

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

February 21, 2017

Approved: March 7, 2017

Members Present: Bogazianos, Bradley, Hembree, LaRocco, Michaud (ASI), Wassmer

Members Absent: Cowan, Lindsay, Newsome, Pinch, Topping, Vargas

Guests Present: Endriga

- a. **Call to order:** Called to order at approximately 9:08 a.m.
- b. **Open Forum:** Hembree noted that the Feb 1 deadline for grad signatures is a big problem for students since faculty aren't present in January. Michaud agreed. Endriga noted that OGS has very limited staff and that it might be important to emphasize this in the Grad Task Force work.
- c. **Minutes of February 7:** Could not be approved because there was no quorum at the start of the meeting.
- d. **Approval of Agenda:** Could not be approved because there was no quorum at the start of the meeting.

e. Information Items

- a. Report from Chair

Bogazianos reminded the Committee to fill out the Senate Poll. He also noted that the Committee will need to elect another GSPC Chair for next AY. He opened it up to the group, noting that he would be interested in serving again.

- b. Report from Graduate Dean

Endriga reported that Paul Hoffman from IPGE is still interested in lowering the minimum English language proficiency requirements from 7 to 6.5 in order to encourage more participation. She noted that Sac State is one only 2 CSUs that still require 7. Endriga noted, however, that it was unclear at this point if lowering the writing scores would become unacceptable at University levels. Endriga also noted that grad coordinators had not come to her with any concerns about the issue, and that Hoffman would like to speak with GSPC at some point in the future.

- c. Report from Statewide Senate

Nothing to report.

f. Discussion Items

- a. New Business: WASC Lines of Inquiry

Bogazianos explained to the Committee that it had been charged by Senate Chair Heather with answering the following question asked by WASC: What is the status of graduate learning outcome assessment? Committee members were a bit confused by the question because the Committee does not have any role in enforcing the policy, which is handled by Academic Affairs. Endriga, however, did outline the basic status: the

policy was passed by GSPC last AY and Academic Affairs has been implementing it; the first reports were due in Spring 16, with most programs submitting (although a couple did not); Yvette Farmer evaluated the reports and provided feedback, posting the reports to the OGS website; for this AY, there is now a template and guide posted to the OGS website; the submission deadline is May 30th; Endriga noted that she has spoken about the process many times to grad coordinators and so far the process has seemed clear. Bogazianos agreed that he would talk to Heather about the discussion and send along a written version as fulfillment of GSPC's charge.

b. New Business: Resolution Discussion

Bradley noted that she had looked up grad coordinator compensation information in the Department factbook but was unable to find anything, which seemed strange since it appears to be a clear workload issue. Bogazianos asked if the Committee believed that standardizing such issues across the University is the way to go; Committee members seemed to agree, but that such standardization would probably be minimum standards, with depts. being able to depart from the minima. Hembree emphasized that standardization is also difficult because accrediting and supervisory work differs so widely between depts. Wassmer wondered where data about how and if each College supports grad coordinators could be found, especially since these issues will also be discussed in the Grad Task Force, of which he, Topping, and Endriga are all a part. As an example, Wassmer noted that thesis supervision used to count for assigned time, but that is most often not the case anymore across campus. LaRocco suggested that the resolution language be phrased more broadly, asking the University leadership to make explicit commitments to grad ed concerning curriculum, workload, and resources. Endriga agreed, but also suggested that the resolution should also contain aspirational elements, laying out the many contributions of CSUS grad ed to the region, community, and ungergrad ed. Discussion closed with Bogazianos asking for each member to send along examples of resolution language before the next meeting in order to move actual drafting of a resolution forward in the near future.

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m.

Dimitri Bogazianos, Chair, GSPC