There seems to be an agreement that it is time to have a campus-wide discussion about graduate education:
- There has been a lot of talk about the topic, and we are also in a time a flux (new president, talk of merger, etc. etc.)—these forums are an effort to understand what faculty are thinking in terms of graduate education so that, as we move forward through these changes, we will be organized and prepared.

A few questions from previous forums...
What is our model? What is it that we want to look like? Also, if we do want to expand, for what purpose?

Some discussion questions to guide, but not necessarily structure this discussion:
1. What do you think the role of graduate education at the College should be?
2. What do you see as the relationship between graduate and undergraduate education at the College?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of graduate education at the College?
4. What is your vision for graduate education in 2020?
(From previous Forum on Jan. 22)

Question 1. What is the role of graduate education at the College?
- Perspective from the Humanities:
  - an R1 would not work- there is not enough demand in the job market for PhDs in the job market. “We would be preparing people for unemployment” (in the case of PhDs in humanities)
  - We do not want to contribute to the “glut” of PhDs that exist in a number of fields (this may differ from department to department)

- From previous forums and from this one, a consensus appears to emerge that, in the case of doctoral programs, at most what we want is strategic development of specific, target programs that might benefit

- Do not want to build PhD programs “for the sake of doing it”

...Lets turn the discussion more toward Master’s-level program development

Question 2. What do we see as the relationship between undergraduate and graduate programs?
- Does graduate education hurt undergraduate?
- Is there a synergistic relationship?

-Biology
- Very synergistic graduate-undergraduate interaction. The existence of graduate programs provides critical mass, larger labs, more capabilities. They've experienced success in terms of interactions between students.
- Need more cross-listed courses (open to graduate and undergrad students)—might be problems with SACs requirements, but it's often a waste of time, resources, faculty to not combine certain courses. Thus, most conflict has occurred at the course-level.

- The presence of master’s programs has helped with departments attract higher quality faculty members—they want to work with graduate students, brings in better applicants

- We recognize that there are a lot of different reasons for wanting a graduate program, depending on the department (i.e. job opportunities, bringing in better faculty, putting students to work on specific research projects, etc.)

- Another participant acknowledges that since having a graduate program, their department has seen better faculty as well as better students.

- Departments report that there is a very positive, synergistic relationship between their graduate program and the Citadel (joint programs)—"It is a wise use of scarce resources for both entities"
  There are however some logistical challenges (different grading systems, different academic calendars) that need to be eased.

Graduate students on campus report that they feel "invisible" –like an afterthought, due to the fact that there is so much focus on undergraduates. They feel (and are treated) as second class citizens—when it comes to resources (or at least communication of resources)

This raises a new question: Are graduate programs not as visible on campus? What could we do about it? What would be the benefit of more visibility?

- Widespread agreement that, yes, graduate students and programs are not as visible.
  - There may be some blame that can be attributed to the programs themselves (not enough self-promotion). But, at the same time, there may be the notion that graduate programs need to "keep their heads down" and not draw attention to deflect the negative attention that grad programs at the College sometime receive
"We shouldn’t have graduate programs” is an attitude that many say they encounter on a regular basis. As a result, departments with graduate programs tend to isolate themselves.

How can we turn this around? Why don’t some people on campus want graduate programs?

-How much impact do evening-only classes contribute to the feeling of invisibility?
-Some participants agree that yes, this can contribute
-Graduate programs are also seen as cash cows—that grad programs should only bring in money, rather than give money out to students. This is a money issue.

Who is the audience? By whom do graduate students need/want to be seen?

-We accommodate two different kinds of graduate students with different needs: One set that, for them, their master’s is a secondary thing (i.e. to get a promotion, additional training, career development, etc)—they are already working, need to take classes at night, only a few at a time. VERSUS students who are getting a master’s because they’ve found something they really want to do, might be considering doctoral level, want a full graduate experience. The point: We can’t miss this latter group.

Do faculty members and directors also have the same feelings of invisibility in terms of their grad students? How could we more effectively integrate the, and why—what would we gain?

-It wouldn’t help to jump into PhD programs—it won’t help this issue.
-Let’s not divert resources to develop any new, more expensive programs
-Approve on what we already have—we have established ourselves as a substantial graduate school for Master’s degrees, let’s approve upon that (primary need = money, resources, scholarships, etc.)

How much do we target our own undergraduate students to apply to graduate programs at the College?

-Participants report that they often encourage their undergraduate students to go elsewhere because that’s what is in their best interests.
-Others say that they experience trouble getting the word out about graduate programs to undergraduate students—need the College itself to match their efforts in terms of marketing
-Finally, there is a need for more funding for assistantships and fellowships— “Why would I recruit and encourage a student to come here when I know they could get a free ride somewhere else?”
So, there is a need to elevate the presence of graduate education here.

- Marketing
- Resources

Is this systemic? Is it that we just have such focus on undergraduate, liberal arts education that, as an institution, we don’t talk/focus on graduate education enough?

