

College of Charleston
Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
Executive Summary for the open Faculty Forum Meetings

Purpose of the Faculty Forums

Five round-table discussions were held from January 22 - February 11, 2014 to discuss the role and the future of graduate education at the College of Charleston. With organizational assistance from the Graduate School, the Graduate Committee sought input from the College faculty: those who have taught graduate courses and/or who worked with graduate students as well as those not participating in graduate education. Although the potential growth of graduate programs has been part of the College's planning for some time, recent and well-publicized suggestions for change -- from a merger with the Medical University of South Carolina, to a purchase of the Charleston School of Law, and to the need for a comprehensive university in Charleston -- have played an important role in triggering the forums. The CofC academic community had not previously aired different perspectives on graduate education as it had done extensively with general education and with the College's identity. This document summarizes key points from these discussions. However, as the issues are complex and cannot be fully captured in an executive summary, we submit the recorded minutes of these forums in their entirety.

Expanding Master's Programs and Adding Doctoral Programs

There is general faculty interest in expanding and developing new master's programs at the College when it can be demonstrated that it is advantageous for the institution to do so. Possible advantages of program expansions include servicing specific employment needs within the Lowcountry community, taking advantage of the increased marketability of certain disciplines, using untapped expertise among College faculty in developing new programs, and finding collaborative opportunities both within the institution and with other local universities that could be used in developing new programs.

Beyond master's programs, there is also interest in developing a small number of targeted doctoral programs. Faculty interest in such programs is currently limited to academic areas such as Education in which there is a specific hiring need and in which the need for additional resources is minimal. However, it should be noted that EdD discussions have not thus far been successful.

The expansion of existing graduate programs and the development of new programs is not without concerns. Faculty want expanded graduate programs to be strong, vibrant, and competitive. In order for this to happen they want any expansion to be a bottom-up process rather than an externally-imposed process, they do not want this expansion to harm the College's strong undergraduate programs, and they do not want expansion to occur without adequate funding, infrastructure, and other support.

Caveats and Concerns in Expanding Graduate Programs

1) Bottom-Up vs. Top-Down Program Development

Faculty members are concerned with the possibility of unplanned, unsupported growth of graduate programs. Their general expectation is that such programs will be developed in a bottom-up approach that makes use of as much existing programmatic support facilities and personnel as possible, such that the programs are being developed in response to internal ideas and opportunities rather than external pressures. The possibility of a forced merger with MUSC is seen as the opposite of a bottom-up approach: external forces are driving the discussion rather than faculty.

2) New Graduate Programs Should Not Harm Undergraduate Programs

The faculty generally see the College of Charleston's identity as that of an undergraduate institution dedicated to the liberal arts and sciences model. There is great concern that putting an increased emphasis on graduate programs could change the academic culture of the institution, and therefore its identity. It is generally agreed that a large-scale expansion of graduate programs is not likely to work if it harms undergraduate programs, and if it is thus done in a way competitive to undergraduate program development.

3) Program Expansion Needs Financial Support to Succeed

The lack of resources to support graduate expansion is a critical problem. Resources in the form of improved infrastructure, money for research equipment and new space, higher faculty salaries and lines to offset lower teaching loads, and increased graduate student stipends, have not been promised by anyone. In fact, College administration has expressed doubt that such support is coming, and legislators proposing merger legislation have expressly stated their expectation that a merger will result in a cost savings. Many faculty members feel that the College is already underfunded. There is real fear that graduate education expansion in this environment would detract from all levels of institutional operation instead of providing an added value. Thus, there is a real uncertainty as to the values that expanded graduate education might bring to the College.

To be successful, expanded graduate programs need to attract and retain high-quality students in a competitive regional and national market. Graduate students currently receive minimal financial support, and South Carolina does not even allow them to receive tuition waivers. Without significant improvement in financial support, the College will have difficulty competing with other educational institutions for graduate students.

Similarly, blindly adding doctoral programs without properly testing the market for such programs is undesirable, and could potentially contribute to what is already a glut on the market of PhDs. There are concerns that increasing the number of graduate students at the College could change the College's status with grant agencies, which would disqualify the institution for many of the grants that are received as an undergraduate institution. Furthermore, the College currently does not have the infrastructure to support many doctoral programs. This is particularly true in the sciences (e.g. Biology and Chemistry, which have supplied individual department letters), where research programs capable of producing competitive advanced students require expensive equipment, significantly increased and sustainable student financial support, additional space, increased staff support, and new faculty lines.

Conclusions

These forums have indicated that graduate education already plays an important part in education at the College of Charleston, and that it can play a more important role in the future. The College is at a crossroads, and faculty support exists for expanding involvement in graduate programs and for making the College into an institution in which graduate programs augment existing undergraduate strengths. However, expansion and improvement of graduate programs should be done thoughtfully, with foresight, and with adequate financial support. The Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs urges the faculty, the administration, the Board of Trustees, business leaders, and politicians to continue discussion on these issues in ways that take these concerns into consideration.

Graduate Education Forum
January 22, 2014
2:00-3:00
Maybank 208
Facilitator: Dr. Jo Ann Ewalt

The role and future graduate education, to date, is yet to be formally addressed throughout campus, but we know it is a topic of interest. The purpose of these faculty forums is to hopefully drive the agenda forward thoughtfully.

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?

Question #1 What do you think the role of graduate education at the College is now, and what should it be?

-Difficult to not fuse this question with Question #2—the two are linked: What does CofC want to be (in comparison to other institutions)?

-Currently, the College is so focused on its undergraduates, these students get attention and research opportunities not afforded elsewhere. There is the thought that expansion of graduate education may detract from this and take away from undergraduate experience. Don't want to disrupt this unique "Undergraduate Research University"

-At the same time, gaps exist in the job market, the community, as well as with research conducted here at the College, that would benefit from the expansion of certain graduate programs. This expansion would also benefit undergraduate students who wish to continue education, but currently must go elsewhere.

-A conflict, therefore, exists. But, the general consensus is that there are gaps that an expansion of at least certain graduate education programs could certainly fill.

The question, then, becomes: Is this really a zero-sum game? Does the expansion of graduate education have jeopardize/take away from the undergraduate experience?

