

Minutes of the Graduate Board

Thursday, September 21, 2006

3B Conwell Hall, Main Campus

2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Ann E. Barr, Saroj K. Biswas, Beth Bolton, Daniel L. Canney, James L. Daniel, Jay Fagan, Edward Flanagan, Laurita M. Hack, Kathryn Hirsh-Pasek, Barbara Hoffman, James Korsh, Jagannathan Krishnan, G. Augusto Lorenzino, Elizabeth Moran, Roberta A. Newton, Wes Roehl, Michael Sachs, Jagbir Singh, Miriam Solomon, Jon Suzuki

Ex-Officio Member:

Aquiles Iglesias, Dean, Graduate School
Zebulon Kendrick, Associate Dean, Graduate School

Graduate School Staff:

Cheryl Jackson, Assistant to the Dean
Kathryn Petrich-LaFevre, Director of Graduate Information
Margaret M. Pippet, Assistant Dean
Michael Toner, Research Associate

Approval of the Minutes:

Roberta Newton motioned to approve the minutes of April 19, 2006. Wes Roehl seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously passed.

It was requested that the meeting minutes from the Graduate Faculty meeting held in May 2006 be made available.

Business:

Dean Iglesias welcomed new and returning members to the first meeting of the 2006-2007 academic year. He expressed anticipation that this would be an exciting year for the Graduate Board and asked that members provide input on the Board's agenda for the year.

Turning to the day's agenda, the Dean noted that he was prepared to present data that would allow the Board to identify the issues with which it would like to deal. His goal is to have the Graduate Board participate in the bigger picture of graduate education. Toward this end, he presented a slide presentation on the trends in graduate enrollment both nationally, as observed by the Council of Graduate Schools, and at Temple.

The first set of slides demonstrated graduate enrollment. Temple's enrollment significantly contrasts with that of other "Research I" institutions. The student body at Temple is 45% full-time vs. 73% full-time at other Research I schools. *Is it problematic that our numbers are not on par with the national average?* The Dean noted that Temple's number is skewed to some degree because the institution only regards those students taking nine credits as full-time, while the Graduate School sees Teaching Assistants and Graduate Assistants who take six credits as enrolled full-time. *Is there intrinsic good in students being full-time? What is wrong with them being part-time students?* It was noted that time to

completion is generally less for students who attend full-time. *Is the issue of time to completion then a concern with regard to the NRC Review?*

The second set of slides examined citizenship of graduate students. Temple's enrollment again differs, with an international population of 13% vs. 26% for other Research I institutions. *How can Temple better compete for international students?*

The third set of slides revealed acceptance rates by field of study. In this, Temple compares favorably with other Research I institutions. Generally, the greatest differences lie in Temple's lower acceptance numbers in the areas of business and education and higher acceptance numbers in engineering. *What do these numbers reveal about selectivity?* It was noted that an institution can accept more applicants if the number of admitted students who actually enroll is low, while an institution with a high rate of enrollment following admission can be far more selective.

The fourth set of slides reflected the annual percent change in enrollment by field of study. In contrast with the national trend of increases in each of the fields, Temple's enrollment decreased in seven of the ten areas. Most significant were drops in business and education.

Laurie Hack questioned if the shrinkage was planned. The Dean explained that in some cases, the decrease reflects both fewer applications and fewer offers of admission in an effort to maintain standards. In other cases, a hold was placed on admissions to several programs because the college did not have sufficient faculty to mentor its doctoral students.

Kathy Hirsh-Pasek inquired about the impact of lower graduate enrollment numbers on Teaching and Research Assistants. The Dean noted that although the pool of potential TAs and RAs is smaller, the same number of assistantships is being awarded.

The Dean noted the URL for the report by the Council of Graduate Schools, which is <http://www.cgsnet.org/portals/0/pdf/R_GED2005.pdf>. He asked that the Graduate Board consider where the discussion of national trends should lead.

Two concerns were immediately raised. James Korsh asked about the number of potential graduate students out there. The Dean pointed out that the undergraduate population has already hit its highest mark so a decline in numbers can be expected. Ann Barr suggested that the popularity of urbanism ought to be harnessed.

The next agenda item discussed was "R" grades. In an attempt to clarify the use of the "R" grade, a revised policy was prepared for presentation to, first, the Associate Deans and then the Graduate Board. The "R" has wrongly been used to replace the "I" to prevent unfinished Incompletes from becoming Fs on the transcript. But this leads to numerous other problems. The revised policy is slated for discussion before the Graduate Board's Policy Committee.

The discussion next turned to grants for the completion of doctoral dissertations and terminal master's projects. It was noted that these awards offer less money than an assistantship so students are saying, "Thanks, but no thanks." It was further noted that MFA students are not using the funds they receive to support themselves but rather to purchase materials and services need to finish their projects. The Dean would like to increase the amount of the awards to the TUGSA minimum for each discipline. This will then prevent students from having to get jobs to support themselves.

Gen-Ed and the reallocation of Teaching Assistants was the next topic of discussion. A proposal is before the Board of Trustees to delay full implementation of Gen-Ed for one year. Regardless of the decision, the Graduate Board is being asked to determine how to allocate Teaching Assistants to Gen-Ed: How many for Gen-Ed? How many for core courses for the next year or two? And how many to fulfill departmental requirements? The Dean stated that he would be working with Peter Jones, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, to determine which departments will add or lose students based on the Gen-Ed requirements. The Graduate Board then needs to advise the Dean on the reallocation of TAs.

Miriam Solomon expressed her concern that a class system exists for graduate students. TAs and RAs get a free ride. But departments that need additional support hire graduate students as adjunct faculty, who receive \$3,000 in compensation for the same work. The Dean noted that the Graduate School has no control over adjuncts, stating that a TA cannot be shifted to adjunct status in the same academic year nor can one individual hold both appointments in the same college at the same time. He acknowledged that he would like to be able to increase student support somehow, noting that some programs bring in only the number of students that they can support for the duration of their time at Temple. Ann Barr noted that this is a discipline-specific problem in light of the fact that Physical Therapy supports no student fully because many choose to keep their part-time clinical jobs where they make much more money than the department could provide.

Last, the discussion focused on goals for the 2006-2007 academic year. The Dean noted that no new policies are pending, but that planning should begin. He asked that questions and issues be raised and items be suggested for future meeting agendas. He mentioned inviting Peter Jones to attend a meeting to discuss what might drive TA decisions.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned @ 4:15 p.m.

The next Graduate Board meeting will be held on the Health Sciences Center Campus, in the Executive Conference Room on the 4th floor of the Student Faculty Center, on Thursday, October 26, 2006, @ 2:30 p.m.