

MINUTES
June 11, 1996
The Graduate Council

1967 Fircrest Drive

Members Present: Katharine Cashman, Marian Friestad, Judith Grosenick, Van Kolpin, James Lemert, Catherine Roach (masters student representative), Richard Sundt, Mark Tveskov (doctoral student representative) Steadman Upham (*ex officio*), Claire Wachter, Virpi Zuck

Absent: Scott Delancey, Robert O'Brien, David Schuman (*ex officio*)

Guest: President Dave Frohnmayer, Professor Dan Kimble (liaison for program reviews)

Staff in Attendance: Shirley Collins, Toby Deemer and Maggie Morris

The luncheon meeting was called to order by co-chair Marian Friestad at 12:10 p.m. at the home of Dean Upham. For the benefit of President Frohnmayer, members introduced themselves, and Dean Upham distributed several documents that summarized the key issues affecting graduate education for the year:

Tuition/enrollment

Tuition increases of 10% (resident) and 14% (non-resident) both last year and the coming year are impacting tuition-bearing grants as well as individual students. Partial offsets included a special allocation of \$450,000 from the Chancellor's Office plus ~\$250,000 institutional aid dedicated to graduate students. These funds have helped, but rising tuition is an obvious explanation for a portion of the decline in graduate enrollments. Measure 5 program closures also account for some of the decrease. A partial offset to that decrease is the addition of a new master's program in arts and administration and the doctoral program in journalism and communication, along with the elevation of creative writing to program status. However, the net enrollment drop over the past five years is alarming, especially if it continues into 1996-97.

Program quality

Another concern is program quality. In last year's publication of National Research Council rankings, only two UO programs, biochemistry (molecular biology) and psychology rank within the top twenty-five. Correspondingly, only in these two program do we compete successfully for graduate students with GRE scores at or above the average for AAU institutions.

GTF Stipends

Stipends for graduate teaching fellows are also low comparatively, although the UO full tuition remission, an offset to incidental fees, and a contribution to insurance creates a package that is more competitive than the stipend alone.

Additional concerns

Dean Upham also reported that the UO Deans' Council has recognized that the attention focused on undergraduate credit hour production has led to a neglect of graduate education. The possibility of giving greater weight to graduate credit hours in the productivity model (perhaps at 1.3:1) is on the agenda for a Deans' retreat in late summer.

President Frohnmayer then shared his personal observations on the importance of graduate education, of the program review process, and of liberal arts curricula. He also responded to questions concerning the OSSHE planning process.

Program Reviews

Copies of the Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) were circulated for the 1994-95 program reviews: fine arts, industrial relations, economics, chemistry, and classics. Dan Kimble then reported that five reviews were conducted in 1995-96: art history, architecture, comparative literature, English, and folklore. Reports have been received from all review committees except for comparative literature, and MoUs are now being framed. The schedule for 1996-97 includes computer science, environmental studies, Romance languages, religious studies, and exercise and movement science.

It was noted that the review process is important in the strategic planning process and in the self-study being conducted as part of the institutional accreditation process. There was additional discussion of the degree to which campus goals and current issues affect the review process. The religious studies review was moved up on the review schedule in part because of campus pressure to incorporate Judaic studies; computer science was to have been reviewed two years ago, but was postponed because the newly-hired chair requested time to get established. Deans sometimes request moving a review up in the schedule to coincide with other program or staffing decisions. Flexibility is allowed so long as changes in schedule are not *ad hoc* or perceived by the faculty as punitive. The quality of reviews remains high: external reviewers are chosen as representatives of their profession, and a member of Council serves on each internal review team. The reviews examine accomplishments as well as goals or plans for the department's future.

Several suggestions were made for changes in the review procedures or guidelines. For example, the fact that the process is coordinated from the Graduate School can mislead a department into believing that the self-study process applies only to graduate programs. Calling the process "Department and Program Review" with specified sections for undergraduate and graduate program information might add clarity. Likewise, more specificity concerning the section on plans and future goals might encourage goal-setting that doesn't necessarily involve additional funds but might add to the coherence of program offerings.

It was further noted that the wider university community may not realize or understand the benefits and changes that occur as a result of reviews. Distribution of MoUs to all review participants would help disseminate the results more widely.

Revisions of the Program Review Guidelines will be put on the agenda for the first fall meeting.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of May 22, 1996 were distributed at the meeting and will be approved via e-mail after members have had a chance to read them over.

Election of Officers

It was pointed out that electing Council officers during the first fall meeting can delay action on many agenda items that require advance preparation. It also places new members in the awkward position of needing to vote on officers whom they may not know and for a committee whose work is still unknown to them. A spring election would eliminate that problem and would allow the outgoing, but experienced, members to voice their opinions on Council's direction for the coming year. It was decided to implement a spring election. (In the future it is suggested that we also invite incoming members to the spring meeting so that they could vote and also begin to become familiar with the workings of the council.)

The following slate of officers was nominated, seconded, and unanimously elected for 1996-97;

Chair - Marian Friestad
Vice Chair - Van Kolpin
Secretary - Richard Sundt

End of Year Business

Dean Upham presented outgoing members, James Lemert, Robert O'Brien, Catherine Roach, and Scott Delancey with gifts of appreciation for their service. He also presented humorous tokens of their office to the outgoing chair and secretary.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Sundt, Secretary

xc: President
Vice Presidents
Vice Provosts
Academic Deans