GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING  
May 4, 2006  
3:00pm, MU 212

Present: Filtz, Francis, Gitelman, Harter, McCandless, McLain, McMullen, Proebsting, Rettig, Sanchez, Tadepalli, and Unsworth  
Absent: Gupta, Koenig, Rockey  
Guests: Robert Iltis and Elaine Pederson

1. Minutes from Previous Meeting  
Tom McLain (Forestry), concerned that programs already preparing self-studies would be required to employ the revised Graduate Council Graduate Program Review Guidelines, suggested that an effective date be added to the minutes. After discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve as amended the minutes of April 6, 2006. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

2. Chemistry Follow-up Review Report  
Elaine Pedersen (College of Health & Human Sciences) presented a follow-up report of the Chemistry Graduate Council Program Review. The original graduate program review took place January 30, 2003. Pedersen and Stephen Hobbs (College of Forestry) revisited the department Winter term 2006. Pederson reported that in a meeting with the department head, Douglas Keszler, they collected the following information (report appended here):

CHEMISTRY GRADUATE PROGRAM  
GRADUATE COUNCIL FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM REVIEW 2006

Department Overview  
In 2003, when the Chemistry Graduate Program was reviewed, the department faced a number of challenges including a building in need of many repairs brought on by low to zero building maintenance funds and a need to refill faculty positions vacated by retirements. The review committee was appalled to find out that the serious building problems that existed in 2003 still existed. Recognizing the need for additional funds, the Department has been creative in seeking increased funding. The Department has used funds from restructured course fees, Ecampus courses, Summer Session courses, and returned overhead in order to achieve some of the changes discussed in this report. In order to continue to support the various objectives of the Department, including the graduate program, the Department’s goal is to generate $1M each academic year in excess of their base funding. Since the Graduate Council Program Review in 2003, the Department has successfully increased the number of graduate students from 57 to 80 students. Three tenure-track faculty members have been added to the Department faculty.
Responses to Recommendations from the 2003 Graduate Council Program Review

Graduate Teaching and Advising
A re-examination of required graduate coursework is suggested. Given the size of the faculty related to the various traditional divisions of chemistry, the Department should consider reducing the total number of graduate courses that are offered.
At the time of the Graduate Council Program Review, the majority of graduate programs in chemistry in the United States required a lower number of credits for course work and a higher number of credits for lab/research work than was offered by the OSU chemistry graduate program. To make the OSU Chemistry Graduate Program more aligned with other chemistry graduate programs, the department successfully sought an exemption from the Graduate Council for the 36 credit minimum for course work for doctoral students and has reduced their minimum number of graduate course work credits to 27.

As faculty members retire, discipline-specific graduate coursework should be re-examined to insure compatibility with research areas identified as important to the Department and the research specialties of the faculty.
The Department reviewed the specializations of faculty who had retired and who were close to retirement and revised the curriculum. The Department is currently moving from five concentrations (Organic and Bioorganic, Analytical and Environmental, Physical, Inorganic/Materials, and Nuclear) to three concentrations (Organic, Bio-analytical, and Materials). These three areas fit the specializations of the Department’s mid-career faculty and have been the focus of new hires.

Although the courses needed for graduate students will vary according to sub-discipline, an effort should be made to have a common set of degree requirements, for example, the number of courses, research proposals, seminar presentations, cumulative examinations, and so forth.
There are no department core courses because each area of concentration is quite different from other areas. In both organic chemistry and in bio-analytical chemistry graduate students take core courses within their concentration. Core courses are not required in materials chemistry because it is a very interdisciplinary subject area and tailored to meet the needs of individual students.
At the master’s level the degree requirements are the same across all concentration areas. For doctoral students, all students take the same number of required courses, all students are required to participate in the department seminar, and all students who wish to be considered for a GTA take a seminar teaching course. Only the organic and bio-analytical chemistry doctoral students take written preliminary examinations. The materials faculty feels the oral preliminary examination is sufficient to test their students’ readiness for research.

Continued involvement in multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary programs is recommended. This offers graduate students the opportunity for additional coursework and an enhanced graduate and research experience.
Faculty and graduate students continue to be involved across disciplines.
To insure adequate graduate faculty for various divisions and research interest group areas it is critical that new hires be tenure track faculty to insure no further loss of graduate faculty.

