

**Minutes of Meeting Held  
November 8, 2007**

*Present:* Interim Dean Jeffres, Professors Bailey, Bathala, Bayachou, Beebe, Bowen, Dixit, Forte, Gatica, Karem, Mason, Meiksins, Mensforth, Oprea, Simon, Sola, Weyman

*Guests:* Giannina Pianalto, Alan Weinstein, Santosh Misra, Benoy Joseph, Larry Ledebur

*Absent/Excused:* Professor Rudd, Smith, Thornton,

Dean Jeffres opened the meeting at 1:05 p.m. He mentioned that at the Convocation the Presidents essentially said that he proposed a Northeast Ohio University System with a single Board but with separate identities as Institutions. The good news is that Cleveland State University has been admitted to NEOUCOM. We will be a full partner with Akron, Kent, and Youngstown. This will generate thirty-two FTE's each year.

**Announcements and Communications:**

*Graduate Program Directors Meeting – November 29<sup>th</sup>:*

Dean Jeffres informed Council members that there would be a Graduate Program Directors meeting on November 29<sup>th</sup>. He asked Council members to let him know if there they have any items of interest for Graduate Program Directors that should be added to the agenda.

*NRC Postdoctoral & Senior Research Associateship Programs:*

Dean Jeffres distributed copies of the program information that he received and asked Council members to pass them on to anyone they think might be interested.

*Law School Grading Changes:*

Dean Jeffres determined that the Law School grading changes is not the purview of the Graduate Council since this change affects on the JD program.

*CSU's Proposal for a MA in Global Interactions extension approved by RACGS:*

Dean Jeffres reported that the MA in Global Interactions was past the two-year limitation set by RACGS for the time between pre-proposal and full-proposal submission. He requested an extension and at the last RACGS meeting, it was voted on and approved.

*CSU/UA PhD in Adult Development & Aging on RACGS Agenda early December:*

This proposal is on the RACGS Agenda for review and vote early in December. The Chancellor will be at this meeting.

*Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Assistants:*

Dean Jeffres reported that the number of volunteers for this committee underwhelmed him. He called individuals, asked them personally, and thanks those who did agree to be on this committee. The first meeting will be held November 9<sup>th</sup>. The agenda for this committee includes getting information on how Cleveland State University uses Graduate Assistants and investigate how other institutions use GA's. He would like to survey current Graduate assistants to find out they are treated and their experience. He has been in the role long enough to hear complaints. While we are asking program show to use Graduate Assistants it would be nice to ask Graduate Assistants about their experience. This is an opportunity to inform ourselves about our Graduate Students throughout the institution. Another item for the committee is the support levels. They have been too low for too long. In the 1990's we stopped increasing the minimum and the call went out that if you want to reduce the number of GA's and increase the stipend

level you may and some departments have done this. Let Dean Jeffres know if there are additional items for this committee. They will report to Council.

*OSPR Staff Responsibilities:*

Dean Jeffres distributed an accounting of the individuals and what they do on grants and contracts in the Office of Sponsored Programs and Research. The Interim Director, Beth Cline, currently reports to Dean Jeffres as the Interim Vice Provost for Research. When the Vice President for Research is hired, OSPR will be split off and they will report directly to that person. There will still have to be cooperation between the two departments. He is unsure how this will work. Faculty travel funding and Graduate Assistant cost share comes out of that office.

**Committee Reports:**

*Faculty Senate Representative:*

Robert Mensforth reported that the Faculty Senate acted on three items that affect Graduate Council. The Master's of Public Health program shift from the College of Business to the College of Education and Human Services with the provision that there was no objection by the College of Business. No documentation was received stating this. Dean Jeffres stated that he had submitted emails from both colleges. With regard to the President's address, everything seems rather abstract. As the Universities define themselves relative to their regions and communities, the primary strength of Cleveland State is the size, diversity and number of students of its Graduate programs. When it comes to self-identification, the Graduate Council and members of Graduate Programs is important in this process. It is worth paying attention to what is going on. Mekki Bayachou reported that to add to that there was a proposal by the Provost to brainstorm the new direction. She called it "Publicly Engage University Scholar/Scholarship". She wanted discussion to start at the Department, College and University level to come up with and define areas of excellence in resources and input. This falls in line with what the President was talking about in terms of the merger with Akron. The idea that the actual merger with Akron is not viable but we have to come up with alternatives such as his suggestion of regional systems/academies where you have four universities with different mission statements with the provision of non-overlapping centers of excellence.

