

Approved  
Vote: 5-0-1  
May 5, 2009

Graduate Council  
Meeting 17  
April 21, 2009

**Indiana State University  
Faculty Senate  
GRADUATE COUNCIL  
Minutes**

Present: W. Barratt, S. Barton-Bellessa, M. Boyer, B. Corcoran, E. Hampton, M. Haque, B. El-Mansour, L. O'Laughlin

Absent: Stan Buchanan

Speaking Seats: D. Collins (COE), J. Gatrell (SoGS Dean), S. Gick (Registrar), H. Hudson (CAS), A. Jamison (Graduate SGA), D. Mallory (Nursing), G. Maughan (Technology), R. McGiverin (Library), T. Sawyer (Senate Exec.)

Guests: S. Anderson (Art)

1. **Call to Order:** M. Boyer called the meeting to order at 8:02 AM.
2. **Agenda:** The agenda was adopted by acclamation.
3. **Minutes:** L. O'Laughlin moved approval of minutes from 04.14.09; M. Haque seconded. Minutes were approved. **Vote: 6-0-2.**
4. **Old/Unfinished/Ongoing Business**
5. **New Business**
  - a. Curriculum Items regarding Physical Education are still before Program Development Committee. Approved changes include: three tracks being combined into two and three course title and description changes. The curriculum committee is still reviewing three new syllabi that have arrived late.
  - b. Graduate Outcomes/Goals Workgroup Report
    - i. L. O'Laughlin reports on the Assurance of Graduate Student Learning Outcomes. The document comes from committee and so is on the floor as an action item without a motion. The five principle learning outcome goals (revised per discussion) that are aligned with the ISU and SoGS Mission Statements are as follows:-
      - Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.
      - Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.
      - Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.
      - Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.
      - Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.
    - ii. Discussion:
      1. On language: A number of GC members suggest specific language changes to the learning outcome goals to assure consistency and clarity. These are accepted and included in the above text. B.
      2. On the reporting process: There is a significant discussion about the specific reporting mechanism for this assessment proposal.

A single template is discouraged because over the first reporting cycles, a variety of reporting styles will yield insight into the best reporting formats. However, page limits are important as this is not meant to be an onerous process. M. Boyer says that the procedure and requirements for the report need to be kept simple and clear. E. Hampton asks if specific data will be required as evidence for the attainment of learning objectives. There is concern that this might be a data-heavy program review.

3. Further discussion of the reporting process: There also is some question as to how this assessment plan fits with similar program review mechanisms in bodies (like CAAC) overseeing undergraduate program reviews. M. Boyer states that the development of a graduate academic plan will be important to further guide this process. S. Barton notes that responses from non-accredited programs might be different than from accredited programs, who are more accustomed to this sort of review for accreditation purposes. L. O'Laughlin notes that the reporting process for programs with established assessment procedures will be similar to that of accredited programs, as they will already have much of the work done. She also notes that there is a campus wide expectation that all programs will engage in assessment procedures.
4. On the overall purpose: H. Hudson affirms that the purpose here is the review and improvement of individual programs by the programs themselves. A number of GC members state that effective university-wide dissemination and buy-in by the graduate faculty are essential. M. Boyer reminds that this proposal is an acknowledgement of the general campus need for program review.
5. On non-compliance: The question of non-compliance is raised by S. Barton. J. Gatrell suggests that a lack of participation might be addressed by GC through the procedures that GC already maintains (curriculum approval and peer pressure). The developing university wide assessment council will provide support to programs in developing effective assessment procedures. Once again, this review/assessment is not an accounting exercise but is meant to be useful for programs themselves. It is not about cutting or retaining programs or distributing funds; program review has too often been tied to the budgeting process. Program review involves a different set of questions and expectations. M. Boyer says that perhaps there should be some statement that this is *not* program review.
6. J. Gatrell recommends that presentation of graduate student learning outcomes is something that needs to be thought through more strategically. To lay the groundwork for broad community-wide approval, this still needs to go before deans and chairs. H. Hudson notes that a vote on the outcomes section of the proposal might be useful.
7. L. O'Laughlin moves approval of the goals as amended by discussion; M. Haque seconds. **Vote: 7-0-1.**
8. The committee will consider recommended adjustments in the narrative statement on "Assurance of Student Learning-Graduate Education at ISU" in preparation for ongoing discussion of the issues raised above.

- c. Nominations for a graduate faculty member on the Athletics Committee are needed. GC recommends four faculty members: Jolynn Kulhman, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Tim Demchak, and Susan Berta.

**6. Reports:**

- a. Chairperson (M. Boyer):
  - i. Subcommittee summary reports are coming in and will be reviewed in our next meeting.
- b. Faculty Senate Liaison's Report (T. Sawyer):
  - i. Exec approved the name change.
- c. Administrative Report (J. Gatrell, SoGS Dean):
  - i. A complication has come up in the name change approval process. The task force looking at use of the terms "college" and "school" sees our name change as useful. CAAC will complete the review. There will be no added administrative expansion as a result of the name change.
  - ii. Next year, J. Gatrell will bring before the GC a formal edit of the Graduate Assistantship stipend guidelines.
- d. Registrar's Report (S. Gick):
  - i. Registrar is testing a process for the email notification of faculty of students dropping, adding, or withdrawing from specific courses. These adjustments would also automatically appear in Blackboard class listings.
- e. Graduate Student Report: (A. Jamison)
  - i. The graduate student luncheon was not well attended though it was well-catered.

**7. Upcoming Business**

- a. The next GC meeting will be May 5, 2009 to discuss curriculum matters, GC committee reports, and graduate student learning goals-outcomes reporting (continued).
- b. GC Sub Committee reports.

**8. Adjournment – 8:53 AM**

Respectfully submitted,  
Brendan Corcoran, Secretary