MINUTES OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING  
Friday, February 21, 2020 – 3:00 PM  
Robert Scott Small, Room 235

Chair – Godfrey Gibbison, Interim Dean of the Graduate School

Members and Guests Present: Emily Beck (LALE/ESOL), Vince Benigni (COMM/HSS), Mary Bergstrom (RO), Deanna Caveny (AA), Karen Chandler (HIST), Roger Daniels (ACCY), Mark Del Mastro (AA), Susan Divine (HISP/LCWA), Mike Duvall (ENGL), Grant Gilmore (CPAD), Gerald Gordon (URBP), Melissa Hughes (BIOL/SSM), Martin Jones (MATH), Alex Kasman (MASC), Brian Lanahan (EDEL), Brendan Laubner (IR), Ron Magnuson (MBA), Judy Millesen (MPA), John Peters (SMFT), Craig Plante (MBIO), Emily Rosko (CREW), student in place of Susan Simonian (MSCL), Sandy Slater (CGE), Rafael Teixeira (SCIM/SOB), Annette Watson (ENSS), Kelley White (EDEC), Mikey Zinn (GSA)

GSO Staff Present: Laura Everett (Recruitment & Marketing), Susan Hallatt (Admissions), Robyn Olejniczak (Student Records), Erica Shirley (Admissions & Support Services)

I. Welcome – the meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm.

II. Approval of the Minutes January 24, 2020 Meeting – unanimous approval

III. Curriculum Proposals – Sandy Slater, CGE

A. Computer & Information Sciences, MS
   i. CSIS 638: description change

   The course description change is needed to align with the Citadel’s catalog course description.

   The proposal passed unanimously without discussion.

B. Data Science & Analytics, MS
   i. DATA 699: prereq change

   The existing prerequisite was too prohibitive and did not allow students to complete the program in one calendar year. This allows the student to enroll in thesis credits in the second semester.

   The proposal passed unanimously without discussion.

C. Early Childhood Education, MAT
   i. EDEE 525: course title and description change
   ii. EDEE 550: course title, description, number change
   iii. EDEE 567: new course – science methods in early childhood education
   iv. EDEE 588: prereq, course title, and description change
   v. Program change: reduce degree hours from 48 to 45, offer 18-month accelerated program format in addition to existing format, remove 2 required courses, add new course

   These changes enable to program to reduce its degree hours and separate out some content that currently exists in one course. The program would also like to offer an accelerated format similar to the Elementary Education MAT, but it requires approval beyond the College of Charleston.
All proposals passed unanimously without discussion.

D. History, MA
   i. Admissions reqs: decrease letters of recommendation from 3 to 2, decrease required undergraduate coursework in history from 15 to 9 hours
   ii. Public History Concentration: add courses to electives, add clarification re: thesis requirement
   iii. HIST 803: new course – comprehensive exam
   iv. Program change: reduce required 700-level seminars from 2 to 1 for Comp Track students, add new required course for Comp Track students, add additional elective course for Comp Track students

These changes restructure the existing program requirements for regular students and Public History students by removing required courses and adding a course for students on the Compressive Exam track. It also add clarity to the required thesis enrollment for Public History students. The program is also lowering the amount of required undergraduate history for applicants and reducing the number of required letters of recommendation.

All proposals passed unanimously without discussion.

E. Languages, MED
   i. SPAN 698: new course – independent study
   ii. Program change: reduce degree hours from 37 to 31, remove required technology course, reduce emphasis areas (ESOL, SPAN) from 15 to 12 hours, add new course, add clarification re: capstone and elective requirements

These changes reduce the degree hours and the required hours in each emphasis area (Spanish and ESOL). It also adds a new independent study course for students in the Spanish emphasis, and adds clarifying language to the capstone portfolio requirement.

All proposals passed unanimously without discussion.

F. Mathematical Sciences, MS
   i. Statistics Concentration: remove requirement for one additional course after two course sequences
   ii. Math Concentration: remove requirement for one additional course after two course sequences

These changes remove the additional course students were required to take within their concentration. The program felt it was overburdening given students were already demonstrating content mastery through the required sequences.

Both proposals passed unanimously without discussion.

G. Special Education certificate
   i. Post-Masters certificate: program termination

The program has not had any enrolled students for several years so there is no teach-out plan needed. The termination also helps address some confusion in the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance since there were two graduate certificates with the same requirements – one post-bac and one post-masters. Jon Hakkila (GSO)
added that is a welcomed clean-up for something that was also confusing to the Graduate School.

The proposal passed unanimously without discussion.

