

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Graduate Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) Meeting**

July 28, 2005
(Third Meeting – Day One)
1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Committee Attendees:

Charles Ambler, John Borelli, Mario Diaz, John Dollard, Alicia Dorsey, Allan Headley, Sam Hill, David Jeffrey, Marco Mariotto, Mitchell Muehsam, Robert Nelsen, Richard Pitre, Michael Roth, Joseph Stafford, George Stancel, Sandra Terrell, and Susan Yarbrough

Proxy Attendees:

Jeff Brown (for Jerry Thompson), Paul Meyer (for Rick Giardino), Michael Moore (for Dana Dunn), Quentin Smith (for Roderick Nairn), and Paula Williamson (for Mike Willoughby)

CB Staff Attendees:

Roger Alford, Linda Ewan, David Gardner, Kal Kallison, Kevin Lemoine, Raymund Paredes, Carol Raney, Cheryl Rosipal, and Mary Smith

1. Introductions

- A. Joseph Stafford opened the meeting by thanking committee members and other attendees. Dr. Stafford then asked committee members, Coordinating Board staff, and audience members to introduce themselves.
- B. Kal Kallison also offered thanks to the group. Dr. Kallison explained that the Coordinating Board had adopted the committee's recommendations at the July 2005 Board meeting, with some minor modifications. Dr. Kallison explained that minor modifications involved language in certain of the recommendations at the advice of Coordinating Board General Counsel Jan Greenberg.
- C. A copy of the Board's adopted changes to Chapter 5, Subchapter B is attached to these minutes.

2. Consideration and approval of minutes from the May 6, 2005 meeting

- A. Sandra Terrell asked committee members to offer a motion to approve the minutes from the May 6 meeting. Robert Nelsen offered the first motion, which was seconded by Mitchell Muehsam.
- B. The vote by members was unanimous for the approval of the minutes.

3. Consideration of measures of quality in graduate education – full committee

- A. Dr. Stafford asked Gerry Dizinno of The University of Texas at San Antonio to provide committee members with a copy of the spreadsheet entitled "Doctoral Program Measures of Quality/Effectiveness: REVISED Summary of Suggested Domains and Measures." The spreadsheet was developed by Joe Stafford, Dorothy Flanagan, and Gerry Dizinno through joint discussion.
- B. Dr. Dizinno addressed the committee.
 1. Dr. Dizinno explained that the spreadsheet had been developed by looking at the original summary, with additional consideration given to the Coordinating Board's new Accountability System. Dr. Dizinno further explained that the

- Questions/Concerns column included questions and concerns that still needed to be answered or addressed.
2. Dr. Dizinno noted that when we look at graduation and attrition rates for doctoral programs, we need to consider the time frame to be used -- for example, eight years or 10 years, depending on whether we consider certain criteria. Dr. Dizinno also noted that Measures #4 through #7 would require significant tracking. He noted that while the Coordinating Board can track undergraduates with Coordinating Board data in conjunction with data from the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), it still is limited to Texas. (David Gardner confirmed that TWC data was limited to Texas.) Given that doctoral graduates may move out of state, tracking graduates at the doctoral level will be more difficult and likely will fall on the backs of faculty. It also could involve increased bureaucracy.
 3. Dr. Dizinno noted that using faculty publications as a measure of quality may not be relevant for some disciplines. He also emphasized that professional productivity can be a challenge to consider as a measure of quality.
 4. Dr. Dizinno expressed concern that using certain measures of quality might be misleading for programs that had not been in existence very long. He also suggested that numbers of graduates may not always be a meaningful measure of program quality, particularly when it comes to the public's perception that smaller numbers may mean poorer programs.
 5. Dr. Dizinno noted that UTSA and UTEP appear to be doing better than UT-Austin in terms of doctoral graduates who are employed, but that this probably reflects graduates staying in Texas.
- C. Dr. Muehsam suggested a two- to three- year moving average rather than having annual measures required for all doctoral disciplines.
 - D. Dr. Gardner agreed and noted it would be very difficult for institutions to report these data annually.
 - E. Dr. Kallison noted that Recommendation #3 could be measured at various intervals and that Recommendation #1 could be measured annually.
 - F. Dr. Gardner noted that different disciplines could be measured on different intervals.
 - G. Dr. Kallison agreed and noted that this was the way measurement was envisioned.
 - H. Dr. Stafford thanked Dr. Dizinno and emphasized that the worksheet is intended for internal use.
 - I. Dr. Stafford turned meeting over to Dr. Terrell.
 - J. Dr. Terrell told the committee members she would like for them to divide into six groups. She then explained the process she envisioned. First, each group would consider Recommendation #3, because this recommendation was needed as a springboard for Recommendations #1 and #2. Once everyone counted themselves off from 1 to 6, worksheets would be distributed. Dr. Terrell suggested that each group consider three of the recommendations. Each group would then be asked to tell the full committee whether a criterion should be included in a statewide assessment (i.e., yes, no, or maybe; and explanation and disciplines to which applicable). Once each group had shared their group's recommendations, the full committee would discuss the recommendations of each group. The vote of the full list of recommendations would occur tomorrow morning.
 - K. The discussion then turned back to who would select the disciplines to be measured at various intervals.
 1. Dr. Kallison explained there may be certain disciplines that would be selected based on a specific interest of the Coordinating Board, the Legislature, or the

Coordinating Board staff (e.g., high profile disciplines like engineering or nursing).

