

## Graduate Council Meeting Minutes, 10/10/18

### Call to order

*Members Present:* C. Anderson, B. Baker, L. Broberg, M. Mayer, C. Nelson, M. Murphy, C. Palmer, D. Schuldberg, R. Smith M. Beavers S. Ross, S. Stan, N. White

*Members Absent/Excused:* S. Rinfret, E. Voronina, S. Whittenburg

*Ex-Officio Present:* A. Kinch

*Guest:* Provost Harbor

### Call to order

- The minutes from 10/3/18 were approved.

### Communications

- Subcommittees were reminded of their presentation dates and to prioritize the items on the Reorganization list distributed by the Provost. The Subcommittees are free to ask follow-up questions. There are no forms for a few of the items (MCLL Moratorium, College of Business Reorganization, Journalism move to the College of Visual and Performing Arts) so the Council does not need to comment on those. Two program move forms were submitted and assigned to subcommittees.

Subcommittee	Level II	L I	ProgMod	Prog Move	E-curr	Date
Humanities	2	2	2		3	10/23
Professional Schools	3	3	2		7	10/31
Sciences	2		4	1 HHP	18	10/23
Social Science	5	2	1	1(MPA)	15	10/31

- The Chair of the Faculty Senate sent a message to senators and chairs with a link to a feedback form, the summary of proposals and Box links, and the subcommittee presentations to the Curriculum Committees, so there may be guests when some of the items are scheduled to be presented.

### Business Item

- The proposal from Organismal Biology, Evolution and Ecology (OBEE) in DBS to eliminate the GRE requirement for its Masters and PhD program was approved.

## **Communication Continued**

- Provost Harbor was welcomed to the Council and members introduced themselves. The Provost did not prepare responses to the questions provided in advance by the Council (appended below). His calendar indicated the meeting was to open communication and he had a few notes on items he is interested in with regard to graduate education.

He briefly responded to the questions. Graduate education did figure into the staffing plans. The procedure came out of a lengthy review process of the AAIP, APASP, and the UPC. The first step was to consider student credit hours and the second was to consider investment according to strategic priorities. The second step involved graduate education. VP Whittenburg was on the advisory Executive Planning Council that provided input related to the investments. In terms of his interactions with the VP of Research with regard to graduate education, he is in frequent discussions with VP Whittenburg and is learning about the research infrastructure and the application of indirect costs. He sees the relationship as a good partnership that is necessary for the University to succeed. The Vice President's Office also has independence.

Provost Harbor is interested in more graduate student professional development. His previous institution had specific programs to prepare future faculty that gave graduate students a more holistic education as specified by the Council of Graduate Schools. He is trying to figure out what UM already does toward this goal. The GPSA is working on this issue and would be happy to meet with him. The University should support these efforts and he wonders whether the programs should be centralized. There is a lot of good research on how faculty learn and best practices in teaching and mentoring. This should be incorporated into graduate student training.

He is also interested in agility. How long does it take the University to develop a new program? He asked the question at Perdue and the answer was 18 months. He is interested in more hybrid and online programs that will bring more students into the university and wants to understand the process. He also would like UM to investigate offering stackable credentials/certificates, micro masters, and non-credit badges. There can be lots of innovation to further develop students' /employees' knowledge and skills. We should create structures that are responsive to getting programs to students quickly.

Growing online programs will require external partners (online management companies). Three have provided recent presentations. He is going through a process to identify a partner to invest in a scalable opportunity.

He wants to better understand how new programs are proposed. Is there an attempt to look at what is missing from our portfolio? Who is managing this? He also wants to understand the constraints on stipends and TA levels.

The Council is concerned that the University doesn't differentiate trainings and services in terms of undergraduate and graduate students. Their needs are different. There should be parity. The focus on student credit hours prioritizes undergraduate courses and there is already a problem of not enough graduate course offerings.

Given the current struggle with staffing plans, programs don't know how they will offer the core curriculum that is essential for students to be competitive after graduation. Students will be losing any differentiation to stand out in the market.