IV. **Update on the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate School Financial Model** – Godfrey Gibbison, Graduate School; Deanna Caveny, Academic Affairs

Deanna Caveny (AA) continued the discussion of the work of the ad hoc committee. The topic of focus was instructional costs and she walked the group through a prepared powerpoint presentation. Using the 1/6 as a the agreed upon distribution of cost, she discussed the distinction between instructional and program cost. Program costs include instructional cost, but also things like program director stipends, cost of course releases, operating budgets, administrative staff support. Gathering program cost data has been a challenge since not all programs have their own budget index. Caveny outlined some definitions and measures including revenue minus expenses, instructional cost per student credit hour, program cost per student per credit hour. She explained the committee’s understanding of graduate “economics” to be does the revenue cover all expenses, what is the intrinsic value of the program, what is the market value of the program, and how does this compare to our peers. Institutional Research (IR) developed a methodology that can be applied to each graduate program and possibly to undergraduate programs in the future. Alex Kasman (MASC) asked about students that are enrolled in courses but are not in the program – accelerated undergraduates or students from other graduate programs for example. Caveny (AA) responded that the methodology considers purely instructional cost regardless of who is in the classroom. Roger Daniels (ACCY) asked how the 1/6 v. 1/8 cost-sharing was decided. Caveny (AA) responded that it was decided at the previous meeting when one member made an argument for 1/6 and no one countered or made an argument for 1/8.

Jason Coy (HIST) asked how to consider faculty that are teaching in a joint programs. Caveny (AA) responded that it is too complicated to include that in the calculation at this point. John Peters (SMFT) asked how instruction delivered through individual enrollment are being considered and how whether or not adjuncts have fringe costs. Caveny (AA) responded that those enrollments are included in the instructional cost even though the faculty are doing it as a part of their teaching load and without compensation, and yes, some adjuncts qualify for retirement and health benefits. Daniels (ACCY) noted that because his program is being used as an example of the instructional cost calculation his costs look high, but that he also teaches a lot of undergraduates. Caveny (AA) responded that graduate instruction tends to be higher on average and that because graduate programs are smaller, the proportional calculations can fluctuate greatly from year to year. She added that the ad hoc committee knows that including joint programs, interdisciplinary programs, and programs that share courses are going to be a challenge for the methodology. Brian Lanahan (EDEL) wondered if programs this is going to incentivize programs to lower their quality because it will be less expensive to use adjuncts. Hakkila (GSO) countered that programs should invest in the quality of their programs, which will enable them to recruit better students and faculty.

Peters (SMFT) asked what purpose the data will serve once calculated and how it will be used for programs with high cost. Caveny (AA) responded that the intent is to not make decisions purely based on these data – the intrinsic value of a program is also very important in the overall study, but the President wants the College to consider different budget models. Godfrey Gibbison (GSO/SPS) added that the President wants programs to grow and wants to incentivize growth so we have to have a method that can project costs associated with that growth. Ron Magnuson (MBA) added that it is important to consider the cost of program competitors. Caveny (AA) responded that peer information is not hard to gather since the College has access to data from IPEDS and the Delaware Study; she noted that some measures will be comparable but not all. Craig Plante (MBIO) said that it is odd this work is being conducted by the Graduate School instead of the academic schools or
departments that actually control the funds. He added that the Marine Biology program is providing a service to the Biology department through teaching assistantships, but the costs will look high. Hakkila (GSO) responded that the President tasked the Graduate School with this study, not schools or departments. Caveny (AA) added that one way to approach the President’s request would be to impose rules and methodology onto programs, but the committee is intentionally keeping stakeholders updated and engaged to have a collaborative decision-making process. Emily Rosko (CREW) asked what the proposed timeline of the committee’s work is. Caveny (AA) responded that we have not been given a deadline so we do not have a direct answer. Melissa Hughes (BIOL/SSM) asked if faculty input has changed the direction of the committee. Caveny (AA) responded yes, faculty decided to adopt a 1/6 instead of 1/8 cost-sharing model. Gibbison (GSO/SPS) closed the discussion by listing three decisions that have been or will need to be made: 1) assistantships are being treated as financial awards which are not costs that are passed on to the program, 2) should a separate methodology be developed for joint programs, 3) the programs in the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance will be treated as one block as it would be too labor-intensive to try to disentangle these programs for our purposes. He is also still gathering information on the administrative support graduate programs receive from their departments or schools since this data is not readily available via IR.

V. Graduate Student Association – Mikey Zinn, President

Mikey Zinn (GSA) provided an update on what they have been working on this semester. They still intend to restructure the GSA and have done some peer research that presents some interesting options. They also intend to restructure the way delegates are managed/required. The intent is to only require one delegate from each program, and students will not be eligible for funding if there is no program delegate. The GSA is working with the 250th party planning committee and will help collect 250 letters to send to veterans, collect food for the Cougar Food Pantry, and donate produce from to student garden beds. They also intend to replenish their regalia inventory to be able to provide more rentals to graduating students. The GSA is also putting together some professional development opportunities for graduate students including free College of Charleston business cards, headshots, and a LinkedIn workshop. He closed by encouraging program directors to remind their students to complete the Youth Count survey that is collecting data on student food and housing insecurity as it will be important to understand the graduate-specific data.

VI. Announcements, Updates and Reminders – GSO Staff

Hakkila (GSO) noted that this semester’s thesis workshop had the highest attendance yet, which is a good sign that students find it valuable. Peters (SMFT) noted that the poster session’s scheduling makes it hard for full-time teachers to participate as they are at work. The Graduate School could consider aligning the poster session with spring break for Charleston County Schools. Susan Hallatt (GSO) added that between her and the programs, there is a good completion rate for applications – rather than applications remaining un-submitted and incomplete.

VII. For the Good of the Order

There were no comments for the good of the order.

VIII. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 4:48pm