2. Dr. Stafford asked about the statutory requirement.
 3. Dr. Gardner noted that it once was every five years, but this requirement was no longer on the books. Dr. Gardner noted that some reviews would be desk reviews. Dr. Gardner noted that there would be more emphasis placed on undergraduate education in the future than there has been in the past.
 4. Allan Headley asked whether all institutions offering a certain discipline would be included in a given measurement cycle.
 5. Dr. Kallison said yes. He noted that when the Coordinating Board approves a new doctoral program, there is a new requirement that the institution provide the Coordinating Board with information about the program three years after the program's approval.
 6. Paula Williamson asked if this requirement was a "one-time thing."
 7. Roger Alford responded that we hope so. Dr. Alford explained that the idea for the information requirement after a program's first three years was meant to help ensure that the program, as approved by the Coordinating Board, was in place and operating as approved.
- L. Committee members then counted themselves off from 1 to 6 and broke into six groups.

4. Consideration of measures of quality in graduate education – breakout groups

Recommendation #3:

The Coordinating Board should conduct (on a periodic basis) statewide surveys and evaluations of doctoral programs in selected disciplines of importance to the state. Institutions would be asked to provide information on the following measures (in addition to what the Coordinating Board already collects):

- i. number and percent of doctoral graduates employed in the field (including post-doctoral positions) within one year of graduation and the average length of time to secure the job*
- ii. number of core faculty by rank in the doctoral program*
- iii. teaching loads of core doctoral faculty*
- iv. number of peer-reviewed publications/full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core doctoral faculty/year*
- v. number of dollars in grants/FTFE of doctoral core faculty*
- vi. percent of doctoral student in the program who are full-time*
- vii. percent of full-time doctoral students with fellowships or research or teaching assistantships*
- viii. dollar amount of research and teaching assistantship stipends for doctoral students*
- ix. full-time student equivalent (FTSE)/FTFE in the doctoral program*
- x. Other*

- A. Group 1 considered Recommendation 3, Criteria i, ii, and iii.
1. Criterion i (Doctoral graduates employed in field within one year)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. Two years is better than one year.
 - c. Break down into smaller categories.
 - d. Cannot consider across all university.
 - e. Should be all doctoral programs, regardless of type.

- f. Strike “average length of time to get a job.” Time to get a job varies by discipline and could encourage adjunct appointments.
 - g. Other distinctions for employment needed: professional employment and further education (e.g., post-docs/internships).
 - h. **Suggested revision:** number and percent of doctoral graduates employed in the field (including post-doctoral positions) within **two** ~~one~~ years of graduation ~~and the average length of time to secure the job~~
- 2. Criterion ii (Number of core faculty)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. Teaching loads of core doctoral faculty should be an institutional, not a Coordinating Board matter. Institutions need flexibility.
 - 3. Criterion iii (Faculty teaching loads)
 - Keep only if criterion is used internally.
- B. Group 2 also considered Recommendation 3, Criteria i, ii, and iii.
- 1. Criterion i (Doctoral graduates employed in field within one year)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. Concerned about timeframe. Instead of having one year, believe it should be related to disciplines and national norms.
 - c. Another concern is length of time to get jobs – difficult to get data. Difficult to determine when a student began looking, particularly in terms of hiring cycles for faculty appointments. Need timeframe qualified. Also, how do we remove from the data individuals who do not actively seek a job (e.g., a person who decides to stay home)?
 - d. Better to have an average over a given time frame than one year.
 - e. **Suggested revision:** number and percent of doctoral graduates employed in the field (including post-doctoral positions) within **XX months of graduation** ~~one year of graduation and the average length of time to secure the job~~
 - 2. Criterion ii (Number of core faculty)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. Common definition of core faculty is needed. Much time is spent defining core faculty by program. Core faculty should be connected to quality measure (i.e., number of enrolled students or graduates).
 - 3. Criterion iii (Faculty teaching loads)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. How do we handle buy-outs (i.e., grants, chairing dissertations, etc.)?
 - c. Concern that certain information can be misunderstood and misused. Important to consider how it could be used.
 - d. **Suggested revision:** ~~teaching loads of core doctoral faculty~~ **Expected average number of organized classes taught by core faculty per academic year**
- C. Group 3 considered Recommendation 4, Criteria iv, v, and vi.
- 1. Criterion iv (Faculty publications)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. What type of programs should the number of publications be applied to? Define as Ph.D.s, and when research publications are an expectation of faculty (e.g., Ed.D., Doctor of Public Health).
 - c. Publications should include books and journal articles only.
 - 2. Criterion v (Faculty grants)
 - a. Yes, keep.