-The experience of some department chairs that currently have graduate programs is that, NO, graduate education does not have to come at the cost undergraduate. The two are not necessarily mutually exclusive. These departments that have established graduate programs did so due to the size

and diversity of the Charleston area, and an apparent lack of graduate development. To date, program assessment efforts seem to suggest that graduates are filling jobs in the areas that were lacking previously. → Seems to demonstrate that graduate education has a purpose in our community and is filling “gaps”

-Another thought is that, proportionally, the number of students interested in advanced degrees and research is relatively small—therefore, diverting resources/focus to this smaller proportion of graduate students shouldn't necessarily impact the majority of undergraduates. (Some disagreement about this; participants point to the high number of undergraduates that are involved in advanced research).

-Presence of graduate students might encourage and mentor the more promising undergraduate students.

Depending on the type of graduate program that's being discussed, the needs a program will meet are vast and diverse: What, ultimately, are we trying to accomplish with the expansion of graduate education at the College?

-We feel confident in the job the College is doing at the undergraduate level. But now, recent economic activity in the area seems to indicate that we should expand, become a strong research institution in the Lowcountry.

-Some anecdotal examples of where graduation education expansion did hurt the undergraduate experience—for example: switching faculty lines in order to staff a new program, undergraduate programs suffer.

-Moving forward, then, it is not so much a matter of whether we want or need graduate education expansion, but rather, HOW are we going to accomplish it? Need to understand the policy and process

For example: one popular way to off-set the cost of graduate education is the use of graduate students (TAs) as instructors—there is a strong notion that this can detract from undergraduate education—but is this the only viable/successful financial model?

The issue of teaching assistance is multifarious, and there are rationales for conflict mentioned above. While some TAs can be used as instructors of record (after 18 hours, etc.), the majority of TAs are not and, instead, are used in lower division courses with heavy supervision. One participant whose department currently relies on TAs believes that a very useful and positive feedback loop can exist between TAs and undergraduates. Support for both graduate and undergraduates can be mutually reinforcing.

-“We should be enormously proud of the amount and quality of undergraduate research [at the College]. It is what sets us apart nationally” ...and can be enhanced by the presence of graduate students.

Infrastructure can be a concern: Will we be able to offer adequate support to more and more graduate students? Where would this support come from? The financial needs associated with expansion must be a thought-out very carefully, top priority. Currently, this topic lacks feedback from certain levels of the administration at the College.

Institutional identity crises—one participant offers her experiences at another institution that, in trying to become a tier 1 research inst, tripled the size of its graduate school. Very trying, very costly. Consider the fact that graduate programs at the College are already underfunded currently. Her recommendation: Decision-making is problematic when it is top-down, needs to be communicated thoroughly from the bottom-up. (Why these forums are taking place)

Bigger question: What is our goal (with expanding graduate education)
Is the ultimate end to become a tier one research university?

What are the questions that we need to ask and have answered before we move forward? (Surely there is institutional knowledge of what these questions are, how can we tap into that?)

- How will we manage and provide student support?
- Distance learning? Hands-on research v. distance? (Consensus: distance learning is not desirable)
- scholarships & assistantship funding
- TA/instructor policy questions

“We want to [expand graduate education]. We want to do it right. Because we know we are doing something very, very right at the undergraduate level.”

Issues of cost arise again. Question posed to department chairs present: “How many new lines would you like to request today?”

-For some, it isn’t just faculty lines, but also support lines (i.e. technical support in Geo dept.) to free up time for faculty who are currently covering teaching, research, and support.

-Another program reports it needs 5 or 6 new lines, just to catch up at the undergraduate level.

-Another program reports that it is dependent on a large number of adjuncts, and would not necessarily like to replace them with a large number of FT faculty—likes working with adjuncts because it provides flexibility as

enrollment surges and lulls from term to term. But would like more funding for adjuncts, as well as for Graduate Assistants.

“We are 240 years old, and we’re still trying to figure out who we want to be.”

Doctoral Programs

-There seems to be a lot of pressure from the outside community in support of instituting more doctoral programs in the Lowcountry—likely due to the robust economy. However, there may be a disconnect here: there isn’t necessarily a high demand for Ph.D.’s in the job market yet. Extremely successful doctoral programs will create that kind of demand in the job market (after a lot of time), not the other way around.

-Do we really want to be competing against older, more established doctoral programs for the type of funding necessary for a strong doctoral program (e.g. an NSF grant)

-It is important to establish what it that we do well, some to agreement on that, and commit to protect it.

-For some programs, many in the Arts, it is not at all necessary to instill a doctoral, or even masters program—these are too theoretical (versus applied) to meet or create job demand in the area

Advance responses to the faculty survey sent by committee (preliminary findings)

1. Vision as a liberal arts and sciences research institution...
 - a. Majority of faculty and students choose CofC for this reason
2. ...Further development of master’s programs will benefit current mission
3. ...Further development of PhD programs will benefit current mission

*There appears to faculty support for targeted development of master degree programs and select PhD programs.

-In scientific fields, the public sector is shifting toward hiring more Ph.D.’s. However, this is not the trend at all in the public sector in general (outside of sciences) → A “one size fits all” strategy will not work here. Different needs for different fields.

-becoming an all around Tier 1 research institution does not seem to be what we are looking for → rather, strategic development of targeted programs

What are the technical issues of expansion? What strengths and weaknesses can we identify in preparing to expand?

-Consensus: Commitment to do “do no harm” approach to the unique undergraduate research—we’ve established a floor that we will not go beneath. Now let’s discuss how we improve from where we are now.

-A discussion of political issues—competition with other universities within the State, CHE. Politics is not a problem we are going to solve here. This is not something we can control...What can we control?

-For example: For now, a MUSC-CofC merger is undetermined, but are there opportunities to enhance graduate education through more deliberated and support collaboration between the two NOW?

-Are there things that we can grasp and drive will impact positively in the future, regardless of what happens politically with the merger?

-Not just in terms of research, but maybe teaching, collaborative programs, grant opportunities...

-Downsides include: MUSC’s degree of specialization, only certain CofC programs would benefit; history of unequal commitment from both sides of the collaboration (both sides need to be “all in”).

What would it look like if, in your view, we had a very healthy graduate education structure? What would be the characteristics, what goals would we be achieving, what would have to change? What does it look like?

-We need to address physical plant issues

-The way in which we approach scheduling would need to change, especially with peripheral services (i.e. library)

-We would need to strongly strengthen ORGA*

-Understand how we will support graduate student support (assistantships, thesis/dissertation grants, abatements, finding, conferences—would want a very strong structure set up for all of this)

-We would need support from upper tier of administration in place

-We need to understand how to communicate the structure of our graduate education programming effectively and honestly: “Yes, you will have classes taught by a TA from time to time, and here are the benefits of that...”

