

**2016-17 FACULTY SENATE  
GRADUATES STUDIES POLICIES COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**February 7, 2017**

*Approved: March 7, 2017*

Members Present: Bogazianos, Bradley, Cowan, LaRocco, Pinch, Topping, Michaud (ASI)

Members Absent: Hembree, Lindsay, Newsome, Vargas, Wassmer

Guests Present: Hayes, Endriga

- a. **Call to order:** Called to order at approximately 9:20 a.m.
- b. **Open Forum:** Topping informed the Committee that he is on the Grad Ed Task Force
- c. **Minutes of October 18, 2016 and November 15, 2016:** Approved.
- d. **Approval of Agenda:** Approved.

**e. Information Items**

- a. Report from Chair

Nothing to report.

- b. Report from Graduate Dean

Endriga reported that the Grad Ed Task Force has been having positive discussions. A few GSPC members were concerned about whether the task force has specific goal and a strategic plan; Endriga noted that the task force is refining its charge and mapping on to the President's agenda. Endriga reported that because of Unit 11 bargaining issues, the hiring of TAs, who are now non-exempt employees, has become more complicated to administer. Endriga also reported that Grad Learning Goals reports are due end of May, and that Yvette Farmer has created a template for programs to use, links to which should be available on the OGS website soon. Endriga also reported that there are some issues with some grad programs' course repeat policies: if programs don't have clearly defined culminating course sequencing, then repeating the same class can violate catalog and policy, and that grades can revert to no-credit. She suggested it might be helpful for programs to think this through.

- c. Report from Statewide Senate

Nothing to report.

**f. Discussion Items**

- a. Old/New Business: Grad GVAR updates/discussion

Current GVAR coordinator Hayes was invited to speak to GSPC concerning a pilot WASC assessment study of grad GVAR conducted last semester. Readers from 5 departments, all using the same rubric, read student samples twice, and their scores were averaged. There were 50 usable samples out of 75, since a number of them were not completed correctly. Around 15% were capstone level; around 40% were in the 3 range; around 50% scored low in mechanics; 2.4 was the average; and only one sample scored in the 1s. Hayes noted that faculty readers were comfortable scoring papers for

purpose but not for disciplinary knowledge. Hayes noted that there is some inherent bias in the pilot since some of it depends on faculty and students who self-selected to participate, but he believes the rubric will work moving forward, especially with greater outreach to departments as well as potential professional development help, perhaps through FLCs. Hayes and the committee seemed to agree that continuing to move towards a portfolio style GVAR progression, collected and assessed at three points (entry, GWIs, and culminating experience), would be ultimately beneficial. Such progress, however, would depend on having a more consistent program-level collection of writing artifacts. Ultimately, it would be most helpful to formalize key elements of what programs are already doing into GVAR policy, and that course-level grading should be part of it, in order to reduce the level of added work on already highly strained programs and grad coordinators. This part of the discussion prompted Pinch to move that GSPC formulate a resolution to be forwarded to Exec and the full senate that would unequivocally state GSPC's position that, in order to adequately move forward with grad education as a whole, graduate coordinators MUST be given far more support—especially in assigned time—than exists currently. Bradley seconded the motion. The committee agreed that the level of work piled on to grad coordinators in recent years, especially since the great recession, has made it almost impossible for programs to adequately address the various expectations added seemingly every year. LaRocco noted that Business, for example, raised tuition for the grad program, which helps with resource allocation, although the money did not trickle down to faculty. A number of members, however, were not in favor—ideologically or practically—with the notion of raising tuition. The motion passed unanimously.

- b. New Business: Minimum IELTS score [From Endriga at the request of Paul Hofman from IPGE]

Endriga reported that Paul Hofman was in support of lowering the minimum English language proficiency requirements from 7 to 6.5 in order to encourage more participation. Endriga noted, however, that further discussions will take place with grad coordinators and will report back at a later date.

**Adjourn:** Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:40 a.m.

---

Dimitri Bogazianos, Chair, GSPC