

Graduate Council Minutes

Campus Commons VP 2201

Thursday, November 21, 2019

3:00 - 5:00 P.M.

Present: Michael Cohen, Silvia Correa-Torres, Galen Darrough, Kathleen Dunem, Robyn Hess, Katie Kage, Andreas Mueller, Philipp Schaberl, Melissa Weinrich, Brittney Morgan, Zvi Murry, Annie Epperson, Cindy Wesley, Kirsten Ranalli, recording secretary

Absent: Rick Adams, Mary Evans, Amy Graefe, Jay Schaffer, Isaac Wanasika, Bomin Paek

Cindy Wesley established a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

I. Review and Approval of Minutes: October 31, 2019

After review of the October 31, 2019 minutes, Cindy Wesley called for a motion to approve. Motion to approve by Andreas and seconded by Galen.

II. Announcements/Updates

A. Interim Dean's remarks – Cindy Wesley

- Cindy sent out an email last week regarding Graduate Student Success. We need to take the lead in talking about graduate student success at UNC. In the spring, the Graduate School will send out information about process changes over email every couple of weeks.
- The Graduate School will host two sessions for graduate faculty to talk about graduate student success. The sessions will be on February 4 and February 7. Times and locations will be sent out soon.
- Cindy is working with David Shimokawa, GSA Director, on dates for face-to-face sessions and zoom sessions for graduate students. They might also do a forum for those that are not on campus so students can post their thoughts and ideas.
- Cindy and Sonja will gather information from these sessions then analyze and report. We are hoping to identify resources and processes that can improve graduate student success.
- One thing we would like to look at is peer to peer and faculty mentoring to help graduate student success.
- Graduate student enrollment is at 3165. We are up in new enrollment this year by 2% compared to last year. It is predicted that enrollment will be flat or down some because we have graduated large classes. There are 385 graduation applications for fall and 450 for spring. Carol has over 90 thesis and dissertations that she is reviewing.
- Graduate deans search update. Still receiving applications until December. Search committee will be reviewing applications in early January. At this point thirty applications have been received.
- Cindy is working with Sonja Rizzolo and Chris Saxton to create a program to incentivize students to write grants. The program would offer a scholarship to students and they will learn how to do grant writing through workshops. The goal is that at some point in their program doctorate students would write a grant.
- Changes in policies went out on the listserv from Faculty Senate.
- The Graduate Student Professional Development Graduate Assistant, Letha Mellman, has been working on planning events. Dissertation writing workshop completed and Research Evening is December 10 at the Campus Commons from 4pm to 7:30pm.

III. Standing Committee Reports

A. Standards Committee – Galen Darrough

- Cindy thanks to the committee for reviewing these applications.
- We have suspended using Digital Measures for reviewing these until it is set-up correctly on the back end.

- Cindy called for a motion to approve, Kathleen motion and seconded by Sylvia.

B. Program Review Committee – Robyn Hess

- Review of the Dean’s Citation for Excellence nominations is complete. Outstanding Dissertation/Thesis reviews are due December 2 by noon.

C. Graduate Student Association – Brittney Morgan

- Packet from David with updates on what is going on with Graduate Student Association.
- Lunches with GSA coming up. Faculty are welcome to attend to hear graduate student needs and wants.
- Students interested in serving on the GSA should contact David Shimokawa.

D. Library – Annie Epperson

- Dissertation Workshop was well attended with around 15 there. Feedback received that students appreciate the chance to focus and write. Cindy met with the director of the Writing Center and they are looking at starting writing groups for students to have dedicated writing time.