**We need to have these and other ideas documented and ready to present so that we are prepared once in front of upper administration. Idea: Collect and compile memos written previously on topic. Use targeted areas where we have demonstrated strength in collaboration as examples

Final note/question: What is the vision of a joint undergraduate and graduate institution at the College of Charleston?

-Perhaps it will be helpful to look at other institutions as models (not draw completely from the abstract).

Graduate Education Forum
January 23, 2014
3-4 p.m.
Beatty 216
Facilitator: Dr. Nam-Jin Lee

First question posed to faculty to help guide the discussion of graduate education at the College of Charleston:

1) What do you think the role of graduate education at the College should be?

-Are we talking about Master's or PhD? College of Charleston was founded by library society; founded as a great university. Graduate education's role is to follow on to undergrad. In a master's program we do specialty training. At some point we should have all 3 levels at the college

-Agreed, but isn't it at the control of the S.C. state legislature? What can we do? I agree; we should have PhD programs.

-Would you want PhDs now?

-It depends on whether a department is ready...

-What would the criteria be to determine whether a department is ready?

-Money, research resources, library resources, faculty lines

-When would you know?

-When the faculty wants it. Isn't it curriculum-driven by the faculty?

-As long as we have a culture that cranks people through a program, it isn't going to happen. Right now we don't have the culture in our department to do a PhD. We need to grow that culture.

-No graduate education in philosophy. We don't need a grad program in philosophy. One concern... there's not a market to absorb those people. I'm attending this meeting because I wanted to hear what are people interested in. What is the external need? There has to be a broader need. I'm not bashing any program...

-The President mentioned the white paper where the Chamber of Commerce perceived the needs of the community in determining the need is almost exclusively engineering programs. This is the one thing we're not able to do. If the white paper is to be believed, the demand is for things that are tough for us to do. As for building that culture, many of us have questioned, and are asking/curiosity-based

programs... College has shifted more toward hiring people in that direction... how long will it take?

-We currently have the teacher-scholar model. In most cases, the students take a chunk of a professor's research and explain it. We don't spend time in seminars, and we don't have students answering questions.

-Talk about market point. I'd like to see the Chamber's white paper. When I was at a Southern California (R1) they closed the PhD program because there was no market for it. I agree that we need to nurture a culture. We have a good and growing master's in communication program, but we are not into PhDs. Faculty don't want to teach in the grad program. There is this larger issue of market. *US News* is looking at the quality and placement of graduates. Where would we be if we had an oversaturated market in 10 years?

-We would lose what we're quite good at... the role of undergraduate research. We're producing really good students who are ready to go into grad programs/PhD programs. A lot of discussion is master's is more important because it is higher. I think we'd be foolish to change our emphasis. We have limited resources in the state. We do undergrad better than anyone in the state. If you want grad programs, how will they be funded? Talking to the legislature here. Where has that got to come from? Undergrad quality will suffer.

-Private foundation could come along and give money to start a grad program. It would have to be a lot of money to support it.

-Market for PhDs isn't very good. People have quality of undergraduate education scrutinized. Looking to an R1 structure isn't moving in a good direction to move in, i.e. lecture halls, multiple choice tests. Many of us are here because we value undergrad education, but I don't know how to manage both well.

-Any other examples of a public college like William & Mary that we could look to, work from?

-Suggestion: Miami of Ohio is a comparable one. William & Mary is well-endowed and well-supported. Miami of Ohio is a better example. And, they never merged... they do both undergrad and graduate well.

-Should we expand our grad offerings? Our enrollments aren't going to increase in undergrad, so we need to expand grad? Do we need more programs?

-The industry hires more master's over PhDs. Bio master's students go onto get PhDs and work for public agencies like NOAA. They tend to do well and get paid better than PhDs

-Resources question? Our director has no money to promote graduate program. We don't even have a brochure. We can't place an ad to recruit students in a journal. Tell me where the money is going to come from.

-Heard talk in the past about the School of Business and School of Education are the likely candidates for a PhD program.

-7 years ago, I was on a committee to look at PhDs and questions were asked then whether we were ready? We have talked about it. We met 2 years ago and talked about it. Determined it would take 3-4 years just to set it up to make sure we knew what we were doing. This directive came from the Dean(s).

Moderator presented the recent faculty survey findings showing support for graduate programs.

Question No. 30: Further development of graduate education at the Master's level would benefit the current mission of the College

385 responded - 64 percent agreed (19% strongly agreed while 45% agreed)

Question No. 31: Development of PhD programs in a few select areas would benefit the current mission of the College of Charleston

387 responded - 49 percent agreed (18% strongly agreed while 31% agreed)

Question No. 32: Development of PhD programs in a few select areas would provide a substantial benefit to the local/state economy.

388 responded - 44 percent agreed (15% strongly agreed while 29% agreed)

-Faculty are quite skeptical with funding. According to the survey, the idea of creating a culture, you'd have to look at the folks who strongly agree. If you don't have folks strongly agreeing that level of commitment isn't there with strongly agree about 19%.

-One good faith measure to get faculty on board would be to support the library more and buy all the science access and not limit it.

-No one has ever come to Academic Affairs with that request. We have no idea how much that would cost.

Second question for the group was asked:

2) What do you see as the relationship between graduate and undergraduate education at the College? The current state and what the future holds...

-We get this discussion going a lot in biology. We don't just suck resources. Our grad students are good mentors, an addition to the faculty. Sometimes undergrads can relate more so to the grad students as compared to the faculty. Example right now: If I have a qualified excellent grad student, I will direct my undergrads to this grad

student. If Biology didn't have TAs, it wouldn't be cost-effective. How many grad marine bio students? When we reload in the fall we will have about 50.

-Grad and undergrad don't always mesh well. How would bio run all those labs without TAs? It can increase the distance between students and faculty, which changes the culture.

Onto question No. 3:

3) What are the strengths and weaknesses of graduate education at the College?

-We share an English grad program with the Citadel. Sometimes we disagree on the ways we go forward. The question always goes back to resources. There are some strengths to it but more weaknesses in my opinion. Too many chefs in the kitchen.

-We had a program like that with MUSC when environmental studies started. We did all the teaching and got none of the money.

-Middle grades is a joint program. It is logistically difficult.

-We have part-timers in English mixing with full time. The audiences we're serving have totally different goals/expectations. I don't see a lot of cross-pollination between grads & undergrads. The College of Charleston is an underfunded college. It is kind of tough on the graduate students.