Three tenure-track faculty members have been hired or are in the process of being hired, including the Harris Endowed Chair position. It should be noted that one faculty member will retire June 2006, one faculty member has resigned and accepted a position elsewhere, and two additional faculty retention cases are in process. To date, permission has not been granted to open a search for new faculty members. Regarding the impact of the retirement and the resignation, these two faculty members had efforts in two foci areas, organic and bioanalytical, of direct relevance to the health of the graduate program. Thus the impact is related to the Department’s capacity to maintain both its graduate research and education.

Faculty and Research Programs

While two of the three hires made in the last five years are women and one is an individual of color, the total number of faculty that are women and individuals of color is low. The Department is encouraged to continue to search for qualified women faculty and people of color as new hires by identifying capable women and individuals of color as recruiting targets as part of their hiring process for the replacement of retiring faculty.

The hire for the Harris Endowed Chair is from an underrepresented group. The other two are white males. The Department chair stated that current department demographics are close to the national average in terms of underrepresented groups.

Although current faculty are productive and successful in acquiring grant funds, the changing needs of industry, the failure to refill faculty positions, and the need to replace faculty who are soon to retire, place research programs in potential jeopardy. If research programs are in jeopardy, so is the graduate program. It is critical the Department be allowed to continue to hire faculty and be provided adequate start-up funds to recruit strong faculty. Substantially higher start-up funding will probably be necessary to attract women and people of color.

The Department was able to offer $600,000 for the two new faculty members and $2M for the Harris Endowed Chair position. As discussed in the overview, to continue to have monies available for future start-up funds and other Department needs, Department faculty members have made the commitment to try to generate $1M per year.

Graduate Students

The Department is considering a variety of initiatives. Some of the initiatives can be pursued with few new resources (Chemistry Self Study Report, 2002). The review committee supports these initiatives and recommends their implementation:

• Re-examination of required graduate coursework and restructuring of GTA work loads.

The restructuring of the graduate course work was discussed above. The lack of additional funds for GTAs and the increase in undergraduates across campus who need chemistry courses has negatively impacted the Department’s making the restructuring of
GTA work loads possible. Undergraduate chemistry service courses are in high demand and are required for many majors across campus. While the increase in undergraduates in Chemistry courses has brought new dollars into the College of Science, the review committee understands the Department is not receiving these dollars. Additional funds for hiring additional GTAs would lessen the currently high workload.

- **Continue to recruit international students.**
The Department has developed contacts with four universities in mainland China. Each year one faculty member goes to China and interviews students at these universities. Through one on one contact, students with English language skills and strong science backgrounds are identified. Generally, three to four Chinese graduate students are admitted to the Graduate Program each year. Additionally, the Department is beginning to establish relationships with several Korean universities.

**Other initiatives would require additional resources, but it is clear that if the Chemistry Graduate Program is to remain strong and keep its current status these actions will be necessary. The following are recommended:**

- **Hiring more graduate faculty.**
  As discussed above, this has happened.

- **Increase graduate stipends to stay competitive.**
  Graduate stipends were increased 3 percent this January and will be increased 4 percent January 2007. With consistent but small increases for several years the stipends will be closer to the national average.

- **Increase access to advising and faculty interaction during the graduate student’s first year.**
  Students are now required to make a decision about their research focus and subsequent research advisor by February 15 of their first year. Because of this earlier deadline they are more active in taking part in the orientation seminars during Fall term. In these orientation seminars they meet with Department faculty and learn of ongoing research projects. This change has opened up communication between new students and the faculty.

- **Identify potential needs of incoming students and match applicant interests with faculty research.**
The Graduate Recruitment Committee carefully evaluates applicants and steers incoming students to the mid-career faculty in one of the three identified foci areas discussed above.

- **Provide opportunities for first-year students to learn more about each professor’s research activities.**
  During the Orientation Seminar (discussed above) held during Fall term, new graduate students meet with different faculty members once a week for about six weeks. The voluntary seminar is held during the lunch period and because of its link to the deadline for a research focus commitment (discussed above) attendance is good.
Facilities
While a thorough cleaning would help and an immediate major renovation will provide some relief, the Department badly needs a new facility. Postponement could result in compromising a program of otherwise excellent quality. Therefore, problems with the laboratory facilities must receive high priority. It is recommended existing facilities be rehabilitated and construction of a new facility pursued.

