GRADUATE COUNCIL
April 22, 2010
2:30 pm – 128 Kidder Hall
Agenda

Grad Council Members Present: Carolyn Aldwin (HHS), Rick Colwell (COAS), Theresa Filtz (Pharmacy), Nancy King (Business), Denise Lach (CLA), Walt Loveland, Chair (SCI), Kathy O’Reilly (Vet Med), Darlene Russ-Eft (Education), Jo Tynon (Forestry), Tom Wolpert (AG SCI)

Grad Council Members Absent: Chris Lenn (Student Representative), Vinod Narayanan (ENGR)

Ex-officio Members Present: Martin Fisk, Gita Ramaswamy

Support Staff Present: Nagwa Naguib

Guests: Dan Edge, Chair, Fisheries & Wildlife; Ilene Kleinsorge, Dean and Jim Coakley, Associate Dean, College of Business; Rosemary Garagnani, Assistant Dean and Mary Strickroth, Coordinator of Graduate Services, Graduate School

1. Approval of Minutes – April 8th, 2010
Walt Loveland noted a correction to the minutes as follows:

- 2nd paragraph, 4th sentence:
  ..... and the Senate will consider the Oceanography proposal at its May meeting.

April 8th minutes approved with above corrections in underlined Italic.

2. Updates from the Chair
Loveland reminded the Council that last year the Council approved the Applied Economics Category I proposal. Course proposals for this program are submitted by the Graduate School and are designated as AEC. He then indicated that he had received about a dozen proposals seeking to convert existing AREC/ECON courses to AEC courses. Economics does not agree with this change. Loveland went ahead and decided on behalf of the Council to ask AEC to rewrite all the course proposals leaving ECON courses alone. This action is based upon the principle that one cannot eliminate courses of a department without their consent. (Economics wanted to use those courses in their public policy degree.) This proposal will be reviewed by the Curriculum Council. AEC faculty were not enthusiastic about this decision.
3. **Fisheries & Wildlife – Category I Proposal – Dan Edge, Chair, Fisheries & Wildlife Department**

Following the introductions, Loveland informed the Council that the Category I proposal to rename Fisheries & Wildlife (F&W) needed to be approved by the budget and fiscal planning group. An email from the Chair of the group, Jeff McCubbins, indicated that the committee had no objection to the name change proposed by F&W based on fiscal impacts.

Dan Edge introduced the proposal to rename the F&W department to Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology Department: the proposed new name will help better represent the nature of the department’s mission to the university, the students and the public. He then proceeded by saying that the idea was introduced about five years ago during the faculty retreat. They had a vigorous debate between the three groups, namely fisheries biology group, wildlife biology group, and conservation biology group. A large number of names were introduced and debated. They finally decided on the Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology Department. A large number of junior faculty are in the field of conservation biology.

Two years ago, the department then proceeded to survey stakeholders, alums and students. The largest resistant came from the alumni group as they thought the name did not sufficiently describe their fields.

The Department surveyed another group of liaisons. Three areas of concerns were identified as well as a large number of alternative names. Some of the concerns were:

- How can F&W be doing this while everything on campus is changing:
  - The department has been working on this for more than two years. There are no other departments with “conservation” in their names. It did not make sense to wait when the College of Agricultural Sciences has already listed the new name in their restructuring plan.

- Conservation Biology being represented as an interdisciplinary profession:
  - It is a biological science; F&W department is the only one doing it on campus. The department has been listed in the Society for Conservation Biology for the last 10 years and has more graduate students in Conservation Biology than any other department on campus. There is a difference between expressing interest and fully doing it. A comment from Lynda Ciuffetti indicated that Botany & Plant Pathology (BPP) would support the name change contingent on being able to develop interdisciplinary degrees or options in BPP in restoration ecology or conservation biology. Many environmental science graduates take F&W courses.

The liaisons identified several names and Edge responded that most of the faculty wanted to make sure that there are three components in the name. Hal Salwasser suggested a longer name. Others suggested “science” instead of biology. Conservation science was not acceptable to the faculty. There is a professional
society with an identifiable discipline, and science is too broad and outside the realm of biology.

Loveland asked if, in historical context, the issue of people was an interest in plants. Edge responded that plant conservation biologists are mostly in the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology. Denise Lach stated that conservation biology is an emerging discipline, when the two words are put together, a new discipline is created. It is really narrow. She then wondered why it was not defined in the department’s curriculum, if they wanted to become leaders in the field. Edge responded that there are two levels to the discipline: research and curriculum development. The department has a defined interdisciplinary master in biology across campus. Working on curriculum with other departments on campus is a challenge. On the other hand, they build coalitions as far as research is concerned, as twenty five percent of the grants are being submitted together with other departments.

Carolyn Aldwin wondered if an umbrella for a PhD program in Conservation Biology might get other departments interested in supporting the name change; and not as an alternative to the masters program. More people might be willing to work in this area. Edge pointed out that Brenda McComb does not support the name change as she herself is a conversation biologist. She indicated that it would not have been a problem if the two departments resided in the same college. Lach suggested that some faculty may be lured to the department from other departments. Loveland commented, in the case of moving to F&W from other departments, that there were principles that Becky Warner suggested, and Memorandum of Understandings between the two deans. Edge commented that there are different commitments from colleges to their individual faculty.