-Placement question: Are we able to get good students?

-Speaking for the communication graduate program: The students are getting better and the students are going onto PhD programs. We have good research on why undergrads come here. We need more research on why graduates come here. It is likely program-driven. Sometimes it is a destination choice.

-We run the program and we have adjuncts, NOAA, and they're looking for laborers. A lot of our students get into their programs and get good jobs from them. I need someone to help me answer these questions: weakness of our program is that they spend 3-4 years getting their master's degrees. They get a lot of remedial skills but it is a long journey

-Culture question: About teaching English graduate classes... based on the audience. I have students who could be in great PhD programs and I have grad students who write worse than my sophomores. What are we programming our program to?

-We want intellectual diversity. We want our graduate students to go on elsewhere, just like when we hire... faculty come from all over the world; we're putting a major emphasis on study abroad.

-Strengths & weaknesses:

Strength - We have something that is specific, unique with the Fort Johnson consortium. We have all the advantages of all that. Maybe with engineering we'd have Boeing? It is program-specific... Another strength is the teaching. Most of us went to an R1 and teaching was great there and also terrible.

Weakness - Support level; we don't have enough money to go around. We have grants, but we don't have the kind of numbers of percentages that most R1 places have. We don't currently have enough. We have to change that culture to support the students.

-For instance, when you buy an instrument you need a service contract. Who's going to pay that? The College doesn't help pay for that. We'll have all those kinds of hidden costs: library subscriptions, maintenance costs

-Assume R1s use in-directs to cover that sort of stuff, and at R1s your teaching loads are cut in half because you need time to think. If we cut down teaching loads, we'd have to hire so many more faculty.

Final question for the group:

4) What is your vision for graduate education in 2020?

-We are going to be in a chaotic cycle due to climate change. That's going to become the dominant theme.

-Past trends in the 20 years in S.C. I see USC & Clemson getting better at what they do because they have the political clout. I would be in favor of top-notch master's programs, or one option like Coastal Carolina getting unique permission to do a PhD in marine bio and maybe a joint program with Clemson having it mostly geology oriented.

-We are best situated to have a marine bio PhD program because we are on the water. I'm back and forth on this about us becoming more dynamic. Maybe this is something we need to jump on because we are so nicely situated?

-It can't hurt to develop that culture if you had a graduate program. I see the understanding as keeping it a really strong undergraduate. I think that undergraduates can start to ask questions and it would be beneficial. We need to think of ourselves as our own intellectual development. We could go on with more graduate programs. Perhaps have more of an online component and joint efforts. I miss that here, having a sense of more communication and an intellectual community.

-We have to start valuing intellect and knowledge and not just so much a brand. That's at the heart of building this culture. My department would say we're so busy now we can't even begin to think about it.

Graduate Education Forum
January 24, 2014
Beatty 214
Facilitator: Dr. Jo Ann Ewalt

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 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 within 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.

Graduate Education Forum
January 27, 2014
2:30-3:30 p.m.
Alumni Center, EHHP
Facilitator: Dr. Jon Hakkila

Here today to talk about what your concerns, dreams, goals are for graduate education...

First question to start the conversation:

1) What do you think the role of graduate education at the College should be?

-We must be responsive to local needs for graduate education, to the degree it fits with our mission. I don't think that means we need to start an engineering school. We need to figure out local needs. We're the biggie in the community. Think about our response to the community. We'd have niche places... Marine bio program is really good because of where we are in the state. We'd also attract students from all over for a graduate program in African American studies. That would be a clear place for a niche program. There are places appropriate for the college to think about national needs like African American studies.

-What are the community needs/local needs?

-I don't know the answer to that. My understanding is that is how the MBA program is justified. It was developed out of a community need.

-It is unusual for a city this size not to have an MBA.

-Our mission statement hasn't been updated. It needs to be reconsidered. It emphasizes we're about undergraduates and business. It says that we offer graduates with pressing local need. An accelerated MBA is a local need. We also need to meet a state need. Communication master's program for example. The other communications programs in the state are very odd. Specialized nationally. Communication attracts folks statewide.

Question No. 2:

2) What do you see as the relationship between graduate and undergraduate education at the College?

-There is some room in some programs for graduate to keep in concert with undergraduate. I'm pro-graduate programs. Illustration is music: Music program is all undergraduate. The students think they are better than they are because they're undergrads. You get a bunch of kids who table; when you bring in graduate students to work with them they then know they're not at the top. Help to graduates working with undergrad. They have to be together

-Echoed that sentiment. A good mentor relationship with undergrad and graduate is important. You have to catch up the doings of the system.

-Graduate strengthens undergraduate. Recruit a different kind of faculty member. Securing research-based graduate programs are exciting to especially entry-level faculty. Research-based faculty wouldn't have come here if there was no way to grow the communication graduate program. Here the working conditions are changed by an opportunity to work with good undergraduate and graduate students.

<Moderator> We all realized that our visions are different and expectations the needs and resources are different. It may not be a one-size fit all solution. How do we get where we are going? What's our vision to accomplish it?

-Do we envision ourselves having PhDs either with MUSC merger or without

-Leave PhD programming with MUSC?

-A big automatic change if we start offering PhDs... Personally, I don't have a problem expanding that in that direction but we'd need a lot of resources to bolster undergraduate. Investment in personnel.

-Main concern? The need for faculty for graduate programs

-Yes - our faculty must grow. This is where we (College of Charleston faculty) distinguish ourselves when talking to parents of prospective students: Your kids are not going to be taught by graduate assistants. That's our strength as an undergraduate institution.

-But if we have enough faculty? Some faculty teach graduate and undergraduate. What are the other risks to the undergraduate programs?

-The benefits outweigh the risks to an undergraduate education graduate research and faculty research. Teaching load at an institution with PhD programs is probably lighter.

-Its then a question of resources and can we afford this?

-Faculty would need more time for research. There would be a huge benefit/difference from a 4-4 to a 4-3. While that shift of having fewer students, professors would do a better job teaching.

-Could have a 2-tier system. Undergrad faculty is treated one way and the graduate faculty is treated another way?

-I think of changing loads for PhDs teaching. Not suggesting it's a danger to undergraduate. The typical teacher won't be affected.

-Not every program would have PhDs

-I'm teaching in a graduate program right now and there's no change in my teaching

-Supervision of PhD theses is a huge load. That needs to be considered

-Sounds like the model would be elective. A faculty member would position him-or-herself to do this. It's not a blanket impact. What I'm wondering is how do people perceive research? Is it summers or year-round? In general for scholarship, what are the expectations? I'm curious about that across the university.

