

**Graduate Council Meeting  
Minutes  
October 8, 2004**

Faculty Members Present:

Dave Cannon, William Crawley, George Grant, Cynthia Grapczynski, Rita Kohrman, Mark Luttenton, Nancy Mack, Jeff Ray, Bennett Rudolph, Roger Wilson

Absent: Cindy Coviak, John Shinsky

Student Members Present: Dorjee Damdul, Jennifer Treat

Administrative Ex-Officio:

Claudia Bajema, Seidman College of Business, Brian Cole, Continuing Ed, Irene Fountain, Graduate Studies, Priscilla Kimboko, Graduate Studies, Steve Lipnicki, Pew Student Services

Student Ex-Officio: Dara Marshall, Kenneth Patricio

R. Wilson is serving as temporary interim chair in the absence of C. Coviak, who is serving as interim chair. The meeting opened at 9:03 AM.

**Introductions (this is actually item 4)**

Provost Gayle Davis was introduced. Introductions were made around the room. New members include Mark Luttenton and Nancy Mack from CLAS. Two grad students were in attendance as well.

**1) Provost, Gayle Davis-Discussion of Strategic Plans for Graduate Education**

**Discussion:** The Provost, G. Davis, discussed a report she had received the previous day concerning the percentage of adjuncts teaching at GVSU. She asked the group to comment, keeping in mind where graduate education is, what percentage of grad credits should be taught by tenure/tenure track faculty as opposed to affiliates, visitors, and adjuncts. G. Grant in SW suggested 75%. B. Rudolph indicated that adjuncts serve an important purpose as real world practitioners, and suggested 50%, if teaching is our only concern. Others agreed that it depends on the program. G. Davis stated that adjuncts should get regularly screened and evaluated. Some departments have adjunct training for teaching. Others use the Pew Faculty Teaching & Learning Center for adjunct support.

The Provost had been looking at the budget to determine how to increase the number of tenure/tenure track faculty without new money, including reviewing total instructional costs, which current visitors could be converted to tenure/tenure track. Bruce Tweddale put together a report with the number of graduate credit hours by tenure/tenure track faculty. The report included totals of undergrad, graduate, and total university figures. In 03-04, the total percentage of grad classes taught by tenure/tenure track was 60.4%, up from 50.1% previously. The highest was 72% in 1997. Seidman's percentage was 74.7%. B. Rudolph stated that faculty hold several roles, in terms of teaching and research, but adjuncts don't do research. If you want research you have to have more full-time people.

G. Davis indicated this report concerned the number of credit hours taught by tenure/tenure track faculty.

Other comments were that, the lower number of credit hours taught by visitors and adjuncts shifted the burden of committees and advising to tenure/tenure track faculty; tenure/tenure track faculty are needed for scholarship and teaching; most adjuncts have no interest in becoming permanent.

Additional statistics were given, using the old organizational structure: SW was at 59.8%; the lowest was Science & Math at 54.3%, which included Health Professions and Engineering. For strategic planning purposes, the new colleges should be used rather than the old. Each department has a breakdown. The Provost's office will provide the report to the GSGA office.

Some of the attractions of having practitioners is that they have expertise in their profession. For planning purposes, GVSU should look at peer institutions, Masters I public with similar missions, which include Western Washington and Appalachian State. Who is our competition and who do we aspire to be like?

G. Davis stated that the reorganization was the first step to the new mission, vision, and values at GVSU. Liberal arts and professional education were buried together, but under the new structure, they are now separated. The DPT was necessary because it became the entry level for licensure. However, GVSU will not be offering any PhD's any time soon.

The Chronicle of Higher Ed Almanac report shows that there are only eight schools in the US that are similar to GVSU. The US Dept. of Ed gives the number at about twenty. G. Davis discussed the value of having rich graduate programs while not offering PhD's. The Grad Council can look at the optimal grad program that GVSU could have at master's level. Take a look at the best schools of our type that are public, keeping in mind Michigan's budget difficulties. Our mission is to do both liberal arts and professional education. We can go ahead with the grad programs we have committed to and make a commitment to lift the grad programs out of 'stepchild' status.

Regarding new graduate programs, G. Davis stated there is always pressure from the community, region, and students to meet their needs. Her office is open to new programs, but not small ones with expensive equipment, for example, but those where we have resources already. For example, the master's in English helps teachers meet the requirements of No Child Left Behind Act. Public school teachers have been coming back to increase their content knowledge in English, rather than their pedagogy. There is a demand for a literature program for teachers. Also a plus is the fact that graduate tuition is not dictated by the state.

Another consideration in strategic planning for graduate education is where jobs are going to be. Two top careers predicted as having jobs to fill are in the health professions and college teaching. There will be a shortage of university teachers. GVSU can prepare those students to go on for a Ph.D. There is not only an interest, but a market regionally. Another consideration is diversity; GVSU is less diverse than we need to be for students to have learning environment that feels like the real world.

Regarding the state budget, while GVSU was growing, we were getting more resources than other schools. However, now we are underfunded.

Another issue is not being able to offer graduate assistantships to those being recruited throughout the Midwest. They have no incentive to come here to become full time students without assistantships.

