**Graduate Studies Meeting Minutes for October 12, 2023**

**3:05 pm**

Sprague-Carlton Room

 [Minutes](https://myccsu.sharepoint.com/%3Aw%3A/s/GraduateStudiesCommittee/EQFAbsFZEOtMpb1g6WsikJkBRUngBfLDk1IPOdetTGCCjw?e=xG2uGr) from last meeting

Meeting [Schedule](https://myccsu.sharepoint.com/%3Ab%3A/s/GraduateStudiesCommittee/EaISBToQnqlFmpnckFsIThABw4Rgw7W_2-G7CPniQgv9hw?e=Sf8Dsq)

Attendance: D. Kirby

Announcements:

* The minutes from the 9/21/23 meeting were approved without objection.

Standing Committees

* [CURRICULUM](https://myccsu.sharepoint.com/%3Ax%3A/s/GraduateStudiesCommittee/ESzPk3sb4rNGv1fX07QSBkgBrbnkvvb8wxUTfZECFspYlg?e=sy7YRd)- Chair: Toni Ryan
	+ Discussion of Construction Management Program change & admissions policy

T. Ryan summarized the consent agenda. T. Ryan indicated that the Curriculum Committee met and clarified the nature of program changes proposed and approved the changes noted on the consent agenda. There was one issue removed from the consent agenda to be discussed and voted on separately for the Department of Construction Management

The consent agenda was approved without objection.

D. Kirby from Construction Management represented the department at our meeting.

There was confusion regarding the department’s desire to change their admission criteria. The department did not want to remove conditional admission. Rather than requiring CM500, they wanted to allow the program coordinator to decide whether to admit students without a background in construction management. In working with N. Lamont from Curriculum, the Department of Construction Management would like to be less specific about what courses might be required for case by case decision making about admittance.

M. Davis – Is there a program policy for deciding who is admitted that is similar for all applicants?

D. Kirby felt that the criteria are better spelled out on the program website as opposed to the curriculum description. This would make the decision making process more flexible.

M. Davis – Do you ever have students disagree about what additional classes are required?

The department has typically required CM500. This plan was not working as intended and thus this change was proposed.

Regarding the policy change vote, the changes were approved without objection.

Regarding the program change vote, the changes were approved without objection.

* + - * + POLICY – Chair K. Shah

No report provided.

M. Davis – Some information was formerly listed on the Policy website that provided directions regarding how departments should remedy policy issues. It was suggested that this information be made more readily available.

* + - * + AWARDS & SCHOLARSHIP- Chair: Jillian Maynard

No report provided.

New Business

* Enrollment related updates from AVP Christina Robinson
	+ We have a bigger applicant pool for Spring 2024 than we did last year. Our acceptance pool is also up significantly from this time last year. Some of that pool may be deferred students from the Fall.
	+ C. Robinson took time to stress that some of the students attending the Open House will be visiting the Open House virtually from other countries.
	+ We have our Open House on 10/21/23 from 10am to 12pm in the Willard-DiLoreto Atirum.
* Updates from AVP John Tully
	+ Communication
		- We have a new social media plan. We have Instagram, Facebook and X accounts.
		- We have restarted the Graduate Student Association. There was an election and executive board appointed.
		- J. Tully is also considering different ways for communicating with the Registrar Office in a more efficient manner
	+ Role of the Graduate School in thesis and capstone review:
		- Graduate Studies provides the university’s final approval of graduate students’ theses and capstones. John is looking for your thoughts about the best way to support students and faculty in this role.
			* For example, is the review primarily designed to ensure a level of mastery worthy of a graduate degree? Is it a way to monitor and ensure that students are being treated fairly within and across departments? Is it simply a check for proper formatting? Or is it some combination of these elements and possibly others?
				+ In this role, J. Tully indicated that it would be possible that he would compare the length of different theses or the quality of different theses to notice trends in departmental theses and make recommendations to better standardize the process.
		- J. Tully was hoping for some feedback from the group.
			* J. Sikorski thought it would be best if some sort of rubric was developed so that J. Tully or someone from the School of Graduate Studies to use when evaluating the quality of the theses.
				+ J. Sikorski indicated that he thought it would be best to discuss what should be evaluated and how by the Graduate School at the departmental level as opposed to the level of Graduate Studies Committee representative. J. Sikorski thought we should ask our departments first.
				+ C. Robinson feels this is an important conversation to have as soon as possible. Having a plan for worrying less about past confusing policies and focusing in on clarifying procedures is a worthy goal.
				+ Counseling person – There are a lot of policies and paperwork that are unnecessary and adds time and work to the process in a way that does not facilitate student learning.
				+ W. Henry indicated that they had worked at a couple of institutions and faculty and administration recognized that this was not a good use of time based on the needs of other graduate students, so they moved away from one central executive review of theses and dissertations.

N. Zlatareva noted that everything has already been discussed and evaluated by multiple faculty members and she was not clear why there was some sort of executive administrative review required.

* + - * + L. Jacobson – We should seek information from the department about possible roles that J. Tully and Graduate Studies could pursue at the level of administrative review. These processes, for the last several years, have been required steps that needed to be pursued by students.

L. Jacobson thought we should ask the department for information beyond ideas that the review may not be necessary. Is there a reason why we have the executive review process? Is there a reason we have someone who knows how the theses and capstones look across graduate programs?

* + - * + J. Tully – There are some reasons why an executive review or approval would be needed at the level of Graduate Studies.

Many agreed that these reasons should be a part of any discussion.

Graduate students don’t have a lot of voice or recognition. So having somebody or some group who do those readings and knows the rules gives us an idea of what is going on in graduate studies across the varying departments

J. Tully added that he hopes to use his role to serve as a trusted advocate for graduate students. After all, there would not be anyone else who would have the broad background to react to inequities.

J. Tully would want to notice if one department member was doing things different than others.