

## Graduate Council Meeting Minutes

November 7, 2016

Barge 304; 3-5:00

**In attendance:** Archer, Kevin; Boullion, Marv; Claridge, Amy; Gabriel, Kara; Ge, Yingbin; Haviland, Liz; Kovalerchuk, Boris; Lubinski, Pat; Lipton, Jennifer; Lovett, Sadie; Lupton, Natalie; Marrs, Heath; Mattinson, Chris; Olson, Darren; Perez, Mark; Portlese, Laura; Pritchett, Kelly; Robison, Stephen; Robinson, Scott; Roemer, Karen; Shaw, Denise; Sheeran, Lori; Sheldon, Allie; Stoddard, Cody

**Guests:** Provost Katherine Frank

1. Approval of 11-7-16 minutes

2. Provost: Graduate Council solicited questions for all of GC and appreciated the Provost's thoughts on the following questions: 1. What is her vision for graduate programs at CWU? 2. How will RCM model impact CWU graduate programs in the short term (2016-2017) and long term (5+ years from now)? 3. How do you assess the viability of the ~30 graduate programs, given that each program is unique, from a student needs standpoint? Here are the Provost answers to the questions:

1. The Provost feels it is the graduate program/department's vision and not hers. One of the key questions she asked at her interviews was "What is our philosophy" of graduate programs at CWU and what story does that tell us and what story does it tell our external stake holders? She feels there is a story there, but it has not been articulated properly to her. She knows that we have very diverse programs and as she meets with the different programs she finds out that are lots of ideas for new programs. What is our strategy at CWU? What do we know is working? What questions do we have and what challenges are we facing? What is our plan moving forward? While meeting with departments the question about reviewing graduate programs always comes and the departments are concerned that they could be cut. She explained the external perspective and give some context to our thinking here at CWU. We have been asked to give a set of questions (5 guided questions) to the reviewers from the Council of Graduate Schools who will be from comparable institutions to CWU. They will be visiting sometime Winter Qtr to help us. She stated that she simply does not have enough information to answer the question and was when she interviewed and continues to be. The external reviewers will help us answer question #3. She asked GC what their follow up questions are on the vision and programming discussion.

\*Q: Defining what success is in the strategic plan and graduate education and most faculty feel that graduate programs are qualitative in nature and not quantifiable and if administration is leaving some room for this? A: The Provost answered that there needs to be a balance between the two and it is our responsibility to identify what is working financially and what isn't in our current model. Adding to the original question was that the quality of faculty that come to CWU would define success, possibly looking at historical success and how we analyze and measure success, those departments that have been pushed to be entrepreneurially and the impact from doing so well but now it has changed in the last 5 years due to RCM. The Provost highly recommends that faculty come and participate in the budget forums that are scheduled. One

of questions that is asked is what do faculty value in terms of graduate education and we ask this in the budget forum. Other questions are: What are the underlining principals of this budget model? What do we not want to violate?

\*Q: How do you see disentangling graduate and undergraduate programs and the impact that graduate programs have on the undergraduate programs... how do you see that interconnection? Answer: We are already do a great job with undergrad research initiatives but she thinks we can make it a stand out feature of our institution and she doesn't think we are necessarily doing that yet. She asked again what is our strategy to build research and creative expression.

2. The RCM model is not good for graduate programs and doesn't give the Graduate School whole lot to work with. She feels that we have not thought this out carefully the placement of graduate programs in the model such as the expenses because most graduate programs are expensive. She again encouraged GC to participate in the budget forums so that you can voice concerns about refining the budget model because we are going live July 1. There is a new budget model email so they can keep track of feedback, questions, ideas and concerns. The email is: [newbudgetmodel@cwu.edu](mailto:newbudgetmodel@cwu.edu) and there will also be a website soon.

\*Q: Are graduate credit hours calculated with all the rest of the undergraduate at the same and equal level in the formula in the current model? A: Yes, they are in the current model and a program does not get the full rate on their return on credit hours.

\*An additional comment was made that it is easy to focus on the expenses of graduate programs and the benefits fall through the cracks such as graduate students who involved in external grant funded research, attracting high caliber faculty, impact of GA's supporting undergraduate education, and the stuff that is hard to quantify undergraduate and graduate interacting and inspiring undergraduates.

\*Q: Is the Provost looking for some type of document on a vision/role of graduate studies and RCM recommendations? A: She is surprised GC doesn't have a vision. Would like have something by the beginning of Winter Qtr and not a huge document but more in a succinct version possibly with questions, guiding principles and/or goals.

\*Q: What is the provost's view on graduate assistants and delivering undergraduate classes? A: She was from English and she feels they are very important and very effective in a variety of class room settings. However, some disciplines have a different opinions about graduate assistants. Strongly supports the experience the graduate assistants get and they need strong mentorship to do their job well especially when teaching and researching.

### 3. Committee Reports:

A. Graduate Dean, Kevin Archer: 1. For the Graduate School's internal grants departments do not need to prioritize, just send them on. 2. The consultation with the Council of Graduate Schools was recently finalized. We are bringing two consultants from institutions comparable to CWU. We need to come up with 5 different questions or things for them to look at. Topics such as: Marketing ourselves and how do we distinguish ourselves from the other comprehensive institutions. We need a brand to make us stand out and give students a reason to come to CWU. 3. Encourages GC members to attend the budget forums about RCM.

B. Associate Dean, Natalie Lupton: no report

C. Academic Standards committee: Reviewed the Bridge program and after their questions were answered they are moving to approve the proposal. The supporting documents will be emailed out for all of GC to review so that there can be a vote at the next meeting.

D. Curriculum committee: Met twice and reviewed 2 program changes (name change MS, Health & Physical Education to MS Athletic Administration) and the MA, Theatre Production were approved. Rejected the Aviation program and all the specializations.

E. Procedures committee: Met on Oct 17, approved 9 applications and meeting after today's meeting and reviewing 18 applications.

F. Executive committee: no report

4. New Business: Dawn will send around to GC the past documents/language to help with the shared vision/role of Graduate Studies to the Provost.

\*\*after the meeting Chris Mattinson agreed to be on a subcommittee to help draft the shared vision/role of Graduate Studies.

Adjourned: 4:40 pm