- b. What types of dollars should be counted (e.g., noncompetitive vs. competitive, peer reviewed vs. non-reviewed, internal vs. external, training vs. research, etc.)? There are many ways of categorizing financial support that are secured. Would like for committee to consider how detailed the criterion should be.
 - 3. Criterion vi (Percent of full-time students)
 - a. No, do not keep.
 - b. Percentage of full-time students could be of interest to students and THECB, but it shouldn't be a measure of quality, because there could be contextual variables. For example, urban schools could attract part-timers.
 - c. **Suggested revision:** ~~percent of doctoral students in the program who are full-time~~
- D. Group 4 also considered Recommendation 3, Criteria iv, v, vi.
 - 1. Criterion iv (Faculty publications)
 - a. Maybe, keep.
 - b. Concern over who would be able to access and use information.
 - c. What is the definition of core faculty?
 - d. "Peer-reviewed" is problematic. There are good and bad journals. There are good and bad publishing houses.
 - e. Important to consider field by field.
 - 2. Criterion v (Faculty grants)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. Only external funding should be counted. It should be measured by expenditures per year. Funding fluctuates widely by field.
 - 3. Criterion vi (Percent of full-time students)
 - a. Maybe, keep.
 - b. Part-time students difficult to define. Complicated. Can be in candidacy and only taking three SCH. A better measure would be percentage of full-time students during the first year.
 - c. As a general principle, some will be comfortable with broader definitions, but when publicized may want more detail.
- E. Group 5 considered Recommendation 3, Criteria vii, viii, ix.
 - 1. Criterion vii (Percent of students with fellowships or assistantships)
 - a. Yes, keep.
 - b. For Ph.D. only and maybe some performance programs. Not for professional programs.
 - 2. Criterion viii (Dollar amount of assistantship stipends)
 - a. Maybe, keep.
 - b. Enormously complex issue. May be a good index of quality and of commitment from the institution, but concern is the metric used to determine dollar amount.
 - c. Could be misused.
 - 3. Criterion ix (Full-time student to faculty ratio)
 - Yes, keep.
- F. Group 6 also considered Recommendation 3, Criteria vii, viii, ix.
 - 1. Criterion vii (Percent of students with fellowships or assistantships)
 - a. Maybe, keep. Cannot recommend without qualifications.
 - b. Is this important for every field? Many differences between disciplines. Having support may indicate a good program. Lacking support does not necessarily mean it's a poor program.

- c. Is this a measure of quality? Not only is there a difference between disciplines but also in universities and geographic locations. Student involvement in work related to the doctoral program is an important factor.
 - 2. Criterion viii (Dollar amount of assistantship stipends)
 - a. Maybe, keep.
 - b. Valuable indicator of funding agencies, but would hate to see as a measure taken out of context.
 - c. Does the institution have the resources which can help eliminate distractions from students? This can be a small indicator of quality of the program.
 - 3. Criterion ix (Full-time student to faculty ratio)
 - a. Yes, definitely keep.
 - b. Perhaps as indicated by professional accrediting agencies that suggest.
 - 4. **Added other:**
 - a. Outside accrediting agencies' reports should be considered for discussion.
 - b. Student scholarly productive activity.
5. **Continued discussion of measures of quality in graduate education**
- A. Dr. Headley began the discussion by noting that the student experience is enriched in a diverse setting.
 - B. Terrell: Based on Michigan Supreme Court case, diversity could be considered as a measure of quality.
 - C. Kallison: All of these measures would be proxies of excellence. We know we can't capture the intricacies of a doctoral program. We also know that measures would be discipline specific and there would be differences.
 - D. Paredes: Much work in academia is misunderstood and misinterpreted, particularly by the public. We have to explain what we do better. Instead of fearing that data will be misinterpreted. The tension that exists between institutions and legislature – much is our own fault. There is an attitude of arrogance. THECB understands variability, but still we need to do a better job of making the case for what we do. If higher education wants to receive higher levels of funding from the Texas Legislature, we must show that the money is being used as effectively as possible, and we need to make a case for the importance of what we do. There is a lot of misunderstanding about issues like faculty workload. For example, we need to explain that teaching two courses doesn't mean working four hours per week. Has sensed frustration from Legislature in getting the information needed to make the case for higher education.
 - E. Stafford: Agreed that it is a huge issue to get past our fears.
 - F. Pitre: Competition among institutions causes problems. We don't tell story correctly because of competition.
 - G. Paredes: Believes it is more fundamental than that. Some information is not intelligible to those outside academic communities. We go to Legislative hearings, and there is tension between legislators and institutional representatives.
 - H. Ambler: The economic potential of a program is an important issue for the state. Is there a measure of linkages to industry that would be a useful measure?
 - I. Stafford: This was a good bridge to next part of meeting – What is the role of graduate, particularly doctoral education, in terms of economic development?

- J. Terrell: Asked members to turn in notes from group discussions to Cheryl.
- K. Stafford: There are 600 doctoral programs.
- L. Dollard: In the 1970s, THECB didn't have a lock-step for systematic reviews. Systematic review stagnated at UT-Austin once THECB was believed to be doing it.
- M. Paredes: All campuses should have a rigorous program review process.
- N. Mariotto: "Evaluation" may not be the appropriate term. Periodic assessments could help the Legislature. Accreditation reports are good for collecting data. Here we are developing measures that could help on a state level. Maybe we should drop evaluative aspects, considering that all are proxies. Process of faculty doing self-evaluations is valuable.
- O. Nelsen: Agreed that peer review of programs needs to take place on every campus. Blue Bonnet University elements need to be considered. At UT-Dallas, there is a review every six years. Schools must be working on their own on these materials. Accountability issues are what we need to be looking at. THECB staff is limited – staff can't review 100 education programs.
- P. Stafford: The date of last reported peer review could be added as a criterion.
- Q. Mariotto: Aggregate data could help us consider what should be looked at.
- R. Stafford: Aggregate report shows organization is accountable.
- S. Meyer: We could consider the state of the discipline, rather than the state of the programs.