*University Admissions & Standards Representative:*

Peter Meiksins reported that the Admissions and Standards Committee's Agenda did not have anything relative to Graduate Studies.

*University Curriculum Committee Representative:*

No Report.

*Research Council Representative:*

No Report.

*Graduate Faculty Review Committee:*

Bill Bailey reported that the Graduate Faculty Review Committee conducted a review of round one of the Fall reviews. They considered 84 applications. One person is being recommended for an initial three-year appointment. There is one person that is being recommended for denial. One person has been asked for additional information. The rest of the group is all being recommended for five-year appointments. Looking ahead the Committee has received approximately 70 applications for round two. All faculty whose terms are due to expire were sent a second reminder and given an extended deadline. A motion was made to approve the recommendation of the Graduate Faculty Review Committee. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

**Old Business:***Master of Legal Studies:*

Alan Weinstein stated that Graduate Council reviewed the PDP for a Master of Legal Studies and raised some concerns. The PDP has been revised with the approval of the appropriate committees. The revisions appear primarily on page two. In the first full paragraph, it is stated “MLS students will be eligible to enroll in a cross-listed section of all first-year and upper-level courses at the College of Law and will be required to fulfill all of the requirements for the course, including the attendance requirement.” The footnote states “The College of Law will adopt course admission policies for MLS students to insure that they have an adequate opportunity to enroll in the MLS section of JD courses that frequently are over-enrolled.” There were two concerns, eliminating the ability of the instructor to deny any MLS student from enrolling in a particular course and the grading because the MLS students would be on the Graduate grading system and the JHD students will be graded on the JD grading system. By having the courses cross-listed, it will be much simpler to do the grading on two different scales. The second sentence states “MLS students in the cross-listed section will be graded using the same grades as other graduate programs at Cleveland State University.” That confirms the grading. The other concern was that the areas of concentration be flushed out. There is an extensive list of suggested courses. Which of these courses an MLS student would take would depend on a council advising that particular student. In addition, the proposal does envision that MLS student would take up to eight credits in other Graduate Programs towards their MLS degree. It would be premature to reach out to the other departments that might have courses that relate to these various areas of concentration, but that is our intention. This information would be included in the final proposal. A Council member read a comment from a faculty member that is on sabbatical. He asks how would the law courses in this area with the School Law in Special Education Law that he is already teaching connect with the cross-enrollment mentioned in the proposal. Are you going to do cross-enrollment, devise a completely new class, or develop a new course? The response is that the expectation would be that that one or both of the courses currently being taught would be appropriate for MLS students who are concentrating in Education Law. They would enroll in those courses in that department. They would then be credits that would be counted toward the MLS degree. At the same time, if this were approved he would talk to the faculty member about the possibility of his also offering a course. There might be areas of student interest that are not currently being offered.

Dean Jeffres responded that in general practice that when a department is mentioned in a proposal that there is a letter of support from them. This is done at the full proposal stage not at this level. A motion was made to approve the proposal for a Master of Legal Studies as amended. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved without additional discussion.

**New Business:***Economic Development Specialization in the MBA Program:*

Benoy Joseph stated that this proposal came to the College of Business from the College of Urban Affairs. The proposal asked Business to consider offering a specialization within the MBA program in the area of Economic Development. The MBA program has a number of specializations by taking three or more courses that were restricted to the College of Business. The Urban College asked if students could be allowed to take the elective specialization courses in the College of Urban Affairs. The Economic Development specialization program is part of the President’s Initiative Grant in which they participate. The specialization included two required courses in the College of Urban Affairs and a third courses that can be taken in the College of Urban Affairs or from the Real Estate Investment area. The proposal has been approved by the College of Business. Larry Ledebur stated that he coordinates the Economic Development Specialization Part of their mission is to reach out to the almost 400-500 economic development organizations in the region. We do that through the Certificate Program and try to

get them interested in the Master's Program. Many of them prefer the MBA to the Urban degree. For Urban, it is an existing Certificate Program. A motion was made to approve the Economic Development Specialization in the Master of Business Administration program. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