-It varies a lot by discipline

-2 or 3 departments supporting doctoral programs. Imagine producing 20 research doctorates a year. Many different models. It is a uniform expectation at Texas Tech. Undergraduate program was very professional. Research expectations were very similar from department to department. Teaching master's students is incredibly exhausting; you get them trained and then they're done/graduate.

-What's the role of the Lowcountry Graduate Center in relation to the College's programming?

-I learned a lot of things this year from the grad faculty curriculum committee. Learned that the Lowcountry Graduate Center is co-operated by a few institutions.

-Confirmed that the College does not finance it; the state does. Anything that comes to the LGC is not meant to compete.

-One of the USC programs coming in in the fall is engineering

-We don't offer engineering programs

-Concern is with graduate Cybersercurity certificate

-LGC is created as a result to study College of Charleston, Citadel, MUSC. The result was let's have a center that fosters collaboration, and also have a structure for imports through the state. A few graduate programs were there in North campus. Social work came here from USC. There have been attempts to bring education PhD. There has been activity over there for over a decade. It isn't an excellent example of collaboration. The programs have always belonged to the school who offers them.

-PhD in education could be at LGC

-We're trying to keep Clemson and USC out of this area

-The College of Charleston is a comprehensive university that loves the liberal arts; we're not a liberal arts college keeping out Clemson and USC...

-We are worried about having other institutions in this area. How much will be left for us?

-My biggest concern is that we may end up with graduate programs because the political will is there. This movement toward a more comprehensive university is important for the College. We're in a region that desperately needs well-trained people. We're expanding and improving quality for the community. My sense is that we have the history of the graduate program where we incrementally add to what we already have including having existing staff and faculty teach and serve. We don't have a significant budget for marketing. Also, how are program directors assessed? How do we identify our quality programs? How is the dean assessed? If we're going to do this, do it with an eye for quality. We can't just stick our toe in and do it half-way with resources. This is where I worry... Roster faculty will move to teaching PhDs, and we'll lose some adjuncts as we do for BPS (the Bachelor of Professional Studies). We'll start competing for resources for staff. I don't worry about a two-tier faculty because we're already there with making exceptions for faculty doing incredible research. We do have different teaching levels because we're not the same faculty we were 15 years ago. The front-end, can we be serious?

-Graduate programs have developed from a faculty member who wanted to create a program who wanted to make it work. PhDs eventually popping up here for the same reasons we have a master's program: someone felt a need. In selected areas we would grow. We've made a couple runs on PhDs before knowing full well CHE wouldn't let us do it, i.e. look at Coastal Carolina. Over 25 years I've been here, financial support just dwindles away. It could happen this year that we will merge and we will be told, "Here it is. Go make it happen."

-Then it comes back to program review. For graduate and undergraduate that's the kind of fixed pie scenario and how ugly it gets because we have our foot in the business community – because we link this to training people for jobs.

-Is anyone discussing revenue in a way that sounds encouraging? State dollars? Seems to me the business programs are the way you can pay for tuition.

-What's the comparison of the graduate to the undergraduate when we did the cost-study? Operating and personnel 50 percent.

-We're not paying staff, i.e. when i was program director, I did all the clerical.

-We're not staffing. Think of more than just faculty. Have to think of research facilities are just by far the largest costs.

-Paying assistantships? Graduate program concerned about competitive stipends. We'd get better students if we had the money.

-President has been adamant with Board of Trustees that R1s cost more money and warned them that to go down this road, they have to seek alternate avenues for money because costing is more tricky. This president wants to represent the full range of costs with graduate programming. There's no way to reallocate resources; it has to be new revenue. Where money is concerned, we have to look at tuition and fees and go to the state and say money makers for the state and money losers for the state -- you get what you pay for. You are never going to fund that with grants; you have to have checks.

-Money is no object. Or, I'm not hearing that? Which is it? One of our programs received line-support in our budget. Legislature said 'yes, that's needed' and computer science was awarded. \$400,000 evidence. Is that there is some understanding related to a particular desire?

-Are there comprehensive universities we could look to for a funding model?

-I imagine a distant future looking like William & Mary. This would be through an incremental move where we'd add one program at a time OR all at once like other states? I rather doubt the approach we can't do something we can't afford.

-Incremental addition: Not a moment when you say, "This is how our mission has changed." You're saying, "We've got to be nimble, and react to 4 other universities coming here."

-Example of budgeting model? Incremental additions: It requires incredible desire from faculty in certain departments and it will probably be business and education. English is coming forward with 2 programs now. We have to be clear at what the costs really are and we have to have facilities in place.

-Targeting programs and responding to some need... You have a better chance of getting things through CHE talking about competition. Go in areas where there are less competition?

-Budgeting model example: Miami of Ohio is a better peer comparison. I looked at their workload a few years ago. Their faculty are on a 3-3 load. They are an institution that has managed to maintain small class sizes, and quality at undergraduate level is important to them.

-Miami of Ohio also has a strategic plan that is impressive.

-I have no idea how much funding they get from the state

-States go to money and strings attached to their monies

<Moderator> This is an interesting discussion on a lot of areas weren't brought up at other forums. Final results of the faculty survey are going to be released tomorrow at Faculty Senate meeting. Here are the current results summarized: The most pertinent is 85% of faculty responded either supportive or very supportive of increasing master's programs at the college and 60% of faculty support target-specific PhD programs.

-There's been a general shift with this Provost. Recently at a Department outing to baseball game the young faculty's conversation was all about their research. When I was young, the conversation was all about teaching.

-There was a hostility to graduate programs when I came here. I've seen the sea change across the schools. Amazing work in our graduate programs. Faculty colleagues are doing really hard work with very few resources. If you give the faculty more resources just imagine what they could do.

Graduate Education Forum
February 11, 2014
3:30-4:30 p.m.
Beatty Center, Room 214
Facilitator: Dr. Valerie Frazier

First question posed to faculty to help guide the discussion of graduate education at the College of Charleston:

1) What do you think the role of graduate education at the College should be, including thoughts on the merger proposition?