The Chemistry Department is included in part of the University capital campaign initiative for a Pauling Science Complex. In the first phase Chemistry will have two floors, and it appears that in the second phase they will acquire a new building. This is still a number of years away, and there are serious facilities problems that still remain.

When the Chemistry Graduate Program Review was conducted in 2003 the Chemistry Building, Gilbert Hall, had serious plumbing and roofing problems. Three years later these problems still exist. This is a major concern of the follow-up review team. Ongoing water problems over a period of years continue to further damage building infrastructure and create a potentially, if not already existent, danger to faculty, staff, and student health and well being. The heavy rains of winter 2006 have potentially added to this risky situation. There is particular concern about the structural integrity of a sky bridge used daily by students traveling between classes. The follow-up review team strongly recommends that the sky bridge and roof receive immediate attention.

As indicated in the 1989 report, the Department must address the safety/health issues of graduate student desk space located in laboratories.

In the 1989 Chemistry Graduate Program Review it was recommended that graduate student desk space be located away from laboratories for health and safety reasons. This change was not made during the years between 1989 and the 2003 Graduate Program Review. This change still has not been made due to lack of space.

Resolving the issue of funding for the three major shared instrument facilities (currently supported via internal and external funding sources) would be beneficial to the department.

Since the review in 2003 there has been a joint hire of an x-ray crystallographer with the University of Oregon. The funding of the various shared instrument facilities is operating under a 50 percent cost recovery program. User fees pay 50 percent, and the Department pays the remaining balance from returned overhead. Faculty support this funding resolution.

Administration
Given that most graduate students hold GTA and GRA appointments in the Department and the importance of these positions to the research and teaching missions, the Department might consider ways to increase graduate student involvement in Department activities. For example, the Department might consider graduate student participation on the Long-range Planning Committee or other committees as appropriate. Graduate students offer perspectives and insights that can represent valuable contributions to the Department.
Graduate students are now active on the Department safety committee and the seminar committee. Students have the role of inviting and hosting outside speakers.

**Other – Electrical and Machine Shops**

The Department needs to locate sustainable funding to support shop needs particularly in the machine shop area.

The shop facilities are operating under the 50 percent cost recovery system used for the shared instrument facilities described above. External funding is used to help support these shops.

After Pederson completed her presentation, the Council discussed the condition of the Chemistry building. Members of the Council found this portion of the report to be of very serious concern. Some wanted to provide additional detail about the conditions in hopes of motivating change, but others were concerned that if there is no funding available for repairs, it might do the department more harm than good to draw attention to the matter.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Chemistry Follow-up Review Report and to recommend that Dean Francis communicate directly with the Provost regarding the condition of Gilbert Hall. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

3. Mathematics Follow-up Review Report

Robert Iltis (Speech Communications) presented a follow-up report of the Mathematics Graduate Council Program Review. The original graduate and undergraduate program reviews took place February 28, 2003. Iltis and Prasad Tadepalli (Engineering) revisited the department on April 12, 2006. Iltis reported that in a meeting with the new department head, Ralph Showalter and an associate professor, Mina Ossiander, they collected the following information (report appended here):

**Followup Report on the Review of the Department of Mathematics**

This report is based on a third year follow-up review of the Math department's graduate program conducted by Robert Iltis, the chair of the speech communications, and Prasad Tadepalli, a graduate council member and a faculty member in EECS. We met with the new chair of the department, Ralph Showalter, and an associate professor, Mina Ossiander, on April 12, 2006 and talked to them for an hour. Our overall impression after the interview was that the department has undergone a sea-change in atmosphere in the last three years. Three years ago at the time of the review several people left the department and the faculty slots were not filled by the dean. The undergraduate program was strong, but the graduate program was in disarray. The morale was low and the mood was pessimistic. After 3 years of new leadership, increased support from the administration, several new hires, and increased research funding, there is a new mood of optimism, higher morale, and positive spirit in the department. The old problems seem to have been largely solved, but there are some new issues such as space and covering the low-level undergraduate courses with increased enrollments. The rest of the report summarizes our interview.

1. The budget was $3.5 million 3 years ago. What is the current budget?
CLOSE TO 4 MILLION. INCREASE DUE MOSTLY TO INCREASES IN OPE AND RAISES. THE DEPARTMENT HAS ALSO OBTAINED SOME REVENUE FROM E-CAMPUS AND BOOKSTORE PACKET SALES.