Grad students have certain concerns that they have expressed to the GC. Some issues are: having activities to participate in as a grad student separate from undergrad; having a professional atmosphere for grad students; limiting the number of cross-listed courses that include both undergraduate and grad students in the same classes; undergrads often rely on the grad students to do all the work. Students expressed an interest in seeing interdisciplinary cross-listed courses so they can interact with students from other programs. There is a governance question as well. Grad students who wish to have activities have to go to the undergraduate Student Senate, who then makes the decision on the grad issues.

D. Damdul discussed the challenge of writing for international grad students. They cannot get assistance on writing at graduate level, in a way that meets standards and is publishable.

Suggestions to resolve this included having writing learning groups from students in other disciplines. R. Kohrman suggested Nancy Crittendon to help with such a group. There needs to be more of an intellectual community overall.

## **2) Approval of Minutes**

### **a. September 24**

**Discussion:** Review and changes: Add Roger Wilson's name to those present; Item 1, clarification of what was decided regarding splitting into two committees. No action was taken on that item. Correct the numbering of 4a, I, 2, then 3 and 4 together; the numbering is off.

**Action:** D. Cannon motioned to approve minutes with changes. George Grant seconded. Minutes approved.

### **b. October 1**

**Discussion:** Under item #5, clarification of why the GC is looking at courses when the UCC has done so already. Corrections to be made to sequence of numbers, which should be 321; correction of typos; under area two, add a bullet after 'executive staff, employers, in community as a whole, publics.'

**Action:** J. Ray moved to approve minutes with changes; C. Grapczynski seconded. Minutes approved.

## **3. Approval of Agenda.**

J. Ray moved to approve the agenda. B. Rudolph seconded. Agenda approved.

## **4. Introductions :**

See page 1.

## **5: Report from the Dean**

John Shinsky from the College of Ed has not yet attended a GC meeting. Nearly 50% of graduate majors are in the College of Ed; thus they need to have representation.

P. Kimboko met with Jon Jellema and Pat Oldt about strategic planning for the GSGA Office. Graduate Studies and Grants Administration should be doing its own strategic plan as should all colleges and departments. The goal is for every unit to have a strategic plan by March. Jon and Pat have offered the services of a facilitator that could come meet with the GC in early November, in order to complete a strategic plan for graduate education.

## **6. Report from UCC**

C. Grapczynski gave the UCC report. UCC had planned to review the PSM/Bios but due to problems decided not to do it. The CJ proposals came up; and the UCC had gotten into a discussion about both dual listed courses and whether or not units should have individual courses for research, stats, and so on, or look at ways to offer those courses as service courses for a larger group, that students could take regardless of discipline.

Per R. Wilson, the Provost is concerned with course proliferation. The Provost and Paul Stephenson will be attending the UCC. Stats 215 would be the standard bearer for all undergraduate stats courses. But something should be done at grad level, e.g., quantitative vs. qualitative, where qualitative would be within the discipline, but quantitative would be standard. P. Kimboko noted that it is common to have a core set of statistics courses that are common to multiple programs, taught by statistics professors, but that at the graduate level it may also be important to have a second specialty statistics/research course that teaches advanced methods specific to the discipline/profession.

## **7. Review of Curriculum**

**Discussion:** R. Wilson discussed the format of the proposals and some things to look out for: basic information, the syllabus of record should be minimal and include only key things. The program overview follows guidelines in the faculty handbook; look at the layout of a sample schedule and credits; the number of credit hours; how many courses fulfill the number of credits; what is the rationale to have a lot of low credit courses. If there is a large credit load for one semester, what has it been compared to? In health professions, this may be typical. Those that submitted the program should be invited to come in and answer questions.

The new course proposal form includes standard information, e.g., a statement from library, curriculum resources, books, journals, etc. All programs will claim no new resources, faculty, etc. These should be examined and justified. Course objectives should be included. How will these be demonstrated?

Look at required readings. Will everyone be using that book? Question the date of the publications. Is a book from 1973 still current? Is it the founding work?

The syllabus of record may be linked to the accrediting body. It is important to look at curriculum resources.

**Action:** B. Rudolph motioned to approve the OT courses. Rita Kohrman seconded. C. Grapczynski abstained. Program approved.

#### **Discussion: DPT**

R. Wilson gave an overview of things to look for on course changes. Look at how many changes there are. If there are numerous changes, a course may normally need to be dropped and then presented as new. R. Kohrman asked how many of Movement Science's athletic training masters might cross over. It was determined that the DPT has to stand alone, so probably none or only a few.

**Action:** B. Rudolph motioned. R. Kohrman seconded. There may be some prereq's like kinesiology. The DPT was approved.

#### **8) Discuss Next Meetings Agenda Items**

**Discussion:** Election of a chair will be delayed. A facilitator will be available to come to a GC meeting in November.

SCB will be presenting two proposals for program changes: the MSA may come to the GC by next Friday; MBA program changes will probably come the end of October.

There will be a program change in Engineering, but not until end of October.

The proposals can be sent electronically so each person can print what he/she wants.

Next week, the group will meet for one hour from 9-10 in 340 CHS for a brainstorming session to prioritize what needs to be done, and what issues may be coming up.

R. Wilson suggested that the person who becomes chair to should look at course release time. There would have to be a proposal from the GC.

#### **9. Reports from Colleges**

The College of Ed is looking at its curriculum and programs, graduate and undergrad, and doing some restructuring.

CHP is looking at another masters program in occupational safety and health.

CLAS is developing the athletic training masters degree.

#### **10. Adjournment**

October 8, 2004 Graduate Council minutes approved on October 22, 2004