6. Discussion of the issue of regional economic development

- A. Dr. Stafford shifted the focus of the discussion to regional development. Issue here is at what point does it make sense to have duplicate programs because of their impact on a region? How do you measure and assess?
- B. Pitre: None of our measures are designed to measure benefit to state. It goes back to competition issue.
- C. Stafford: Asked what these programs do for us.
- D. Nelsen: Royce West emphasized that the Legislature needs information on economics.
- E. Gardner: Asked how you talk to Legislature about the challenge of economics – the balance between overselling and the reality of economics.
- F. Dollard: It is perilous to focus on economic development.
- G. Roth: Economic development needs to be on a time dimension.
- H. Borrelli: Impact of mechanical engineering on the cotton and peanut industries.
- I. Kallison: We haven't done a good enough job in explaining the impact of doctoral education on Texas – we're benefiting from the education that is given to students from other states and countries.
- J. Stafford: Asked how we measure that impact. Does education play a different role in a global economy than it does in an agricultural or mechanical economy?
- K. Roth: We wouldn't have the nuggets without the program.
- L. Diaz: Asked whether or not THECB has a say in how money should be invested.
- M. Stafford: Asked what is the right investment strategy for the State of Texas. If we could take the investment strategy, where would we try to lead the Legislature?
- N. Pitre: We are supposed to be about education. If we narrowly define what we are doing, we become training. We need to be careful not to succumb to limited thinking.
- O. Alford: Brought up the issue of competitiveness, which he suggested could be handled by way of reporting, not by way of collecting.
- P. Pitre: We must be careful that we don't spend all our time competing against each other.

- Q. Paredes: In some areas we are so under funded it is difficult to envision Texas leading in these areas. For example, \$8 million was allocated for the state's Advanced Research Program. When we tell members of the Legislature the competitive disadvantage in Texas, they are stunned. California has allocated \$3 billion for stem cell research. In a recent USA Today article concerning research, Texas was not even referenced in terms of research. There are few members of the national academies in Texas. The state is not well-positioned to lead in research endeavors.
- R. Pitre: One positive is engaging a group such as this to discuss these issues and speak with a common voice.
- S. Paredes: Agreed.
- T. Roth: The San Francisco Bay Area is where capitalists are investing money. It started 20 years ago.
- U. Nelsen: Texas could be a leader in "strategic innovation." Texas is at a disadvantage, but if we think in strategic innovative terms, we have a chance. Texas must grow from the bottom up – from faculty. We must get rid of impediments.
- V. Mariotto: Economics are oversold. We must lead with what we can put utility on. Economic development of the region is the selling point. Trying to argue the benefits of a Ph.D. in Classics won't get us anywhere. Venture capitalists could broker. We must think differently.
- W. Stafford: Committee members were moving the discussion toward dinner conversation. We agree there is value in intellectual activity of graduate degrees. It is not surprising that intellectual activity and capital investment are correlated. How do we move Texas into this role, given demographic realities? What kinds of things do we do? Few people can give up six years of their life for mentoring and to be slave labor. Is that the best way for us to prepare our next generation of leaders? Can we use the intellectual talent in our region to extend mentors? Can we limit the number of non-Texans who benefit from Texas dollars? Are there ways we can do more for Texas without huge dollars?
- X. Moore: Tuition waivers to keep the best students.
- Y. Headley: More students are asking for additional preparation. How can institutions better prepare students for their professional investment? Students may not be broadly trained enough for their professional choice.
- Z. Diaz: Asked how much we are doing to develop partnerships. For example, NASA – how many universities in Texas are partnering with NASA? We need a system of incentives and rewards. These incentives could be local. It is crucial to have a system of incentives and rewards.
- AA. Pitre: Some students who graduate make more money than the professors. How can we keep faculty who are making less money than their graduates?
- BB. Roth: Not everyone was motivated by money.
- CC. Pitre: That was hard for a CPA to believe! (☺ Laughter)
- DD. Nelsen: We must create an environment where students who want to stay in school do so. We need a better recruitment system.
- EE. Terrell: The best way to impact economic development will be to impact economic change within families.
- FF. What one innovative thing can the state do? Suggestions from committee members:
1. Partnering with industry.
 2. Use doctoral programs to be policymakers.
 3. Get people to think about what different things they can do with graduate education, in addition to what their professors did.
 4. Fortified outreach programs, especially at high schools.

5. Better serve communities who don't traditionally go to graduate school. Bring universities to the students, rather than the other way around.
6. We need to get out of the elitist environment we operate in. Partner with K-12 schools and do other community outreach initiatives.
7. Build within our graduate programs service learning components, as in some undergraduate programs. Every campus needs better incubators, space where new schools for innovation can be nurtured.
8. We need to create videos of testimonials of people for elementary and high school students explaining what you can do with education.
9. Find ways to attract better faculty. Offer tuition waivers to students.
10. Major deregulation. The structures we have in place prevent innovation and the making of positive changes.
11. We need a master plan. Also, we have to consider a Texas defense education act focused on critical shortage in doctorates in STEM disciplines.
12. Advertise graduate education in Texas as a group.
13. In-state tuition for international students. Doctoral-level students should be convinced that the good of society is their personal good.
14. Develop a mechanism to connect with our community college students to go into research and science disciplines.
15. Need to intervene better with children while they are young.
16. Create a research advisory council, looking at the state of research, technology, etc., and make recommendations at the state level. (Dr. Paredes noted that we have that already.)
17. We need more mentoring of students with faculty and with former graduates of the program. We need to educate students on what it takes to achieve a Ph.D. education.
18. Utilize model programs in the state, such as cooperative programs among institutions, to achieve quality graduate education and to stimulate economic growth. Use distance education technology to better meet the needs of students/programs.
19. Increase research to get us out of low participation and success rates of minority students.
20. THECB should be the incubator or umbrella to use these ideas, to submit statewide sponsored grants, to receive funding and recognition we need. THECB would serve as a type of think tank to develop these projects.
21. Use the P-16 model to reach down into the early levels of education to teach children higher levels of thinking skills.
22. Texas can be a leader in reconfiguring bodies of knowledge and research in different ways. Also, we should lead the country to train people at the graduate level to achieve educational equity and better train people in certain fields, such as teachers and STEM fields.