The university can no longer do what it has been doing. It is down 4000 undergraduate students. Graduate education is harder and more expensive to fund. The administration has heard from constituents that maintaining programs is really important. So we are asking units to look at teaching loads and other opportunities for comparable student experiences. Programs could investigate teaming up with other institutions. For example, Provost Harbor co-taught a course with a faculty member in another country which provided an enriched experience for students. He is open to brainstorming and working with the Council and programs.

- Associate Dean Kinch informed the Council that applications will still be processed through College Net. Submittable has not been able to resolve the technical problems.
- The Handshake system for Internships is not working for Journalism. There needs to be a system to help with tracking.

## **Adjournment**

- The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m. Members were reminded that there is no meeting next week.

## **Communication to Provost Harbor**

Thank you, Provost Harbor, for your willingness to promptly meet with the Graduate Council, a faculty governance subcommittee of the Faculty Senate charged with review and

recommendations to the Senate regarding matters affecting graduate education at the University of Montana.

Graduate education benefits the University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, the nation and the world with the generation of research and creative works that advance knowledge and enrich our lives. That scholarly capacity supports pursuit of grants, fellowships and awards that provide both direct and indirect costs to pay for the facility and staff, monies to pay tuition to UM and to ensure that faculty remain at the forefront of their disciplines.

Specifically, through teaching assistantships graduate education supports the teaching mission of the University of Montana by providing direct instruction of many undergrads, which in turn enhances retention and completion. Many units would be unable to deliver their curriculum without those teaching assistantships.

Through the downturn in undergraduate enrollment, graduate student enrollment has remained stable or grown.

In addition, graduate education has raised the profile of the University of Montana as a scholarly institution. Graduate education contributes significantly to our Carnegie Classification as a "Higher Research Activity" university. In addition, research funding at the University of Montana has been growing in the last several years to historic highs, facilitated by the qualified student provided by graduate education.

For these reasons and others, maintaining strong graduate programs at the University is of paramount importance.

In the face of declining budgets and the proposed reorganization, the Graduate Council has several questions or concerns that merit your response. We offer the most critical here so that we may make the most efficient use of your time and ours in the brief meeting we will have on October 10. We invite you to provide written responses if you wish, but in any event, request your response to the following topics at our meeting:

1. How does graduate education enter into the planning and budgeting process from the Provost's perspective?
  - a. Are impacts on graduate education explicitly included in the budget cuts and will it shape your response?
  - b. Are dollars/student credit hours the only metric for measuring either budget levels or strategic reinvestment?
  - c. Have you considered graduate programs in the proposed changes to the online portion of instruction? If so, how?
2. What do you see as the interactions between your role as Provost and that of the VP of Research with respect to graduate education?

We look forward to your reply to these points and hope to have the chance to explore these and other issues in more detail as we move forward to craft a vital and vibrant UM of the future that includes robust and thriving graduate education.

## **Good and Welfare**

## **Adjournment**

## **Message from Faculty Senate Chair**

Dear Colleagues,

We have had just over one week to think about the instructional budget targets that we will need to achieve by FY 21, and Faculty Senate has now received curricular proposals involving moving and reorganizing programs. The curricular proposals are being distributed to ASCRC, Grad Council, and their appropriate sub-committees. As was mentioned at the September Faculty Senate meeting, we will rely on the regular curricular review process to bring the reorganization proposals to the full Faculty Senate as seconded motions from the appropriate sub-committees. The [Senate's Review and Recommendation Process](#) outlines the plan for review.

More information about the [Presumptive instructional budget targets and responses to the corrections requested by academic units](#) is now available on the Provost's website. Please provide [feedback](#) on the presumptive budgets, strategic investment, and reorganizations. The [Summary of Curriculum Reorganizations and Change Forms](#) provides links to the proposals and identifies the subcommittee responsible for the review. You are welcome to attend meetings of ASCRC or Graduate Council when the reorganization is discussed. The [schedule](#) lists when the subcommittees will present to the full committee.

Sincerely,

Matthew Semanoff

Faculty Senate, Chair