2. The recommendation was to maintain a minimum of 25 graduate faculty members. Has this been achieved?
YES. 2 ADDED IN 2003, 2 IN 2004, 1 IN 2005, ANOTHER FIXED TERM TO START IN 2006. THE INCREASE IS DUE IN PART TO 2 CASES OF SPOUSAL ACCOMMODATIONS FOR FACULTY HIRED BY THE DEPARTMENT. OTHER ADDITIONS HAVE COME FROM THE RECENT PROVOST’S INITIATIVES
   • In 2002-3 there were 13 full professors, 8 tenured associate professors and one untenured assistant. What are the current numbers?

   • In 2002-3 instructors represented about 10 FTE in the department. What are the current numbers?

CURRENTLY: 6 FULL TIME, 3 HALF TIME AND 1 THREE-QUARTER TIME, FOR A TOTAL OF 8.25 FTE.

3. In 2002-3 the department had 48 graduate students, and GTA appointments supported nearly all of them. What are the current numbers?

BUDGETED AT $350 K, AND SUPPLEMENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT TO $540 K. IN 2005-2006: 46 GTA’S, 2 GRA’S, 4 UNSUPPORTED GRAD STUDENTS. IN 06-07 THE DEPARTMENT WILL RETURN TO 40 GTA’S—THE NUMBER ALLOWED BY THE BUDGET, SUPPLEMENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT.

LACK OF PARITY WITH PEER INSTITUTIONS REMAINS AN ISSUE FOR RECRUITMENT OF GTA’S. THE SALARY BASE FOR ALL GTA’S HAS BEEN SET AT $12,500, WHICH IS $1,000 LESS THAN UTAH STATE OFFERED 2 YEARS AGO.

Questions regarding the specific recommendations to the department:

1. What has the department done to pursue innovative pedagogical strategies to maintain student opportunities while reducing the cost of providing them? In your view was this a recommendation that could have been achieved?
SEE BELOW.

2. Did you eliminate courses from the catalog that had not been taught in three years? If not, why?
DONE. THE DEPARTMENT ALSO TOOK STEPS TO CORRECT PROBLEMS WITH GRADUATE OFFERINGS THAT WERE NOTICED IN THE LAST REVIEW. DISCIPLINARY SEMINARS, WHICH THE FORMER CHAIR REPORTED TO HAVE DISAPPEARED IN THE 1990’S, ARE BACK. THE CURRENT CHAIR REPORTS THAT THERE ARE NOW 5 REGULARLY SCHEDULED SEMINARS. IN THE CHAIR’S OPINION THE CURRICULUM’S HEALTH HAS RETURNED. SCHEDULING HAS BECOME A CHALLENGE.

3. What was done about the computing infrastructure in the department?

THE DEPARTMENT NO LONGER OPERATES ITS OWN SYSTEM. DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATORS BELIEVE THAT PROGRESS HERE HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANT. INSTRUCTORS COMPLAINED IN 2002-2003 THAT THEY DID NOT HAVE PCS. ALL INSTRUCTORS NOW HAVE COMPUTERS.

4. Instructors sought a handbook as well as regular opportunities to meet with the leadership in the department, and this was one of the recommendations. Were these recommendations met? If not, why?

THE DEPARTMENT PRODUCED A TEACHING PROCEDURES HANDBOOK AND AN INSTRUCTOR’S HANDBOOK. BOTH ARE ONLINE. REGARDING MEETINGS WITH THE INSTRUCTORS: THE CHAIR REPORTS THAT HE HAS OFFERED TO MEET WITH THEM 2 TIMES, BUT THERE HAS BEEN ONLY SMALL INTEREST.

5. Have you been able to find new sources of funding?

SEE ABOVE. A SMALL REVENUE STREAM (PERHAPS $40 K) IN E-CAMPUS, BUT MOST OF THAT MONEY GOES DIRECTLY TO SUPPORT INSTRUCTION. GRANTS HAVE BEEN THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT HERE. CURRENTLY 12 FACULTY MEMBERS ARE INVOLVED IN 12 GRANTS. MOST HAVE BEEN NSF. 2 RECENT GRANTS ARE DOE.

Additional questions:

1. The review concluded that the department in 2002 was less research oriented and more teaching oriented than it was in 1990. Is this still the case?