7. Discussion of diversity in graduate education

- A. Following dinner, Dr. Terrell began this discussion with a summary of the Report from the Woodrow Wilson Foundation: Diversity and the Ph.D. Diversity in STEM areas is weak in Texas. Strongest area for diversity is in education.
- B. Some of our universities have various programs to increase diversity.
- C. Even when we do have programs, we have to wonder whether or not they are addressing the symptoms rather than the disease.

- D. Robert Ibarra's book *Beyond Affirmative Action*. There are low-context individuals and high-context individuals. Context is the environment and behaviors that surround an event. Some people evaluate the context to determine the best way to do something. High-context people derive more meaning from the surroundings and the group dynamic (high collaboration). Low-context people focus more on the meaning rather than the context (low collaboration). Low-context people tend to be of Northern European descent. High-context people tend to be Hispanics and African-Americans.
- E. There is a need to change the atmosphere/culture of institutions so that we can be more effective at attracting and nurturing students of minority groups.
- F. Ambler: The focus needs to be on expanding the pool of those students who go to graduate school. Part of doing that is to think about having different models of doctoral programs that have a different kind of culture.
- G. Borrelli: Work with students, pay attention to them, mentor them, have special programs for learning and for social activities. Build community with students. In terms of recruiting additional students, go where the students are to get them.
- H. Brown: Create an eclectic environment at institutions. More collaborative efforts among students (peer mentoring).
- I. Diaz: What will the state do to help minority-serving institutions grow stronger? Look at ways in which Hispanic-serving institutions can develop doctoral programs by partnering with other institutions. We need guidance and incentives and other ways to reward institutions to go in that direction.
- J. Dollard: Get people well educated at the lower levels. At the higher levels, it's hard to sell to people. Why should they do it? You have to get people to love the subject in order to do that. Individual attention is key. The group interaction model also seems to be successful.
- K. Dorsey: Partnership model. An "academy" exists between TAMUSHSC and Prairie View to help recruit minority students. Takes place during the summers to give students special educational opportunities and experience on various campuses.
- L. Headley: Build partnerships and alliances with minority-serving institutions.
- M. Hill: Find ways to make minority students not feel like strangers in graduate schools. Until the culture of the graduate programs becomes more comfortable, it will be hard to recruit minority students. There needs to be a sense of justice to the way resources are provided to students.
- N. Jeffrey: Partnerships with minority institutions. It is important to attract minority faculty that provide a good cultural environment for our Black and Hispanic students.
- O. Mariotto: In Houston, we don't have trouble getting minority students in undergraduate education, but it's hard to get minority students to go to graduate school. How to get students to love the subject and make the sacrifices necessary to continue their education? Unless we have a Marshall Plan for this and provide the necessary resources, it will be difficult to make it happen.
- P. Meyer: Institute a major Marshall Plan for each institution, which is what TAMU has been doing. Change culture, increase diversity of faculty, address class issues, and make the campus more welcoming. TAMU has a real commitment. Large faculty group committed to changing the culture of the institution.
- Q. Moore: Success of the McNair program at UT-Arlington. Large numbers of minority faculty are needed. Partnerships with minority-serving institutions. Provide more role models for students in the classroom. At the Legislature, we should target certain economic income groups for tuition rebates and other incentives.
- R. Muehsam: We need an educational environment that encourages team, as well as an environment that challenges the individual. The graduate school environment is

