

Graduate Council Meeting
September 13, 2012 Meeting Minutes
(Room: York Room, Mansion)

Present: Cynthia Brennan, Kathy Burke, Lew Chakrin, Brian Chinni (Recorder), Donna Crawley (Faculty Assembly Exec.), Angela Cristini, Eric Daffron, Mike DiBartolomeo, Julie Good, Tim Landers, Hassan Nejad, Anthony Padovano, Steven Perry, Emma Rainforth (ARC), Chris Romano, Sam Rosenberg, Eddie Saiff, and Elizabeth Siecke

Dean Steve Perry opened meeting at 10:05 a.m., introduced the meeting agenda and distributed copies of related documents for individual and collective review. The meeting topic included:

- Introduction of new members – Tim Sanders., Julie Good, Donna Crawley (for Jill Weiss) ; and
- Assessment of 2011-2012 Graduate Education Goals, Objectives, and Achievement Targets

The following provides a summative report of all activities and related actions:

1. Steve Perry introduced the new members – specifically Tim and Julie.
2. Steve requested that the members reflect upon the activities of last year, and offer any items of focus for 2012-2013. Lew Chakrin expressed concern regarding the need to revisit the current Graduate Manual, and ensure that it takes into consideration non-standard semester formats (i.e., 7-week model). Steve proposed that this issue be a discussion item; all agreed.
3. Steve opened the floor for nominations for the 2012-2013 GC Chair. Lew nominated Steve. All were in favor (congratulations, Steve!). Steve will remain in position for the year.
4. Chris Romano raised the issue regarding undergraduates taking graduate courses, recommending it as a discussion item. Chris addressed the policy and explained how this is becoming a more common question, specifically as it pertains to 5-year programs. Steve recommended that the issue be included on the agenda for the October meeting.
5. Next, Sam Rosenberg raised the concern regarding Graduate Programs as individual cost center. He explained that the Provost is currently examining whether or not individual programs are meeting their respective financial goals. Sam expressed that this is a real concern and the Grad. Council needs to be prepared. Kathy followed by expressing the need to revisit the mission change. She explained that the idea of a master's degree in nursing is becoming obsolete and, as such, the consideration of a doctoral program is fast becoming important. Eric Daffron provided an update on the MA in Special Education program proposal. To Julie Good's credit, the program proposal is entering its second phase and, as such, an external consultant will be scheduled to visit the campus and meet with College leadership. Eric is awaiting information from the State. Finally, Eric explained that, given the growing number of graduate programs, we will need to more formally address the categorical mission change with the State.
6. Chris expressed that he will be presenting the strategic plan in a future GC meeting; he is targeting the 10/18/12 meeting. In addition, overall, our graduate programs met the goal of 95 new graduate students.
7. Next, Steve requested that the members refer to the Graduate Education 2011-2014 Goals/Outcomes document, and opened the collective review of the 2011-2012 Graduate Education Goals, Objectives, and Achievement Targets. The following was determined:
 - a. Objective 1a: Discussion ensued regarding how to verify that faculty has met the credentials/degree requirements. Lew questioned if we had already refined language for evaluations? Brian checked all records and was not able to locate. Lew explained that he would locate this document and provide. Kathy expressed concerns regarding the Student Opinion Surveys.