*MCIS Request for Course Substitution ESL for GAD:*

Santosh Misra stated that this is a proposal for a minor tuning to the admission criteria for the MCIS. It is strictly a program criteria. In the past someone that had a score in the GRE below twentieth percentile were required to take one or two GAD courses. For the seven credit hours, it costs in the area of six thousand dollars for out of state tuition. We have evidence that several people have left the program for engineering because they do not have this requirement. This is not removing the English requirement but rationalizing it to move it to a cheaper option so that they will take the ESL course, which is significantly cheaper. If they are above the fifth percentile and below the twentieth percentile, they will automatically be required to take the ESL courses. The ESL program helped develop the courses. Students who do not meet the twentieth percentile but meet the TOEFL requirements will be admitted as regular graduate students. A motion was made to approve the change in admission criteria for the MCIS program. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

**Discussion Items:**

*"T" Grades and Progress on Thesis & Dissertations:*

Dean Jeffres reported that it has come to his attention that sometimes faculty give "T" grades for a long time to students who are not making satisfactory progress. That leaves to a situation where the students who get a "T" and think they are making satisfactory progress and then are given notice that they are not. That puts us in a potential legal bind. Sometimes faculty are generous when monitoring a student's progress with a thesis or dissertation. Dean Jeffres wanted to alert Council members that sometimes doing someone a favor is not one in the long run. A situation arose where a student was given several years of "T" grades and then was told they hadn't done anything for two years. Council members should discuss this with their Colleagues. Council members reported that they do not assign the grades. In some cases, the Graduate Program Director does without input from the faculty member. A Council member stated that although in his department the committee has some input he would like guidelines from the Graduate College that can be uniform throughout all units. There is uniqueness to each program but general guidelines as to involvement of committee members to attest to the progress. Another Council member stated that he didn't think that would work. The question was raised as to what alternative grades there were. The grades available are "T", "S", and "NS". Dean Jeffres that there is more than one process going on. Bill Bailey stated that there is no implication as far as GPA or hours attended, but after two NS grades a formal review is required. A course graded on a "T" basis is saying to the student that the work is progressing satisfactorily. That is the Bulletin language. If it is short of satisfactory but not failing the NS should be used. This is seen very rarely. A Council member stated that maybe it is a matter of changing the language as to what "T" means. Discussion continued on what the "T" grade means and faculty responsibility for evaluation. A Council member stated that there is two different things circulating in the discussion. One is covering legal exposure and changing the language is viable. The second is how do we ensure that there is some standardization on keeping up with thesis progress. Another Council member suggested that for thesis and dissertation students faculty be required to fill out a form every semester. That way they will be forced to make a decision on how their student is doing.

Dean Jeffres stated that the Provost asked him to start writing a list of best practices. This would be a good discussion for the list. A Council member asked what the process would be if there was a consensus to change the language. Dean Jeffres responded that Council should have exact language written down for consideration by this body. It was suggested that the "T" description should mean continuing. After

continued discussion it was suggested that it would simplify the matter is the student was classified as active or inactive in the thesis or dissertation. If at any time a member of your dissertation committee says that they don't think the student's progress is significant it is their obligation to call a meeting. It is the student's obligation to fulfill their obligations. With a simplified system you are not grading them. Dean Jeffres stated that discussion is valuable and it should be on the agenda again. He asked if anyone would be willing to take oppositional positions on this and bring it to the next meeting. This affects catalog language and would have to go to University Admissions and Standards as well. A Council member stated that being given the power and responsibility to control the grades on a semester basis is very valuable. Assessing the progress and having a more standardized way of doing it even if it is only for accountability would be great. This can be on the agenda for the next meeting or in January. A Council member suggested that what other schools are doing should be looked into as well. Dean Jeffres will bring it up to Graduate Program Directors.