- ideal to attracting minority students. We need to start at the undergraduate level. Change the pedagogy of undergraduate faculty to create educational activities that appeal to high-context individuals.
- S. Nelsen: Need-based aid does not solve the problem. We are creating a center for teaching effectiveness, including collaborative teaching models, at UTD. Could THECB have a need and responsibility to teach us how to have good teaching effectiveness centers? Does the THECB have a diversity officer? Does THECB need to put priorities on partnership between institutions? Should THECB have fellowships for outstanding minority graduate students? THECB could do seminars on mentoring.
- T. Pitre: The Ph.D. Project, meant to increase minorities in accounting, was started several years ago and has been very effective. If you really want something to work and happen, you can make it happen. If we want to be successful in diversity, we have to really want it.
- U. Roth: From the position of a health-science school, it is difficult to get American students to do sciences. There is no economic barrier for a minority to get a graduate degree in a science. The barriers are way down the pipeline. Ten years ago, we started training teachers in Dallas counties to bring their students to classes to see what the research activities are like, but we have seen no big result of this effort. We have an associate dean to recruit minorities, and we are getting more minorities that way.
- V. Smith: Must be put as a priority, and we need to be persistent. Partnering and bridging with institutions and with the community to provide a more conducive environment for minority students to feel as welcome as possible. Go out into the community and the schools to educate them about what they can do with advanced degrees. Have graduates help to recruit new students.
- W. Stancel: There needs to be a master plan for the state to increase diversity in graduate education. We need to start as early as preschool to get students to be more imaginative and creative. Enhance reading preparedness for students in Texas. Graduate schools should also have partnerships with community groups. Important, too, to get the parents involved in the idea of graduate school for their children.
- X. Williamson: The efforts need to be connected. We need to make students aware that the environment will be one in which they can succeed. Also, many faculty members do not have the training to be aware of different learning styles and different cultures. Bring people into the love of a discipline and show them what it is like to be in academia. Include students at professional meetings to show them the real dynamics of a particular discipline. Bring in students even from middle school and high school.
- Y. Yarbrough: Increase the number of faculty role models. Train existing faculty. Form peer mentorship opportunities.
- Z. Stafford: Propose that the master plan be a human development plan for Texas, from prenatal on, and that it be developed by the expertise in our graduate schools. Second, propose that we think about a Texas virtual graduate school, including all of the potential talent in the state to mentor students. What would be the rules under which such a faculty operate in such a virtual graduate school? How would it work?
- AA. Paredes: Regarding a diversity officer at THECB, we don't need one. Everyone at THECB has a strong commitment to diversity. Regarding mentorship, at THECB we have a lot of mentorship opportunities for talented individuals. The Academic Advancement program at UCLA, which provides academic support to students, changed its focus on getting students prepared for graduate school. The University

of Michigan had extraordinary success in diversifying its Ph.D. programs by recruiting students in South Texas and other areas from where many minority students came. There are plenty of effective models around the country. The will just needs to be there. The faculty and department chairs need to be committed to diversity in their programs. In terms of three- and four-year-olds being less imaginative, I think they are more imaginative in ways we just don't realize. They are imaginative and creative in different ways. We need to meet students from different cultures and different experiences on their own turf.

- BB. Terrell: This has been a very productive discussion. We will continue discussing the four recommendations regarding diversity, and that will be part of the agenda for the next meeting. There has been a lot of discussion of the need for the will to accomplish this. We can assume that the will is there. We need to help people alter culture and the way people do things. We just need to show them how to do it. Recommend that in the next meeting, we give institutions the best practices that have been done at other institutions. Also recommend that we invite a consultant from an institution that has been successful at diversifying the student body to discuss how they did it with us at our next meeting.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Graduate Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) Meeting**

July 29, 2005
(Third Meeting – Day Two)
8:30 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Committee Attendees:

Charles Ambler, John Borelli, Mario Diaz, John Dollard, Alicia Dorsey, Allan Headley, Sam Hill, David Jeffrey, Marco Mariotto, Mitchell Muehsam, Robert Nelsen, Richard Pitre, Joseph Stafford, George Stancel, Sandra Terrell, and Susan Yarbrough

Proxy Attendees:

Jeff Brown (for Jerry Thompson), Paul Meyer (for Rick Giardino), Michael Moore (for Dana Dunn), Quentin Smith (for Roderick Nairn), and Paula Williamson (for Mike Willoughby)

CB Staff Attendees:

Roger Alford, Linda Ewan, David Gardner, Kal Kallison, Kevin Lemoine, Carol Raney, Cheryl Rosipal, and Mary Smith

1. Discussion of insights from July 28 meeting

- A. Joseph Stafford opened the meeting by asking for comments from the group regarding any insights from last night.
- B. Dollard: NRC reports.
- C. Pitre: In terms of increasing Ph.D. output, what if we entertained the idea of using experienced people and shortening the requirements of coursework.
- D. Hill: Aspen vs. Boulder model. Aspen model is 50% experience. Could be modifiable.
- E. Stafford: THECB is expected to carry out some kind of periodic review of all doctoral programs, if not graduate programs. The other side is that if that review process takes the place of a rigorous campus review process, it would be a disservice. It should not undermine the quality of what we are trying to accomplish. How would we go about this?
- F. Stafford: Variation of Recommendation 3 -- 600 programs. Establish a review every six years. Take two-unit CIP code. Multi-status review. Stage 1 – review of common data set – review by staff and faculty advisory committee. Most programs would be checked off on basis of these data. If problems, Stage 2. If institution had peer review, those would be checked off. Stage 3 – self assessment and report. Stage 4 – heads of programs – state of affairs for those graduate programs for recommendations on serving Texas well by those programs. First three stages would be to look at individual programs and correct weaknesses. This also may identify collective weaknesses. For example, Biology had gone without appropriations for equipment for several years. The equipment was obsolete. This was enough to get a major appropriation from the Legislature.
- G. Headley: Likes the idea of bringing together experts. Wants to discuss rigor – varies by institution.
- H. Nelsen: Surprised by recommendation. Bluebonnet University. When bring to level of THECB, contexts are lost. There is a risk of homogenation. There also is a risk of punishing people who have taken risks. Hopes we don't move down this rode.

