

**Graduate Council/Graduate Directors
Joint Meeting
February 25, 2005**

Grad Council Present: Dave Cannon, Cindy Coviak (Chair), William Crawley, Cynthia Grapczynski, Rita Kohrman, Mark Luttenton, Nancy Mack, Jeff Ray, Barb Reinken, Ben Rudolph, Roger Wilson

Grad Directors Present: Dan Balfour, Doug Busman, Dave Elrod, Hugh Jack, Paul Jorgensen, Jean Martin, Deb Ross

Student Representatives Present: Dorjee Damdul, Rachel Stern
Absent: Jen Treat

Administrative Ex-Officio Present: Claudia Bajema, Irene Fountain, Priscilla Kimboko, Steve Lipnicki
Absent: Lynn Blue

P. Kimboko opened the meeting at 9:07 AM. Introductions were made around the room.

1) Strategic Plan Discussion

P. Kimboko discussed the handouts. The objective for this joint meeting is to review and approve the goals and objectives. The document will serve as a roadmap of what graduate education should put its time and energy toward in the next 18 months to 2 years. Both the Grad Council and Grad Directors will have a role in carrying these out. She advised the group that the Provost will be given the goals and objectives, but at this stage, the strategies will not be submitted to the Provost.

The Graduate Council and Graduate Directors reviewed and approved the goals and objectives, with the following discussion, comments, and revisions:

GG 1.1: To enhance GVSU capacity to provide a high-quality graduate experience, by raising the voice, visibility, and status of graduate students with the university and community.

Discussion:

- P. Kimboko noted that some of this has already been carried out via the Grad Student Blackboard site, Grad Student Roundtable and the upcoming student event.
- R. Kohrman pointed out that strategies should be more specific, e.g., strategy 1.1.2, *Develop graduate student friendly communication*. Examples should be given, e.g., Blackboard, bulletin revision, and newsletter.
- A sense of reciprocal communication should be evident in the goal and strategies rather than one way communication to students.
- In Strategy 1.1.2, use “responsive” rather than “friendly.”
- Further discussion of the strategies will take place at a later time.

GG 1.2: *To develop consistent high quality policies and processes for the governance of graduate education that ensures quality.*

Objective 1.2: *Clearly delineate roles, responsibilities, and authority in graduate education of graduate dean, college deans, Student Support Services, Student Affairs, governance bodies, and other graduate programs.*

Discussion:

- H. Jack suggested that the objective addresses a couple of mechanisms which should be strategies.
- Take out the specifics at the end of the sentence and put them under 'Strategies.'
- Delineating roles, responsibilities, and authority comes from administrative officers. Use phrasing that gives the sense of "making recommendations."
- Development of resolutions should be strategy of its own. This can be in a separate action step that flows from this objective.

Objective 1.2.2: *Develop minimum quality standards for all graduate programs across the university in student-related, program-related, and faculty-related areas.*

Discussion:

- Suggestion to change to: develop university-wide quality standards for all graduate programs regarding student achievement, graduate curricula, and faculty qualifications and productivity.
- Discussion of suggested change followed with consensus that the GC should not be making decisions on faculty productivity; that is up to the departments. During the discussion, point was made that the GC has been addressing the issue of faculty qualifications to teach at grad level (e.g., in reviews of prospecti). We need people at the forefront of their discipline. We want to foster the message that faculty teaching graduate courses are actively involved in scholarship.
- H. Jack suggested creating a goal that says we support active scholarship of grad faculty and students.
- In opposition to the suggested change, it was felt that the objective should speak more broadly of student issues; not just achievement.
- Suggestion re: original draft: eliminate "minimum." However, graduate education has minimum standards in some areas; e.g., thesis, and the B average requirement.

GG 1.3: *To encourage and support active scholarship and service by faculty and students.*

Discussion:

- We want to create an environment where scholarship and service becomes normal part of what faculty does.

GG 2: *To ensure that GVSU graduate programs can clearly articulate ways in which they build on a liberal education throughout their curriculum and related experiences and integrate that philosophy more intentionally into graduate programs.*

Discussion:

- Clarification that liberal education is not the same as liberal arts.
- Grad level education is not meant to be advanced vocational ed. it covers broader social issues, etc.