- We are primarily an undergraduate institution, that's the first priority, and how does graduate education fit into that? We have a few graduate programs that are connected to undergraduate programs. Increasing the number of graduate programs will take away from the undergraduate focus, and might be wastefully duplicative/unnecessarily competitive to offer certain programs. It seems as though we already offer "local" programs geared towards the community's needs.
- Graduate programs should be complementary to our existing undergraduate programs.
- If we offer PhDs, we will be in another category of competition regarding grants.
- Funding is a major concern regarding the future of graduate programs.
- We have the capacity and a good reason to expand graduate education: there is demand in this part of the state, and we have the capacity for limited expansion.
- Current programs that were targeted for a PhD program already have limited resources and faculty pushback.
- Programs and universities work better when they're built from the bottom up and consider demand – organic supply and demand.
- Where's the harm in having Clemson or USC come to Charleston? It might be harmful if they would take away students that we would otherwise get, but I don't see that happening.
- We might lose donors that aren't loyal to an institution, but we don't have a large donor base anyways.
- The President only sees Boeing.
- Boeing isn't necessarily interested in what CofC does. They are more interested in Trident Tech for things like mechanical assembly. They are interested in grooming employees for middle management and project management.

- This makes the case for the liberal arts and sciences, and not creating students with highly specialized skills because industry wants employees with critical skills.
- How responsive should we be to industry and/or student needs?
- We can serve both! The liberal arts and sciences model allows there to be no conflict with that.
- If you want to maximize earning potential, the model is a liberal arts + a professional degree.
- We shouldn't think too narrowly about the "job market." We're trying to create citizens of the world.
- There needs to be a dialogue with the community – political leaders, municipal workers, etc. – not just industry. If we only talk to a narrow group of individuals, we will get a narrow view. Legislators view graduates that leave South Carolina as a loss on their "investment."

2) What do you see as the relationship between graduate and undergraduate education at the College?

- There are positives and negatives to having a department with both graduate and undergraduate programs. Marine Biology, for example, is able to partner with four other institutions/agencies at Fort Johnson, and wouldn't be able to get by without those partnerships. Graduate programs require more time from faculty, which takes them away from undergraduates. There is already a lack of faculty and most intro courses are taught by adjuncts. A good thing is the ability to have a lab, where undergraduates can see graduate-level work.
- Political science and MPA seem to make it work. The MPA program's student base comes from the area, and they benefit from adjuncts who are currently working in the community in their fields of interest. Teaching one graduate course and two undergraduate courses this semester works. Can't graduate education expand without a merger?
- MPA used to be a joint program with USC, but recently became a stand-alone program. To maintain its national accreditation and remain a viable program after becoming independent, MPA needed X number of graduate faculty, which took lines away from other departments in HSS. And then accrediting bodies also have a lot of restrictions they place on a program.
- What are our peer institutions with similar models of undergraduate and graduate programs? William & Mary, Vanderbilt, Miami of OH, Duke, Rice – all good at integrating undergraduates and graduates.

- You can get a good education at an R1 as an undergraduate; you just have to be self-motivated.

<Moderator> Are resources available?

- No, legislators don't know what making the College into an R1 really means. It doesn't mean we will get grants, and grants alone will not fund an R1. We won't be competitive for federal grants for 20-25 years.
- Legislators think that private industry will cover the cost, but the types of research that industry and universities conduct are totally different.

3) What is your vision for graduate education in 2020?

- Not adding more doctoral programs. There are too many doctorates being produced in the country already. It's irresponsible. We will enter this game at the bottom of the rankings for all programs. Expanding graduate programs is a recipe for mediocrity. Building first rate programs takes a lot of money.
- Being able to free ourselves from counting up degrees conferred.
- There's an opportunity to expand the types of graduate certificates offered. Offering more horizontal education, as opposed to hierarchical. If students are already in the workforce, they can't quit their jobs, give up family time or cut back on community commitments to pursue a degree.
- With the move towards online learning, professionals want some sort of hybrid classes: online plus some class time.
- Certificates would have to be targeted and developed in a way that won't throw off a department's hiring scheme.

<Moderator> How do we relay our concerns to the new president, and how do we relay important thoughts regarding graduate education?

- Faculty should push that graduate expansion be limited and thoughtful and really meet an existing need.
- Those pushing for the merger don't really understand what a comprehensive research university means. What they really want is targeted graduate expansion, but the Board has no idea.

COLLEGE of
CHARLESTON

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY

MEMORANDUM

To: George Hynd, Provost
From: Jaap Hillenius, Chair, Department of Biology Evaluation Panel
Date: 13 December 2013
Re: Graduate and Research Infrastructure Concerns
Cc: Mike Auerbach, Dean of Sciences and Mathematics
Amy McCandless, Dean of Graduate School

During the past year, the Department of Biology has had several protracted discussions about the practicality and desirability of expanded graduate programs in our area, especially the concept of a PhD program in Marine Biology. My interpretation from these discussions is that the departmental faculty is very much ambivalent about these ideas – some faculty strongly support expanded graduate programs, others have significant reservations. A substantial segment of the faculty is of two minds. Among the main concerns voiced by faculty is that it is unclear whether a market exists, locally or nationally, for more PhDs in Marine Biology, and whether it makes sense for this institution to expand in that particular area. More proximally, a second issue that looms very large in our discussions is the recognition that the support infrastructure for our current graduate programs is not up to par, and departmental faculty are concerned that considerable progress in this area is needed before credible discussions of expanded graduate programs, including a Ph.D. Program in Marine Biology at the College of Charleston should proceed. The following is a list of concerns/reservations affecting the health of the Graduate Program in Marine Biology; these will also impact the feasibility of future programs. The Department of Biology considers that significant progress on this suite of items is warranted before a credible discussion on adding new programs can proceed.

1. Financial support for graduate students, especially in the form of additional assistantships, is critical. At most schools students are expected to be supported on an assistantship. This is limiting the growth of all graduate programs at CofC.
2. Out of State tuition abatements are also now limiting graduate program growth.
3. Tuition waivers are very rare at CofC. Waivers are a major component in PhD program support at quality universities.
4. For students in research projects there is a clear need for “gap” funding when grants run out or TA support is limited.
5. There is almost no access to Endowment/Fellowship funding (really no funds) for recruiting top students.
6. Recent events with assistantship pay processes suggest a lack of appreciation for the role of graduate assistants on a research active campus. Graduate students and faculty are still very upset with recent changes.
7. Logistical support for extramural grant funding is insufficient to deal with current level of grant funding. Grants administration for finances is in need of additional personnel and training capabilities. Our ORGA staff, despite quality people, is too small to adequately track all submissions, contracts and grants.