- I. Dollard: Bluebonnet University?
- J. Nelsen: UT has formed its own accountability system. THECB has begun its own accountability system with a variety of measures, breaking down systems into categories.
- K. Dollard: Does not interpret Dr. Stafford's suggestion as program review.
- L. Stafford: Re-explained his suggestion. Review every six years. Check-off system if institution is doing review.
- M. Mariotto: We need to move to more than a productivity accountability system. Does not see as an evaluation of quality.
- N. Kallison: It depends on what we mean by program review. We aren't talking about level of detail. Want to encourage review, but know it won't be done across the board. Measures will help. If a measure would inhibit creativity, it needs to go away. It is hard to argue that measuring time-to-degree would inhibit creativity.
- O. Stancel: Would experts be looking and then reporting to whom? Foggy on how this would work. Who would do the review?
- P. Stafford: Fifteen or so people who are in field would be needed to look at measures. For example, publications. If they were way outside the norm, this would be flagged and looked at. Look at standard measures. Only a small number would go to the third level.
- Q. Roth: Would the institution pay? Who would devote the resources?
- R. (Dr. Stafford provided an explanation, but minute taker unable to record explanation before further discussion commenced.)
- S. Meyer: Doesn't object to idea in general. Challenging to get together a group to do such reviews. Staff could do a desk review. Challenging. 600 very broad programs.
- T. Hill: What is the problem this will solve?
- U. Stafford: Perceives a lack of public trust in our management. Overall picture without meddling in management.
- V. Hill: Who is we?
- W. Stafford: THECB and institutions.
- X. Nelsen: Important to make public understand what peer review is.
- Y. Moore: Professional reviews already are being done.
- Z. Stafford: Trying to establish a screening process for programs that don't have accreditation or peer review and data suggests a problem. Mechanism to assure public that nothing would fall through cracks. What are we going to do with the data? Publish it and then say we did something.
- AA. Ambler: Academics seen as a closed circle. Ambivalent about plan. Why not build constituency. Why not include corporate and business.
- BB. Dorsey: Public distrust? Doesn't understand who doesn't trust doctoral programs.
- CC. Stafford: We scramble to respond to anecdotes in the Legislature.
- DD. Dollard: Reiterates Dr. Stafford's plan.
- EE. Muehsam: Likes idea of every institution conducting own peer review. Can't be just a checkmark. Physics program example. Concern is 4th stage. Report to Legislature could be problematic.
- FF. Meyer: Come down between best practices. Based on policy. For example, peer review required, website published.
- GG. Pitre: Measures could be a minimum part of peer review.
- HH. Roth: Program's own description is usually wonderful. Only when students are consulted do you find out problems. There is a problem with having people do their own peer review.
- II. Pitre: Doesn't peer review require students? Question is the structure of peer review. We need to gather right data for the right decision.

- JJ. Roth: Problematic programs need outside peer review. How do you determine these? Are you asking for an additional level of review?
- KK. Pitre: How can you do peer review without outsiders?
- LL. Roth: There is no money for outsiders. Local outside reviewers. For example, graduate school reviews.
- MM. Nelson: Need to define peer review – for example, stakeholders.
- NN. Mariotto: Slippery slope. Back to question on why we are collecting these data. Only statewide analysis of programs is based on productivity. Report suggests must look at more when it comes to statewide assessment. Don't want to get into Florida model where we dictate. Reason for data? Are these data reasonable? Don't want to get into adding dictating program review.
- OO. Dollard: What data are now available?
- PP. Kallison: Relatively few. Problem is we can't associate with a particular program. Purpose was to try to enhance quality of doctoral programs. If we could collect these data that indicate problematic programs, we could use to identify. Why should students be enrolled in weak programs? Idea is to shore up low-end programs in Texas. We could enhance at the high end.
- QQ. Paredes: Higher education is too micro-managed by the Legislature. Top 10% law. For example, come up with a plan for diversity, but not imposed. We have proliferated graduate programs in Texas without a sense of need, sense of competition, and little long-range planning. Surprised to learn there is no campus by campus plan or policy to regularly evaluate all academic programs. Thinks all campuses must do this. Time is determined by institution. Critical that campuses must develop own plans for academic excellence. Most academic review processes that are good involve internal and external review. Seems to be a fairly normal process. Doesn't think THECB should regulate the quality of programs. Notion of academic excellence should be part of every institution. We have many mediocre programs. Some should be closed down. This should be an institutional process. If institutions don't do it, the Legislature will.
- RR. Stafford: Rewriting Recommendation #3 – 9 points plus a tenth for accreditation. Staff reviews all. Connects with president of institution. Data collected annually in the Blue Bonnet sense – check for outliers, based on limited data. This is closer to what Drs. Dollard and Roth were saying.
- SS. Pitre: Legislature seems to speak in two directions about quality. Many problems we have are a result of the Legislature (e.g., letting community colleges offer four-year degrees). Powerful individuals can get programs.
- TT. Paredes: Certainly need change on both ends. THECB has taken positions on need, and has been totally ignored. Legislators say they want to have a statewide planning mechanism. Then they take a vote, and focus on a district. He has been trying to increase the awareness that we are trying to do too much with too little. On the other hand, institutions need to be self-regulating. Wish more institutions would focus on standing out in terms of undergraduate education. There is too much focus on establishing graduate programs.
- UU. Pitre: Committee needs to interact with group of presidents. Committee will be a joke if presidents don't agree.
- VV. Paredes: Presidents do what legislators do. They agree with having a statewide plan, except for their own campuses.