Objective 2.1: *To define the common expectations for grad programs related to liberal education throughout their curriculum and related experiences and integrate that philosophy more intentionally into graduate programs.*

Discussion:

- Critique of objective: this needs to mean something to students and people outside the university.
- We have elements in our grad programs that are built on liberal education. Our assumption is that most students have had a liberal education.
- Discussion re: some GVSU personnel perceive that grad programs are professional schools not taking liberal education into account. To emphasize the place of graduate programs at GVSU this is a good at this point in our history to talk about liberal education and how grad programs incorporate it.
- Potentially, can we say that every grad program goes through a curriculum process to see if it has elements of liberal education.
- Question was raised as to whether something can be done with this objective in 18 mos. to 2 years? Answer: Perhaps, assessing what we're doing and what the elements are?
- This objective should communicate to students that there is rigor in our programs; we incorporate theory, foundations of research methods, ethics, etc.
- This objective requires that we define liberal education and what it means to us so we can articulate it to students.
- Graduate education needs to be responsive to social issues of the time; there is responsibility on the part of students that they will become more than technicians.

GG 3: *Graduate Programs will build strong ties to organizational partners in the local community/region/nation/globe and their professions or disciplines to enrich their programs and the local, state, national, and international communities.*

Discussion:

- Much of this has already been done.

GG 4: *To support enrichment of the university by supporting an inclusive graduate community and practices that promote diversity on many dimensions at GVSU.*

Discussion:

- P. Kimboko suggested meeting in smaller groups for discussion on what we mean by diversity, e.g., race, gender, age, etc.
- Graduate education should provide support to the university by providing enrichment activities in the area of inclusiveness.
- In the strategic planning sessions, we discussed what we can do to promote the visibility of the diverse individuals who are here (students, etc.) but we do not have data at this time.

GG 5: *Contribute to the intellectual climate on campus and support a vibrant campus culture.*

Objective 5.1: *To provide graduate students with access to resources and programming that enhances the quality of their graduate educational experiences.*

Discussion:

- P. Kimboko indicated objective 5.1 probably does not fit in this spot. It will be moved to 1.2.2 as a strategy.
- We want to provide resources to students; as we have heard from students that they feel current resources do not meet their interests; including GAs and lack of scholarships
- Strategy 5.1.2 should be moved and made into an affirmative statement, “increase reliance on faculty who have terminal degrees in the delivery of graduate education.”
- A concrete action that can be implemented is to add a method for recognizing students’ research.
- B. Reinken commented on the focus of 5.1.3. It is difficult to maintain a “vibrant campus culture” with distance between the two campuses
- Objective 5.1 relates to students but strategies 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 relate to faculty.

GG 6: *To ensure that graduate education is positioned with sufficient financial resources to ensure quality and enable responsiveness to change and emerging opportunities.*

Objective 6.1: *Increase awareness of ways to fund graduate student support.*

Discussion:

- Include “equitably.”
- There should be a link to diversity.
- We cannot get more diverse faculty or students without more money.
- The same is true for faculty time; there has to be more money for faculty.

GG 7: *Increase the image and visibility of graduate education at GVSU and in the community.*

Discussion:

- Objective 7.3 should be moved to 5.
- With GG 7, we want to help the rest of the university understand and be able to communicate what graduate education is and how it fits with the rest of the university.
- 7.4 can be split; 7.4 speaks to a communication process, while 7.1 and 7.2 speak to a recognition process, where student achievement is communicated.
- Objective 7.3 will be moved to 5.

2) GC Curriculum Subcommittee Report

Prospectus - MS in Safety Management

Discussion: B. Reinken provided a handout outlining the GC-CC's concerns about the prospectus and why it should be sent back to the authors. The GC will need to vote on sending this recommendation to UCC.

C. Coviak had reviewed the comments on Blackboard. She agrees with most of the comments, particularly questioning why 100 and 200 level courses would be moved to upper level. There are also inconsistencies with the time frame for completion of program for students who work. The discussion of Oakland University's program is also a concern. The authors are emphasizing that Oakland's safety management program has only one concentration. However, they do not indicate what the proposed GVSU program would "look" like. The comparison to OU program gives more of an impression of competition than an explanation of the need for a GVSU program.

Most of the prospectus discusses moving classes to the upper level but it does not describe graduate classes, even in general terms.

N. Mack's impression is that the authors are asking for permission to develop the degree further which explains why it is not thoroughly developed in the prospectus.

It was not known who the authors of this prospectus are. Otherwise, they would have been invited to the meeting to discuss the prospectus. C. Grapczynski indicated that one of the writers is Eric Van Fleet.

Action: The GC motioned, seconded, and approved the GC-CC's recommendation to UCC that the prospectus for a Master's Degree in Safety Management be returned to the authors for a rewrite.

CC Process and Forms

Discussion:

The GC discussed the process of sending prospecti for review. Currently, they can go right to ECS and bypass their dean's office. There is no "sign-off" required.

B. Reinken stated that the UCC is reviewing new forms and has asked the GC to review them as well. These are on the Blackboard site under "Discussion Board." Please provide feedback. Comments will be passed on to Rita Grant.

3) Adjournment

Next Grad Council meeting March 18; back to regular business.

Minutes approved at 3/18/05 GC meeting.