8. The “Banner” accounting software as administered at CofC is still far from user friendly. It is nearly impossible for an investigator (P.I.) to track financial progress on grants, to understand pay status for students and employees and work with grant timetables. Using the system is too complicated for practical use by scientists who also maintain a full teaching load. Cognos is also difficult to track but some think it may become useful.
9. Biology has a need for additional staff positions to support research logistics, including a facilities manager for the two greenhouses and a full-time Grants finance administrator to liaison with PIs, ORGA, and the Controller’s Office (the latter position need not reside in the Department, however).
10. An improved infrastructure for crediting graduate level teaching, as well as all forms of research teaching with undergraduate and graduate students, is critically needed if we are to grow our research programs.
11. More regular faculty lines are needed in Biology to cover large teaching responsibilities and to reduce our use of part time adjunct faculty.
12. Logistical support, especially facilities support, for research – an activity vital to any graduate program, but especially to PhD programs – is spotty and too often very poor. Research facilities at the Grice Marine Lab and RHSC need constant maintenance. However, persistent gaps or failures of communication and follow-up by Physical Plant pose significant obstacles to functioning research programs and responsibilities.

Colleagues,

I have so many concerns about a merger, I am not really sure where to start this discussion. I apologize in advance for my chemistry-centric discussion below, but it is my frame of reference. Also I read in the Post and Courier that a PhD in chemistry is one of the desired goals, so I have been doing a lot of thinking about how one could create such a program out of thin air in a state with historically sad support of education.

First, I am bothered by the rationales given for the merger. One argument has been that we need more high tech savvy PhDs in order to develop a thriving economy in Charleston area. While it may be true that we need more computer science type graduates to meet the needs of a growing tech corridor (I've seen some of that data), I don't see the rationale for expanding this argument to other disciplines. At least in my field, there is only a very small industrial base for PhD chemists in this area. The gamble of a "build it and they will come" scenario is too high for my taste. (How do I know there is no job market for PhD chemists in Charleston? From the number of Clemson and USC PhDs that apply for Masters level jobs in my department and the inherent difficulty in solving two-body problems when we hire.) In general, companies that hire PhD chemists and biochemists don't have to worry about "local" talent. If they want to hire someone, they place an ad and get 100s of applications from desperate PhDs looking for work from all over the country. If there is a need for more computer science folks or for engineers to support Boeing, then why don't we start by building or expanding those programs here, rather than change the whole institution in such a drastic way.

The second argument I have heard is that merging with MUSC is the lesser of 3 evils: we either become USC-Charleston, Clemson-Charleston, or MUSC-Charleston. I haven't seen any real solid evidence that this is a threat. Of course like all of us, I am very uninformed, but at the moment, without data, this strikes me as a scare tactic to get us to plow ahead. I also find it unlikely that the legislature would dissolve a 200+ year-old institution and it's brand in this manner. Also, is an MUSC-Charleston really much more appealing than the other options, if this threat is real? Their mission is so

different than ours. Where will resources naturally flow in such a merged institution with such disparate missions? This is a real concern to me, because I suspect I know the answer. Also, what will our alumni and donor base think of any of these merging options? Dissolving their alma mater's brand does not seem like a way to encourage a philanthropy tradition and we should carefully consider this. Isn't that part of our new financial model? Building an endowment? What happens to our ability to do this when we no longer exist (at least from our alumni's perspective)?

Destroying the nature of a 200 year-old campus in a turf battle for Charleston area students seems shortsighted to me. If Clemson wants to start an engineering program here in Charleston because Boeing wants this, I don't see how this threatens us. Last time I checked, we weren't interested in doing this. At some point, I would think that CHE would do their job and ensure no unnecessary duplication in the Lowcountry. In theory, I would think this would limit what USC or Clemson can do here. If branch campuses are inferior, underfunded and sub-par (this is part of the argument for rationale #2 and a preemptive, lesser-of-three-evils MUSC merger) then I think this would also naturally limit what USC or Clemson could do here, even if politicians arranged it so USC and Clemson could freely compete here in some sort of branch undergraduate campus. We have advantages that they would not----a beautiful historic campus and 200 years of history and tradition. That will be hard to replicate in any shop USC or Clemson sets up on I-26. Besides, I thought our goal as outlined in our strategic plan was to become a nationally known liberal arts and sciences university. Shouldn't we be focusing on students from all over, not just Charleston to achieve this goal? Are Charleston area students really the key to developing a healthy financial model or key to our goal of becoming nationally preeminent? If so, what is this financial model and how does offering PhDs help achieve it?

The third argument that seems to be driving this discussion is that MUSC is in need of capital and is therefore looking to expand into our undergraduate world. Also, we are constantly looking for new financial models to sustain a healthy institution in the face of decreasing state support. It is worth

contemplating why MUSC is in financial trouble. Their basic science PhD program has been sustained by hospital revenue, and suddenly that equation is changing. If we are in a state that refuses to step in and save the existing PhD program at MUSC (especially with all this evidence that businesses want more PhDs), why do we think that the state will pump money into new PhD programs if some merger takes place? Are we jumping into this to solve MUSC's fiscal problems? What about our financial problems? I don't see how it fixes any of our financial problems, so I am hoping someone can explain to me how it will.

If we assume that we will get no significant new revenue from the state to build this enterprise (and I think that is a safe bet), then are we thinking that we will generate more revenue by having these new graduate programs? To build a PhD program in the sciences, it will cost millions---as in the 10s if not 100s of millions. If we just declare one day that we now grant PhDs without the associated upgrade in infrastructure in the sciences, we will go overnight from being an excellent undergraduate institution with a developing national reputation to a marginal PhD granting institution. I just don't see our state ever investing the type of capital necessary to pull this off. I also don't see a lot of evidence that the state adequately supports its current PhD programs.