VI. New Business

A. Graduate Academic Portfolio Review – Provost Mark Anderson and Cindy Wesley

- Last year Theo Kalikow created several task forces. One recommendation was to come up with a policy and process for reviewing programs. Not the intention to prune programs but provide feedback and strategies for intervention for both undergraduate and graduate programs. We want to create metrics to review program health. With graduate programs, it is a little more difficult because metrics do not always indicate the health of a program.
- We need to create metrics to help us develop reports and identify programs where enrollment is trending down and have not had any graduates in a number of years. In these cases, we would develop strategy to turn this around. This program review will be completed annually.
- Regular program review completed every six years, but that is more of a summary review. The regular program review does not provide opportunity for the institution to provide constructive feedback.
- Philipp: Other than student-based metrics, what other metrics should we be looking at?
 - Mark: Holistic that are not specific to program.
- What is a reasonable amount of time to look at metrics to see the whole picture (3, 5, 10 years?).
- Scholarly productivity is one metric they have looked at. Might be more specific to doctoral and master’s thesis programs. Grant activity, conference, articles. Each discipline is different.
- Andreas: Can we put enrollment numbers in relation to internal funding since this is tied to recruitment.
 - Mark: Next two to three years decentralize funding so it will be up to the colleges to determine funding of individual programs instead of the graduate school.
- Michael: Student satisfaction in quality of the program. How to measure, employment or post-graduation?
 - Cindy: Met with Eugene, Sonja, and Kim Black to discuss how to provide programs with student satisfaction data. We are testing taking the quality of life survey and exit survey for graduates. We will take the survey results and load it into Power BI. Working on and having dashboards that programs can see what their students answered on the different questions. The questions on the survey are based on student success from Council of Graduate Schools.
- Robyn: With accreditation report, we look at student attrition and time to graduation.
 - Mark: The key to any metric used is to provide some sort of normalization and be able to run reports based on data the university already has. If we have the metrics then we have the ability to see how they compare to a threshold. Work with programs to understand what the standards should be for the threshold. The threshold is not to close a program but to look how the program is doing and provide feedback for improving.
- Kathleen: There needs to be some narrative. Faculty retired early but were not replaced and have to decrease number of students in program.
 - Mark: There has to be context. Initial metrics and there will be opportunities for context. Programs already do a lot and do not want to make it more work for the program.
- The six-year review will ask for more information and will follow-up and provide feedback from the Provosts office.
- Robyn: Student credit hour production for dissertation hours and how to measure this? Student to faculty ratio – would look different across programs.

- Mark: Different across programs based on full-time and part-time enrollment. Have to be mindful that graduate programs are different. Maybe it will not be simple to have the same metrics for all programs. Maybe we have to be specific from the get-go.
- Robyn: Accreditation is also important; enrollment might be limited in order to meet accreditation standards.
 - Mark: Cannot be focused on revenue but need to have our eye on this.
- Contribution margin is one metric that is included. Cost to offer the program (salary, facilities) and difference in revenue.
- Philipp: Can this be done by program?
 - Mark: It is hard to do it by program and will be done by academic unit. It would be too hard to complete by program based on faculty crossover to other programs and levels. This gets into issues with programs that span multiple units and have to be able to recognize this in looking at contribution margin.
- Robyn: Contribution margin with state funded and Extended Campus?
 - Mark: If program is only Extended Campus, it would be easy but more programs are state and cash funded. We are in the process of doing an audit on Extended Campus. It is very difficult because we are mixing accounts. Incentive to offer programs that are cash funded for Extended Campus so there is incentive to grow programs.
- Andreas: Moving beyond metrics, when completing the review can we also think about new programs.
 - Mark: Part of the idea is to develop metrics that will help determine what we are we looking at for proposing new programs. Curriculum proposals now are inadequate because they are saying no new resources are needed to add a program. Working on a new process for proposing programs. Get it out to college to decide if adding new resources for a program is needed. Giving those decisions to the college is an incentive to grow programs and enter into spaces we have not been before. Short term we need to be realistic and review current programs. Intent is to provide metrics to help with proposing new programs and what we need to think about in order to create a successful program.
- UNC programs have to be approved by the Board of Trustees. In other places, they have to be approved by systems and have to meet graduation metrics after 5 years and if not achieved, given developmental plan or teach it out. We have to be realistic and have some expectations.
- Philipp: Can we access metrics once they are available?
 - Mark: We will develop a process to identify metrics and then work with IRAS to develop a report to have those metrics automatically generated. This year we will run metrics to see what it looks like and share with Graduate and Undergraduate Councils in the spring. Then generate reports at end of spring for programs. Goal to be in spot to take feedback from this process then to modify and improve. Then in FY21 we will start to share those with units. The goal is to not only provide information but to receive feedback so we can refine and make it better.
- We have to make sure there is not a bias against or for programs. We might have to use different metrics for different colleges.
- Cindy: If you have any feedback on this process please share with her since she is on the committee. Looking at second and third level of data or context, we might need to know. Get to healthy place now where faculty can deal with students. We need good quality programs with faculty to teach.
- Next couple of years will be in the mode of keeping things steady but strong or even a decrease in some programs. We hope to be at a point in a couple of years where we can start investing in new programs or redirecting programs.

VII. **Adjournment**

Adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kirsten Ranalli

Kirsten Ranalli, Recording Secretary