- Some agree that, yes, this is a systemic issue—some departments have faculty who have been here 20 + years and have the feeling that “this is a liberal arts institution and I didn’t sign on for [an expanding graduate school]” – of course, we know that the two are not mutually exclusive, but some have the feeling that they are.

Why is there such antagonism against the idea of graduate education at the College?

- It seems to come from a place of fear: fear that we as a faculty will, once again, be asked to do more with less.
- Fear that members will be less valued if their desire to teach only at the undergraduate level.
- Fear that graduate education will become another initiative to fall on the backs of faculty without the necessary resources to follow.

*We need to nix the kind of thinking that says graduate programs/students only bring in money or are supposed to only bring in money—NO. They are extremely expensive. We can't forget this.

There are many different flavors of liberal arts institutions that have both strong undergraduate and graduate (Master’s level) programs—are there models we could use??

- Because it seems that there’s a consensus that, no, we do not want to become an R1.
- So, what then? What is the model? This also gets at: What is the mission of graduate education at the College?

The College is extremely unique—Carnegie generates no comparable institutions for us.

- We’re the size of a regional comprehensive, but we don’t have PhD programs, and we still have the feel of a liberal arts institution (students get that type of experience)

No particular model in mind, but it would be great to have a more flexible structure and relationship between graduate education programs and undergraduate.

- i.e. allow undergraduate students to sit in on graduate education classes, more integration
- For example, publicize the fact that undergraduate students with a certain GPA are eligible to take graduate level courses
- more cross-listed courses
  - SACs—actually likes cross-listed (i.e. multiple classifications of students for different types of course credit)—there is just a need for intentionality and to show the reasons why its necessary/good, as well as how to student’s needs will be protected.

- Getting a cross listed course is complicated, bureaucratic process

- Other programs try to keep the option of having undergraduate students in graduate courses “close to the chest”--it really shouldn’t be offered to too many students, its should be only the most spectacular

Maybe we could reach out to the Honor’s college, recruit from their student pool for this option--but, they have all these other curricular requirements, so, that may have obstacles
  - Other participants say that this is a good idea, perhaps something we should pitch--would help integration

Ultimately, “we have a cultural problem”--only time will fix this. So, in the meantime, certain departments will merge forward, when they want it bad enough so fight for the resources, let them go out and try, and then they can become the model and then others can join, and the cultural issues might go away.

What would a successful expansion of graduate education look like? What things would need to happen?

- Resources, Resources, Resources

- Cultural changes
  - Some report that they would like teaching a grad course to not be seen as an indulgence; to get rid of the resistance (maybe it will just change over time, but would like to see it go sooner than later)

- Define clearly where we’re going --people who resist graduate programs make slippery slope arguments (“oh, next we’ll be an R1, or we will have PhDs, etc. etc”) NO: declare what it is that we do well, commit to it, and plan to improve upon that

- The CofC strategic plan--discussions about where the College as a whole is going have changed over night, and this is where the resistance comes from

Lets try to identify where this culture of resistance lies on campus
Maybe present a model of growth: department-by-department evaluates the need for graduate education and develops a plan on its own. This way, the College can generate models with in itself--kind of like states as laboratory

A lot of our programs are location-centered: The city is the laboratory --use this, build on the existing strength of the Charleston area

Resistance = fear
  -That is, fear of loss of resources--this is going to take away from my program, and from faculty time --find a way to deal fairly with faculty time (some begrudge those colleagues who only have to teach small grad classes)

- MUST PROTECT the quality of undergrad--because if we grow too quickly, we will end up with a mediocre undergrad program in addition to a mediocre grad program

-Departments--we are confused, and we need to know where we're going--because, we don't know if we are providing a pre-professional degree or a pre-PhD program? Its not "if we build it they will come," right now, its "we will build depend on who comes"

-Some departments report that their undergraduate students out-perform grad students--particular when they have these great specialized skills---this is an opportunity to have a positive and useful feedback loop

-Is one message that should come out of this is that we really need to look at and assess our graduate program? A lot of talk about poor student quality...What about the quality of graduate faculty?

  -Participants, say, actually yes, there are problems with graduate faculty as well
  -Other institutions have special requirements to teach in graduate school--is this something we might want to pursue??
    -Concerns about a two-tier faculty system?
      -Others say, yes: it’s an incentive, esp. if there is merit pay
      -Other programs just don’t have that kind of flexibility (i.e. back and forth between undergrad and graduate; its by area of expertise--you could be excluded from the grad faculty courses)

- Some programs also attach additional responsibilities to those who get to teach grad classes

- Lets not think of it as two-tier, elite versus secondary; rather think of it as recognition based on publication rates, etc. etc. so that it exists as a separate indicator
  -Most feedback: that would be viewed cynically--"That's already all of our jobs"
Previous forum: RESOURCES, RESOURCES, RESOURCES.

-It will be helpful to think of things as they are now, and ask where we can improve--rather than projecting it out, ten, fifteen years, etc.
-Strengthen our existing master’s programs now--this will help no matter what, and might help garner support down the road depending on what decisions are made.

-Lets focus on stories where programs DID get this resources they needed.