Who is going to give us this needed capital then? Maybe the mayor will give us some money since he is very keen on this. Let's ask him! Maybe the businesses clamoring for these 100s of PhDs? Let's get their contributions to get us started. **Or** is it that we are expecting an influx of all the great grant money that PhD programs generate? I suspect there are people that believe this will happen. It won't. As a whole, the current science faculty members here are not competitive for the types of Research-1 grants that bring in the really large overhead from the federal government. A sudden declaration that we now are a PhD granting institution does not make us suddenly competitive for these grants. On the contrary, we will be a PhD institution that no one has ever heard of. Grant funding is very tenuous now. Who are you going to give a grant to? Someone in a top 25 graduate program from an established program or a faculty member from this new

school no one has heard of? Our competitors for grants would now be Harvard, MIT, and Caltech. Not Oberlin, Swarthmore, and Furman, which is tough enough. In my own discipline, Clemson and USC are not even top 50 programs (side note: it's worth contemplating why that is here). While a few of us maybe could be stars in this new funding arena, I do not count myself, or anyone in chemistry, in that group. I mean no offense to my colleagues, but our careers have been too slow here. You need a dozen papers a year to be competitive for grants like this, not 1 per year. It will be a long ramp-up time of being mediocre before we get to that stage. Equally bothersome, we will lose our eligibility for grant funding through many of the programs we currently use. In the sciences, this is NIH-AREA, NSF-RUI, smaller foundations, HHMI, etc. All of that is in jeopardy as soon as the institution's Carnegie classification is changed or when a certain number of PhDs or grant dollars are earned. One big grant-earner who wants to retire here with his (or her!) last big grant and suddenly the rest of us are out of funding options. We will be ineligible for prior programs and uncompetitive for R-1 type grants.

What type of revenue are we talking about to build a PhD program? I haven't seen any numbers on this (which also alarms me), but I can offer some back of the envelope musings. New faculty would be needed. And not at the salaries we are paid, of course. PhD-institution faculty will need a 1-1 teaching load, MAX. We will need LOTS of new bodies to cover our classes. We could try to cover it all ourselves by doing what PhD schools do everywhere---building some 500 person lecture halls or, nowadays, teaching via MOOCs. (But that is in contradiction to our strategic plan---so we wouldn't do that, right?) Even with those cost-saving measures that would allow us to focus on research and minimize teaching burden, we would still need to recruit new people who will be competitive for grants, so estimate 5 new lines per science department to get the cash coming in. Each new faculty member in the sciences will need a big lab and a big startup package. Our current startup packages are typically 50-100k, depending on needs. A PhD school, to be competitive in drawing in people capable of bringing in big grants, will need 300k-500k typically, maybe more if we are trying to get serious---getting serious means post-doc salaries in startup and

that is 100k right there. They also need big labs, not the teeny ones we have now. I love my lab, but it would be entirely inadequate for a PhD lab. We have a biochemistry lab “suite” that currently houses 4 faculty members and their undergraduates and the undergraduate biochemistry lab. That space would be adequate for one, maybe two faculty members if we want to be competitive and serious in this business of generating more science PhDs and big grants.

To open a PhD school, we will need instruments and infrastructure. We need NMRs, autoclaves, microscopy setups, x-ray crystallography, etc. Maybe 10 million would get us started. Many thousands in annual repairs and maintenance, and service contracts that are 10k a year for each instrument. We would also need a lot of support staff to help run these instruments---also a glass blower, a machine shop, an expanded electronic shop, a graduate program director, etc. Maybe MUSC has some of this stuff, and maybe they would share. But, since they don't currently have a chemistry department, I doubt they have what we would need. I am guessing the current SSM building would be needed to house just the chemistry department if we wanted to be a competitive PhD program. Too bad the current building would be inadequate---PhD chemistry schools would have more fume hoods than we have in our beautiful new building. Double what we have currently as a first guess. Where are we going to put our new PhD-generating Chemistry Building? Where are we going to put *any* new buildings? They would all need to be big buildings and without ARB restrictions making us keep green space and height restrictions. Maybe MUSC has a ton of space they will let us have? Or maybe the mayor who is historically so supportive of our quest for space downtown will help us here. And maybe the ARB will understand and look the other way when we ask for a five or six story Biology building.

Let's talk students, in case the argument arises that PhD programs will generate revenue in tuition. Not in the sciences, anyway. Each new student would need tuition *waived* and a \$25,000 per year stipend x 5 year average PhD time x 5-10 students per year x 5 science departments. Competitive programs provide health insurance for graduate students, too. Some of this

cost is regenerated of course because the graduate students will be teaching **all** the lower level labs as TAs, like they do at all PhD schools. But these new PhD students will definitively not generate tuition revenue.

It is worth it at this juncture to contemplate why MUSC is at the table here--- they need revenue and they do NOT get it from their PhD programs. Also, they are not getting the revenue they need from the state to support their current PhD program. Again, why do we think the state is going to treat this venture any differently? We should not accept a revenue argument as a reason to do this merger. And, we should not agree to a merger that does not come with adequate revenue. A PhD program may create revenue for the city from increased tax base as these jobs and industry supposedly come flooding in, but it will not be increased revenue for us. I mention this because the forces outside academia that seem to be driving this discussion don't seem to be aware of the cost of these types of programs. In fact, I am pretty sure some see it as revenue generating or, minimally, revenue saving. Sorry for being science-centric here, but the supposed need for PhDs in STEM seems to be behind the economic development argument for the merger and these programs cost big money. I am not sure the right people understand this. My biggest fear is that we will just suddenly be anointed PhD-granting status without ANY of the necessary resources to pull it off.

Lastly, when I left my post-Doc at MIT, I specifically applied to non-PhD granting schools. The smaller the better; CofC was the biggest one I applied to and I did not predict having much interest in it because of that. I could have applied to R-1 schools and I was encouraged to do so by all of my mentors. When you are at a big school like that, you are viewed as a failure if you do not go get an R-1 job. I was told "you are flushing your career down the toilet" (nice, huh?) Maybe in their view I did do that, but I don't view it this way. I had been at schools for 8 years at that point where undergraduates are an afterthought, if they are thought of at all. There is a reason why CofC generates more chemistry majors than both USC and Clemson. The reason for that is that we care and nurture our students to success. If the state of SC needs more PhDs, then let me do the job I came

here to do, because half of all the students I have mentored in my lab have gone on to earn a PhD (and they would all love to come back). The same can be said for all of my colleagues who mentor science students in their labs. If we had a small PhD program that graduated 5 students a year (a number I have heard thrown around), that number is less than the number of UG students we send off to PhD programs each year in our department. Since 2000, about 100 chem/biochem majors have left here to pursue a PhD. 85% of those students did research at CofC with faculty. If Charleston wants more PhDs in the sciences, then get these businesses or the state or the Board to double or triple the URCA budget. That single small investment would have a huge impact. We have the right formula here to make a big impact in the “pipeline”---we are a big enough school to do meaningful work, but small enough that we can still take the time to nurture students and include those students in our work. That is why I love it here and that is what will disappear if we start PhD programs. I predict that I will not love it here then. I suspect that I am not the only one.

Pam