



Minutes of the Graduate Board

Thursday, March 22, 2012

**Executive Conference Room
Student Faculty Center
Health Sciences Center Campus
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.**

Members Present:

Barbara Hoffman, Daniel Kern, Jagannathan Krishnan, Dan A. Liebermann, Lynn Mandarano, Swati Nagar, Justin Yuan Shi, Paul Swann

Ex-Officio Member:

Zebulon Kendrick, Vice Provost, Graduate School

Graduate School Staff:

Cheryl Jackson, Administrative Coordinator

Kathryn Petrich-LaFevre, Director of Graduate Information

Michael Toner, Associate Director for Graduate Enrollment and Data Management

Approval of the Minutes:

Swati Nagar motioned to approve the minutes of February 22, 2012. Daniel Kern seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously passed.

Business:

The Vice Provost opened the meeting with updates. First, with regard to fellowships, 21 new offer letters were mailed on March 20. To date, 16 of the 60 offers have been accepted. The yield is typically about 50%, with monies available this year to fund 30 fellows. Dr. Kendrick noted that some awardees are now questioning the language in the letter and asking about their funding for Years 3 and 4. He noted that these individuals are referred to the Graduate Coordinator in their departments. Second, the Chapman Report will be made available to all Graduate Faculty in response to the Graduate Board's request. The document will be posted on the Graduate School website for a limited time of two weeks. Graduate Faculty will be advised via a listserv email.

The Vice Provost turned the discussion to the Provost's Report of March 15, 2012 to the Faculty on Proposals for Restructuring the Provost's Portfolio. He noted that a key issue in the document is the Provost's intent to devolve from the foresight of the Graduate School and the Graduate Board the terminal master's/professional science master's programs and professional doctoral programs. This proposed action, he stated, raises a host of questions that he intends to discuss with the Provost and the Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education. Among the questions are:

- Who will set the minimum application requirements, i.e., minimum academic standards of scholarship, for these programs?
- Who will manage the application system for these programs, including opening and closing forms, dealing with problems, and rolling applications to another semester/year?
- Who will process decision letters for these programs?
- Who will post admissions decisions for these programs?

- Who will monitor deposit information for these programs?
- Who will have responsibility for correcting errors introduced by new INB users when they gain access to the multitude of Banner's modules?
- Who will handle suspended records processing for these programs?
- Who will handle registration issues for these programs?
- Will Graduate School policies still apply to these programs?
- Will the Graduate Bulletin still be the official source of information for these programs?
- Will the Graduate School have the authority to suspend the decentralized control of these programs if after-the-fact audits reveal ignorance of data standards and other problems?

It was acknowledged that professional programs will generate income, with 87% of revenues going directly to the departments. However, Board members expressed concerns. Could professional master's courses be a precursor to a doctorate? If so, this presents problems if the Graduate School does not have oversight. Also, commingling master's and doctoral students will result in a dumbing-down of coursework. Ultimately, the reputation of Temple University's doctoral programs cannot be allowed to suffer. The promise of enrollment funds should not lead to a loosening or lack of rigor in academic standards.

The Vice Provost asked to convene a committee to address the proposed devolving of authority for terminal master's/professional science master's programs and professional doctoral programs from the Graduate School and the Graduate Board. The committee is to begin work after Dr. Kendrick meets with Drs. Englert and Blank. The committee will then address the issue at the April meeting of the Graduate Board and at a meeting of the Graduate Faculty in May. Board members expressing interest in working on the issue included Barbara Hoffman, Swati Nagar, and Justin Shi.

In old business, the funding of graduate education was briefly addressed. It was asked what happens when a student has received a scholarship and that individual's work proves to be sub-par. The Vice Provost noted that if a student is not meeting criteria benchmarks, s/he must be reviewed negatively in writing; if the student has not shown improvement by the end of the second year, s/he is then subject to dismissal. It was also asked if the offer letter, which is binding on the University's part, could be made binding for the student. This concern was expressed because students will accept offers and then not enroll. The Vice Provost advised that the best way to get a student to come to Temple is for the departmental mentor and/or Graduate Coordinator to build a rapport with the student.

In new business, the Associate Deans have been alerted about TUGSA arbitration. The issue has to do with language related to "course" and "class." Some Teaching Assistants believe they should receive the same salary as professors, that teaching a "class" in the Summer entitles them to a full stipend. For example, teaching a 1-credit lab course each Summer session would pay them about \$8,000 for the Summer, when the current rate is \$2,100 per credit. This issue has put Summer school in jeopardy for 2012 since costs would double or triple. The Graduate School has argued that TUGSA cannot grieve workload guidelines – and these have been in effect for 10 years. The Vice Provost noted that all information is due to the arbitrator by April 5, and a decision should be rendered by May 5. If TUGSA prevails, the schools and colleges will need to decide if labs will be taught in Summer 2012.

The Vice Provost also reported on problems with international students not receiving their admissions letters. In response to a change in protocol in December, the Graduate School was preparing admissions letters and hand delivering those letters to ISSS for mailing. ISSS was to email students to advise them to download and complete the I-20 if they would be enrolling at Temple and to send the I-20 to ISSS. The student would then be mailed all materials in one packet. It did not come to the attention of the Graduate School until mid-March, however, that the admission letters were sitting on an administrative assistant's desk unmailed for up to three months. The Graduate School has since returned to the original protocol.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned @ 3:45 p.m.

The next Graduate Board meeting will be held on Main Campus, 3B Conwell Hall, on Wednesday, April 25, 2012, @ 2:30 p.m.