2. Discussion of data collection

- A. Following a short break, Dr. Stafford began the discussion by asking what kind of data all institutions should publish and make available to students in a standard way. He asked what data would be available on THECB website.
- B. Nelsen: Independent assessment by peers and stakeholders.
- C. Pitre: Are we saying the shorter the time-to-degree, the better the institution? The public doesn't know what the real measure would be.
- D. Dollard: Could include national benchmarks.
- E. Roth: Could be deceiving.
- F. Dollard: Important to define what you mean.
- G. Mariotto: Expressed confusion. Go back and collapse Recommendations 1, 2, 3?
- H. Kallison: If collapse?
- I. Mariotto: Collapse all measures, and then determine how utilized. Public information for planning, etc.
- J. Pitre: Come up with 10 items we want to look at?
- K. Stafford: Time to go back to small groups. Come back with a set of data that could be made available annually, so it would be part of regular data collection process.
- L. Mariotto: State mandated?
- M. Meyer: Part of the Accountability System.
- N. Roth: Attrition? If the student gets a master's, is it attrition?
- O. (Additional discussion of attrition.)
- P. Stafford: From the student's perspective – probability of success, how long it will take, cost, and what is it worth. From the state's perspective – those issues and whether it is well managed.
- Q. Pitre: Different students will look at data differently. Need to consider audience, different people with different interests.
- R. Stafford: Need to make tradeoffs.
- S. Mariotto: Back to the use for the data.
- T. Meyer: Thinking differently. A – What would be on the website? Not thinking of master data set. What do we need to put on the website for students?
- U. Mariotto: Utility is only assessed as utility for what purpose. Data on graduate programs already is being used for advising undergraduates.
- V. Diaz: Every two years – all points in A and C except 3 and 9.
- W. Dollard – Liked Dr. Stafford's idea. What are the students' questions? What are the Legislature's questions?
- X. Stafford: Students -- Probability of success, time required to be successful, cost to be successful, quality of degree once received. Other category – Management or stewardship of state resources. This is the type of question the Legislature asks. Oversee use of public funds. What data can we logically create, with reasonable consistency?
- Y. Terrell: May be opportunity to collapse data set and to add others. We may have to decide what to eliminate and what to add. Are we going to focus on diversity – minority students, minority faculty?
- Z. Stancel: Expressed confusion. Conversation was not where measures could go. We were focusing on the quality of the data.
- AA. Stafford: In small groups, what data could be reliably and consistently developed to address the four main questions?
- BB. Mariotto: Are we trying to develop a consumer guide? Confused.
- CC. Nelsen: Don't want to waste time from yesterday.
- DD. (Additional discussion of how to proceed.)

- EE. Terrell: We are going to collapse all recommendations into one. Each group is going to be looking at the criteria or data sets, and talking about purpose. Also, we will look at three criteria or categories. For stakeholders, planning, or accountability. Look at criteria and list. If it doesn't have purpose, scratch it.
- FF. Stancel: Also scratch it if it can't be collected reliably.
- GG. Terrell: Agreed.
- HH. Committee member broke into their six groups, as determined on July 28.

3. Consideration of the purposes of the proposed measures of quality – breakout groups

- A. Over lunch, committee members discussed in small groups the purposes of the proposed data collection elements.
- B. Following these discussions, each group reported the members' opinions to the full committee.
- C. See attached document "Purposes of Proposed Measures of Quality in Graduate Education" for a summary of these reports.

4. Continued discussion of the purposes of the proposed measures of quality

- A. Terrell: Would the data be made public, even if institution's program isn't doing well (e.g., zeros)?
- B. Petri: We shouldn't hide data.
- C. Meuhsam: Likes five-year averages and trends. Agrees with Dr. Pitre that there isn't anything in the data that should be hidden.
- D. Roth: Time consuming. If you ask people to do more than they can, they won't do a good job. For example, it is very difficult to serve on a tenure committee.
- E. (Discussion of difficulty and expense of collecting data on faculty publications for multiple disciplines. Collating data on multiple faculty every year would be problematic, even though it would be important for accountability.)
- F. Headley: Suggested the term "creative activities" as a measure.
- G. Stafford: Two additional measures -- year program started and year of last evaluation/accreditation review.
- H. Stancel: Issue of tracking employment after graduation. How can we get this information? Can't demand from a student or his/her job. Would love to do for alumni associations, but how?
- I. Nelsen: We do three exit surveys and still don't get everybody.
- J. (Discussion of accurate reporting of employment outcomes of graduates. Self-reporting would be doable.)
- K. Stafford: Have four categories, including unknown. Make optional. Many disciplines require for accreditation.
- L. Stafford: We covered many different issues. We will come back together in September for needs assessment/master plan initial discussion. What does the State of Texas need to be doing in terms of graduate education?
- M. Mariotto: Asked if graduate education diversity is in *Closing the Gaps*.
- N. (Discussion of the issue of faculty needed to educate the increased number of undergraduates and the diversity of that faculty population.)
- O. Hill: Confidence in committee, except in terms of issue of diversity. Need to move diversity up on agenda. Without this element, it is an empty can.

- P. Terrell: Best practices and how to make it work are important issues regarding diversity. We could consider hiring a consultant like Robert Ibarra (wrote *Beyond Affirmative Action*).
- Q. Nelsen: Offered motion to meet for two days at the end of September. Seconded by John Borrelli.
- R. (Discussion of what would be needed at such a meeting -- need operationally, what is working. Important to find linkages. Need integrated approach to increasing diversity.
- S. Stafford: Will work with Dr. Terrell and staff to determine feasibility of a two-day meeting for planning.

5. The meeting was adjourned at or about 2:30 p.m.