- b. Objective 1b: Eric explained that Lysandra offered a course and only one attended. Lysandra will revisit how we might be able to better promote. Angela explained that every semester she identifies a specific pedagogical topic, and holds Saturday meeting training sessions. Discussion ensued regarding professional development opportunities. Eric proposed that, while all parts of a whole, faculty performance and student assessment should remain isolated; we are not evaluating faculty based on student assessment. Emma seconded and all were in favor. Steve proposed that the Council compromise by repositioning Assessment as the second goal, therefore following the language of the document.
 - c. Objective 2a. Steve suggested that the GC achieved Target 1. Chris cited the graduate minutes on which this was addressed (January minutes). Chris explained that significant progress has been made regarding Target 1. His office has distributed weekly enrollment reports. There are coding issues that are yet to be rectified. Chris explained that Target 3 was not met; currently, there is no graduate education web page
 - d. Objective 2b. Chris explained that, while difficult to attain with absolute precision, we have achieved at a 90% success rate.
 - e. Objective 2c., Target 1. Eric expressed that he did not believe we were at 100%. Cindy sent lists and it is assumed that appropriate action was taken. Target 2 – Chris explained that these two Targets do not necessarily align. Emma explained that they are two different achievement targets and questioned if Program Directors are monitoring academic standing of students. The Directors confirmed. Steve questioned if we have degree evaluations/audits for all programs? Chris confirmed that he would check to verify, specifically regarding MASS and MAEL. Brian confirmed that degree audits were available for MAEL.
 - f. Objective 3a,Target 1. Chris confirmed that business plans were established for all programs. Chris explained that Target 2 had not yet been achieved across all programs. Target 3 has been achieved.
 - g. Objective 3b,Target 1. Chris explained that 75% has been achieved. Target 2 – Chris expressed that he manages the marketing lines of programs that transfer money in enrollment management.
 - h. Objective 3c . Liz explained that there have been some challenges regarding library resources, specifically as it pertains to consistency across programs. These issues are currently being addressed with Beth. Sam explained that the 18K database is no longer required for a certain program. Liz confirmed that this is still budgeted. Sam followed by explaining that the individual relinquished this resources and, therefore, it needs to be pursued.
 - i. Objective 3d,Target 1. Chris expressed that additional resources need to be dedicated to career development. Discussion ensued. Steve expressed that, in the end, we need to continue to conversation to refine the language of this objective and related target.
 - j. Objective 4a, Target 1. Eric confirmed that all programs have implemented an assessment plan. Target 2 - Eric expressed he had to verify, but, his tentative answer is 100%. Eric will find out if in Weave and give Brian access;
8. Next (11:10 a.m.), Steve proposed the Council take break and then initiate conversation around 2012-2013 Graduate Program Goals and Objectives. The GC reconvened its meeting at 11:25 a.m. Steve suggested that the Council work from the existing document. The following was achieved:
- a. Steve questioned if there was a goal that the GC needed to add to the existing collection. Hassan expressed that there was no objective regarding the establishment of a “community of graduate students.” Chris explained that he would bring the survey on which he was currently working. Lew expressed that he recalled that the Council needed to first determine the interest and needs of our graduate students. Chris expressed that we needed to have a program orientation, to which Kathy opposed. Rather, we could address this need in alternative, less traditional means. Chris disagreed, explaining that we need common

messages across our programs. Discussion ensued. Steve questioned if there is a way to ensure that graduate students verify that they have read program-specific orientation information. Discussion ensued. Eddie, expressed that the GC has gone off on a tangent – that the notion of having some type of graduate community available for our students is important. Steve agreed with Eddie, and questioned if the Council should establish a free standing goal related to orientation. Sam reminded the Council that when the conversation first started last year, it was in the spirit of fostering a culture for graduate students. Kathy expressed that the GC considered the survey as an instrument to determine what students want from the College experience. Chris suggested that the GC proceed with the goal of a graduate community, and conduct the survey to determine, more precisely, what students want; specific objectives could be formulated and implemented by the Council this year. Steve offered another consideration – to dedicate a specific location and share central office resources for Graduate Programs. On closing, Steve proposed that the GC establish a broad goal of graduate community, and then formulate objectives for next meeting. The goal should take into consideration a web-based resource to support this goal. All agreed.

- b. Next, Steve suggested that the Council review the goals to determine if there is any need for refinement:
 - i. Goal 1. Eric explained that this goal needed to remain as presented. Lew expressed his desire to refine the language, specifically that the term “training” needed to be more program-specific. It was determined that we needed to consider both the individual program and overall graduate program.
 - ii. Goal 2. Chris explained that we needed to revisit and modify the objectives.
 - iii. Goals 3 and 4. All agreed to remain as presented.

9. Next, Lew confirmed that he would provide faculty evaluation language for Council review at its October meeting.

The next Graduate Council meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2013 (10 a.m.) in the York Room of the Mansion.

Steve Perry motioned to adjourn the meeting at 11:56 a.m.; all approved.

Minutes submitted by Dr. Brian P. Chinni