*Graduate Faculty Membership Extension for Maternity Leave:*

Dean Jeffres stated that it was brought to his attention that for maternity leave you could have a suspension of the clock for promotion. We don't have anything like that for Graduate Faculty Status. It would mean a change to our bylaws. We need to think about what language we want to include so that if someone filed for a delay in the clock for promotion or tenure because of maternity leave, the same extension could be granted for Graduate Faculty Status. A Council member asked why it would have to be parallel. The current bylaw language in 8.4.2 7. a) is "The faculty member requesting the extension was affected by (a) a serious medical condition or (b) an extended absence from work due to a reason allowed under the Family Medical Leave Act during the period of their most recent Graduate Faculty membership." Discussion ensued on the length of the extension. The suggestion was made that the language "A period equivalent to a granted maternity leave" be added. Bill Bailey stated that there are some procedural issues that need to be discussed. The Graduate Faculty Review Committee and the Graduate Council are now in positions not to determine if a person is pregnant or their spouse is pregnant but whether the pregnancy is impacting their scholarship and their probability of recouping afterwards. None of that is found in the Family Leave Act. It is coming back to work not coming back to perform. A Council member stated that it is just a tricky to make the determination about how you are going to come back after medical leave. Another Council member responded that if the University grants someone leave for a certain period we would just piggyback on that decision and take that as a serious condition. It would be automatic. All the Committee would be doing is determining if this person has been found to be eligible. Discussion continued. A Council member felt that it was the responsibility of the Graduate Faculty Review Committee to determine the quality of the scholarship of the applicant. The response was that it is only a clock issue. Just because they are the Review Committee it doesn't mean that every decision they make is based on the quality of a person's scholarship. They can make administrative decisions such as the length of time. It was determined that the previous stated addition is not needed. A Council member moved to interpolate the words "maternity leave or a" under (b). It would now read: The faculty member requesting the extension was affected by (a) a serious medical condition or (b) an extended absence from work due to a Maternity Leave or a reason allowed under the Family Medical Leave Act, during the period of their most recent Graduate Faculty membership. A motion was made to accept the first reading of the change to the bylaws by adding Maternity Leave. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved. It will be brought to Council for a second reading.

*University "Position" Statement:*

Dean Jeffres stated that the University is being asked to position itself vis-à-vis the other Universities and its contribution to the economy. This statement is the beginning of that. It is important for Graduate Programs particularly. A Council member asked how we were going to proceed with this. Dean Jeffres replied that the Provost by soliciting your comments on the notion of an engaged institution was giving

you an opening. At the Faculty Senate meeting the President stated the importance of strengthening and maintaining the traditional role of the University. This is missing from this statement. Dean Jeffres responded that there is a difference between the mission statement and the position statement. If we don't define ourselves the Chancellor will. It is not changing what we do it is layering on top. In the President's Convocation address he stated that CSU transforms not just the economic life and the civic life of the community. A Council member states that the word civic appears only once and is followed by a lengthy discussion of things that are entirely economic. He stated that he does not object to the idea of the University as an economic engine but he does object to the idea of it as its exclusive purpose. He encourages Council members to express your views about the programs in your college to your Dean. Put your best words together and make suggestions where you think they will fit in.

A Council member asked what is the object of the position statement. The response was that it will affect where funding in the state is steered to. The Provost has mentioned that one of the critical attributes of CSU is its large proportion of Graduate Students and its Graduate Programs. We have the highest percentage in the state. It is this group of people that will have the strongest impact on the Vision Statement relative to what the general assembly is doing. What they are doing by having us define ourselves is to really solidify Akron, Kent, and Cleveland State as Universities and work against mergers. If mergers occur money will get funneled into very narrow channels and that is not going to work. The ideas about defining ourselves in relative to our community we are better because we have such a large community. We reach farther than Akron does, farther than Kent does and we reach farther than Youngstown does. Another Council member stated that a couple of month ago he was at a meeting of the Presidents of the Faculty Senates and Eric Fingerhut was there. What is going on is a huge drive for centralization. The legal change of the structure of Universities is astounding. Eric Fingerhut can cancel a program with a signature. He intends to close Universities. The first ones he wants to close are the for profit universities. The faculty should be involved in discussion of the Universities goals.

Dean Jeffres asked Council members to send their ideas to him via email to preface the conversation at the next meeting. A Council member asked if we could have a blackboard site for discussion groups. Another Council member stated that it is already available. It was suggested that Sheldon Gelman be invited to attend the next Council meeting. He attends the Ohio Faculty Council meetings. He could give us a report as to what is going on. In terms of timeline it is coming very fast. The Chancellor has to come up with a ten-year vision plan by the end of March. We have to act very quickly. Mary Jane Saunders want people to discuss these ideas and present something formal by the end of Spring Semester. Dean Jeffres looks forward to a continuation of this discussion. The point person for Faculty Governance in this University is Sheldon Gelman. Dean Jeffres said he will put him on the agenda for the next meeting. We will see if we can get anything on the Web.

*Differences Between Specializations, Concentration, and Tracks:*

Postponed to future meeting.

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

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