POSITIVE STEPS ARE TAKEN TO REVERSE THIS TENDENCY. GRANTS ARE ONE SIGN. MOST IMPORTANT HAS BEEN THE INFUSION OF ENERGY FROM NEW HIRES. ALL BUT ONE OF THE NEW HIRES IS IN APPLIED MATHEMATICS. ONE HIRE WAS IN ALGEBRA.

2. The review noted an increased orientation toward interdisciplinary and applied research. Is this still the orientation?

THE CHAIR BELIEVES THAT FOR INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH PURPOSES THE DEPARTMENT HAS A RESPECTABLE CORE IN PURE MATHEMATICS. A STRONG INCLINATION TOWARD APPLIED STUDIES REMAINS. FACULTY ARE ENCOURAGED TO DEVELOP CONNECTIONS OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT.
3. The review noted that from 1990 to 2003, 8 tenure track faculty members had departed, and five of whom were tenured associate professors. Have more tenured associate professors left? Have they been replaced with tenure stream faculty?

NO ADDITIONAL DEPARTURES.

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

A. THE DEAN HAS BEEN SUPPORTIVE AND RESPONSIVE, BOTH IN TERMS OF HIRING AND OVERHEAD RETURN.
B. THE DEPARTMENT IS WORKING ON THE PROBLEMS OF ADDRESSING UNDERGRADUATE DEFICIENCIES IN MATH PREPARATION. THE FACULTY IS NOW LOOKING AT CHANGING MTH 111 TO HELP WITH STUDENT SUCCESS AND RETENTION.
C. THE CHAIR REPORTS THAT MORALE SEEMS TO HAVE IMPROVED. THE DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN ABLE TO RECRUIT AND HIRE ITS TOP CANDIDATES. IN THE RECENT PAST THE CONCERN HAS BEEN WHETHER OR NOT A CANDIDATE WOULD COME, EVEN DURING HIRING DELIBERATIONS. DURING THE DELIBERATIONS FOR THE MOST RECENT HIRE THAT QUESTION DIDN’T Emerge. ADMINISTRATORS TAKE THAT AS A SIGN OF INCREASED MORALE.

After Iltis’ presentation there were few questions and no concerns from the Council members. Iltis told the Council that he left the Mathematics interview excited at witnessing a successful outcome to the initial review. He told the Council that the department is moving in the right direction and that he credits this to the increased support received from the dean and the change in leadership in the chair’s office. Tadepalli commented that there is always a question of whether or not Graduate Program Reviews matter. The outcome of the Mathematics review gives very positive evidence that they do matter.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Mathematics Follow-up Review Report. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

4. CGS Responsible Conduct of Research Initiative

Sally Francis (Graduate School) reintroduced the topic of implementing RCR (Responsible Conduct of Research) training at OSU, a discussion started at the April 20, 2006 Graduate Council meeting.

Francis asked if Council members had talked with colleagues regarding this issue and if there is further thinking and reflection to be shared. After some discussion, Francis presented two draft proposals (attached) mandating RCR training for graduate faculty and graduate students.

Tom McLain (Forestry) told the Council that he is not fond of unfunded mandates sent down to the departmental level by central administration. He feels this type of mandate would achieve an uneven response. Many Council members concurred. It was generally felt that without OSU RCR training resources already in place, it is premature to require departments to comply. Guidance is needed. A centralized program to provide RCR training should be developed.
After additional discussion, a motion was made to recommend that Dean Francis work with interested parties, including the VP of Research, to form a task force to develop a set of recommendations and report back to Graduate Council. Alix Gitelmann (College of Science) amended the motion to include instructions to the taskforce to bring a preliminary grant proposal to the Council by the end of Spring term. Theresa Filtz (Pharmacy) amended the motion to instruct the taskforce to also identify people willing to work on the proposed project over the summer by the end of Spring term.

The amended motion was seconded. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

Theresa Filtz was in the process of formulating a motion to postpone indefinitely any action on the two draft proposals regarding mandated faculty and student RCR training presented by Dean Francis, when the meeting ended abruptly due to a fire alarm which required evacuation of the building. It is the recorder’s interpretation that such a motion would have passed; therefore, upon approval of these minutes by the Council, the motion to postpone any action on the two proposals described above will be considered approved.