Jo Tynon asked what the level of support vs. no-support was, and what was the feeling about the lack of support from the College of Forestry? Edge responded that there is a total of six conservation biology faculty each from Botany & Plant Pathology, Forest Ecosystems and Society and Forest Engineering, Resources and Management. Marty Fisk pointed out that currently there is no major in conservation biology on campus and wondered where should this major reside.

Edge proceeded by answering the Council members’ questions as follows:

- Proposing a master’s degree in conservation biology, as students are attracted to conservation biology.
- Number of new graduate students will not increase.
- Graduate students can easily find the master’s degree in conservation biology by doing a web search for faculty with expertise in the field they are interested in. It will be managed the same way as other interdisciplinary programs, e.g. ESGP and MNR.
- Eighty percent of the department’s faculty are supporting the new name.
3. MBA Degree Program Outside of the Graduate School – Ilene Kleinsorge, Dean and Jim Coakley, Associate Dean, College of Business (COB)

Loveland began by informing the Council that there have been some correspondences regarding the proposal submitted by Dean Kleinsorge to Provost Randhawa about the MBA degree program transitioning out of the Graduate School (GS). Marty Fisk prepared a response highlighting the Graduate School’s current role in monitoring the MBA program.

Dean Kleinsorge proceeded by thanking the Council for giving the College of Business the opportunity to present its proposal. The MBA program is a small program. It graduates sixty students a year, with an average of ninety students in the whole program. There is a need and desire to grow the graduate student population to 20% of the total student population. The MBA has a global graduate distinction. INTO at OSU requested 50 slots in the MBA next year expecting to transition to 40 students. The COB saw the opportunity to grow and started thinking about how to ramp up the program to include the INTO students, as well as recruiting domestic students. In the early 1990’s, 62% of the student population was international students. The faculty decided not to have more than 50% international. Currently, the international students form 20% of the total population. They are looking at this transition as part of the strategy to grow a robust MBA program, up to 250 students a year. They would like to eliminate redundancy. The request, as in the case of Veterinary Medicine and Pharmacy, is to take control of the processes from admissions to graduation, while maintaining and retaining the Graduate Council policies. The COB is asking for the Council’s advice on how to transition the MBA program from the GS to the COB. She also indicated that Associate Dean Jim Coakley will be in charge of this transition.

Loveland reported that Provost Randhawa is funding this transition as a pilot program. Kleinsorge noted that the extra funds will be used for domestic recruitment. Jim Coakley indicated that the goal is to double or triple the student population and make the process more efficient.

Loveland wondered how to set up a matrix to evaluate the success of the program. Kleinsorge responded that a baseline will be established this May with the MBA Graduate Program Review. The new processes will be reviewed in two years. Tom Wolpert asked about the MBA accreditation process. Kleinsorge responded that accreditation reviews occur every five years. Those include a spot check of what is working and what is not working, an assurance of learning that is very vigorous, learning objectives of the program, external reviewers to judge the students, and several requirements for the faculty. The American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) is the accreditation association which has been in existence for a long time.

Coakley reiterated that the COB monitors its MBA students, which becomes redundant with what the Graduate School performs. The faculty will continue being involved in streamlining the processes.
When asked if the course numbers will be changed from 5xx to 7xx, Kleinsorge responded that they had no intention of making this change. She also indicated that they already control the tuition, are not planning on moving from the Graduate Council as it is responsible for setting up policies for graduate programs, and the strategy is to partner with other programs, e.g. MEng. Coakley pointed out that the MBA is a non-thesis program.

Loveland pointed out that the list prepared by Fisk indicates that professional schools processes are not monitored by the Graduate School.

As far as the MBA admission process, Kleinsorge noted that the COB approves the applications for admission, and then send them to the Graduate School for review. Not one application has been denied by the GS. They also do the graduation audits. Their goal is to streamline and get to the potential students in a timely manner, and respond quickly to qualified domestic students. She also indicated that she has had a conversation with Fisk regarding the difficulty in reviewing international transcripts.

Loveland proceeded by saying that other groups on campus might be interested in going this independent route. Fisk stated that there would be no problem for the COB to do their own admission, but this would not apply to other departments or colleges without an accrediting body. These are two different issues.

Rick Colwell wondered if the COB was intending to articulate this plan at the upcoming MBA Program Review. Kleinsorge responded that, so far, this is just a proposal and the COB is seeking feedback. It is an opportunity for advice on the transition from the GS and on growing the MBA program.

Fisk informed the Council that Dean Sally Francis’ opinion is if this proposal is approved, that all the processes for the MBA should be moved out of the GS. He then pointed out that the students will not have a central point to go to and it would create some confusion.

Jo Tynon wondered how many students were lost due to the current procedure done through the GS. She pointed out that the longer turnaround in the admissions process is not a good reason for moving forward with this proposal. When asked about the turnaround time for reviewing MBA applications, Rosemary Garagnani indicated that as of that day, there were 26 fall term admits, with a median turnaround of 4.5 days and an average turnaround of 6.8 days. Those admitted include both domestic and international MBA applicants.

Kleinsorge would like the opportunity to meet with the Graduate School to find the most effective way to deal with the transition, and identify best practices. More discussions followed.

Once the Graduate School and the COB meet, the Council will revisit the proposal.

Adjourned 4:35 pm