not have the expertise to evaluate some of the applicants. Dean Jeffres responded that we have the criteria but what Dr. Bailey is stating is that he feels they need the outside expertise to evaluate the criteria, which was done routinely in the past. Dr. Bailey stated that in the past the department to nominate persons from their unit, a cognate unit and off-campus experts. It was a little cumbersome and time consuming but a fairer evaluation. Dean Jeffres stated that as a parallel on the Research side, the patents require expertise to review and our faculty do not have the breadth of expertise. What they are authorized to do is to go outside for evaluation. To a certain extent, that is what you would be doing here. In a sense there is precedent at the University to ask for not exclusive but some outside expertise that you can use to make a recommendation. What Dr. Bailey is suggesting is to ask the programs to recommend the outside folks for that expertise.

A Council member asked what the engine that produces the need to account for Graduate Faculty Status. Is this a State requirement that we have to explain how we are meeting a certain requirement? Is there an external standard that the requirements fit? Dr. Bailey responded that there is the expectation from OBOR and our peer institutions that we have a Graduate Faculty process. In fact, we have reciprocal Graduate Faculty arrangements with three other institutions. We have shared guidelines with them. Dean Jeffres stated that he did not know if this would require a notion. He felt that committees had the right to get additional expertise. Asking the Program Directors to recommend an outsider to serve as external experts would help evaluate the practitioners. They would meet with the committee. Dr. Bailey responded that the format that the Graduate Dean would finalize the appointments to the committees. Dean Jeffres stated that some experience would be helpful if this was an ongoing process that would not change every six months or so. He asked Graduate Council for their opinion. Discussion ensued on what the differences in the practitioners' requirements were and which colleges did not have that category. A Council member stated that CLASS had a jambalaya approach. Another council member stated that last year the discussion was that there should be some consistency across colleges.

Peter Meiksins reported that the CLASS steering committee raised the question that the Graduate College wanted to delegate to the colleges the right to determine their criteria then to turn around and say they all have to be similar to each other is redundant. People would feel that they wasted their time developing their criteria just to be told they have to do what this other college does. They labored long and hard on recommending criteria. There was a lot of discussion going back and forth and to make changes would be asking for trouble. Dean Jeffres responded that he felt they could deal with standards in the process. The criteria should be applied fairly and equitably so that you are rewarding faculty with Graduate Status because they meet the standards within their discipline. Can this be done with existing committees or do you need additional expertise.

Dean Jeffres stated that he felt they do not need to seek approval. A dinner or lunch might take care of inviting an outside member.

Bill Bailey stated that there is one thing he would like to point out. If you look at the different college descriptions, the first sentence includes a statement such as the person has to show the accomplishments listed below within the last five years with the exception of Urban Affairs. That clause is missing from their statement. This should be addressed. Bill Bowen stated that it was carefully crafted not to exclude anybody but he does not recall the five-year statement.

Dean Jeffres stated that he has two additional items. Civil Engineering is eliminating the letters of recommendation for admission. He is bringing this to Council as an informational item. A Council member asked why this is being recommended. Dean Jeffres responded that the department did not feel the letters of recommendation were worthwhile. Jorge Gatica reported that this has not been brought to the College. Dean Jeffres will inform the department that this has to go to the College prior to notification to Graduate Council. Bill Bailey stated that a number of years ago it was determined that this was a local option. Several years ago, Graduate Admissions was denying admission to students who did not submit letters of recommendation as required by the program admission criteria. The department acknowledged that they did not pay attention to the recommendations. Dean Jeffres responded that the exit option was also a local option.

Dean Jeffres reported that for the Master's of Global Interactions we have asked for an extension of the two-year limit between PDP and FPP. It is on the RACGS Agenda this month.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

(Minutes were approved by Graduate Council on December 13, 2007)