

**Graduate Education Advisory Committee Meeting
January 31, 2013**

Committee members attending:

Mohamed Abelrahman, Michelle Broadway, Karen Butler-Purry, JoAnn Canales, David Carlson, Dominick Casadonte, Austin Cunningham, Denis Daniels, Dorothy Flannagan, Benjamin Flores, Stuart Hall, Jack Loveridge, Jennifer Martin, Bonnie Melhart, Mrinal Mugdh, Victor Prybutok, Mary Beth Sampson, Robin Satterwhite, Nancy Street, Kandi Tayebi, Debbie Thorne, Jamboor Vishwanatha, Victor Zaloom

CB staff:

David Gardner, James Goeman, Allen Michie, Lizette Montiel, Stacey Silverman, MacGregor Stephenson, John Wyatt

I. Approval of the minutes

The minutes from the January 31, 2013 meeting were approved with minor corrections from Jennifer Martin.

II. Legislative update

David Gardner, John Wyatt, and Lizette Montiel gave an update on the agenda for the 2013-14 Legislature.

Appropriations bills: The CB budget for 2012-13 was reintroduced for 2014-15. Primary changes in the budget include the transfer of the Alzheimer's Disease Center to the UT System, an increase in the physician loan repayment program, a reduction of federal funds in anticipation of removed vocational education grants, and increased funds for UT-Brownsville and Southmost College to support their separation.

Outcomes-based funding: Budget requests for financial aid include grants for undergraduates, the teacher loan repayment program, new graduate medical residency programs, and Norman Hackerman awards. David Gardner requested help from institutions to keep tuitions down to help compensate for the insufficient number of Texas Grants.

III. Consideration of academic program review

James Goeman reported that the CB is developing a new website for institutions to submit graduate program review materials. Institutions will have three things to turn in: a self-study summary, one outside review for each master's program and two reviews for each doctoral program, and the institution's response to the external review. The CB will look most closely at the external review and the response.

Michelle Broadway asked for clarification on how the timeline for the site visit and report can fit in with external accreditation review. Goeman responded that external accreditation can serve for the report sent to the CB so long as it is within the last

calendar year. CB staff are willing to work with institutions to adjust reporting schedules as needed. MacGregor Stephenson added that the graduate program review can be scheduled for any time within the seven-year window, and the clock can be re-set if an external accreditation review is scheduled more often than that.

A motion was made to extend the deadline for an institution to submit a response to the external consultant's report from 90 days to 180 days after the site visit. The motion passed.

James Goeman asked institutions to appoint a single person to manage the collection and uploading of documents to the CB in order to avoid errors and duplication.

Jennifer Martin, Michelle Broadway, and Karen Butler-Purry asked about undergraduate program review. MacGregor Stephenson pointed out the link for undergraduate program review on the CB website which offers a tool for comparing programs by enrollments, time-to-degree, and other measures. Stephenson encouraged institutions to use the information as they plan for new doctoral programs. Undergraduate program reviews are not required by the CB, but institutions may wish to have consultants look at related undergraduate programs when they are on site to review graduate programs. The CB reviews the state's programs in each CIP code every ten years.

III. Consideration of modifications to the 18 Characteristics of Doctoral Programs

James Goeman reported that the CB has had complaints that the 18 Characteristics measures do not apply well to some of the professional practice doctorates. Goeman proposed a small working group to look at the 18 Characteristics and consider specific alternate measures for professional programs. The four issues for the working group to discuss are 1) definition of professional degrees, 2) consideration of alternate 18 Characteristics definitions for professional degrees, 3) which degrees should report the 18 Characteristics in a different way, and 4) how revised 18 Characteristics definitions align with the definitions used for annual reports on new doctoral programs.

MacGregor Stephenson responded to a question from Dominick Casadonte about the timetable for 18 Characteristics reporting, clarifying that the 18 Characteristics data should follow the same calendar as the CBM report data sent to the CB (December submission for the preceding Fall/Spring/Summer).

IV. Consideration of exemptions to Low-Producing Program standards

Members broke into small groups to discuss the program characteristics that would need to be considered if the temporary exemption criteria were changed for low-producing programs. Groups reported characteristics including job needs of the state and region, needs of the discipline as determined by accrediting agencies, grant funding generated by programs, cultural norms and under-represented populations, savings to institutions, diversity, regional educational opportunities, faculty quality and workloads, niche programs small by design, and an institution's willingness to keep programs without formula funding.

V. Discussion of items for future GEAC meetings

Members broke into small groups and reported topics including MOOCs and their relation to graduate studies, cost-saving mechanisms, criteria for new Ph.D. programs that do not have related disciplines, student placement and social mobility, best practices for mentoring and advising, partnerships between institutions, and alternatives to the "hour" as a measure of credit.

VI. GEAC membership policies

Allen Michie reviewed the new GEAC membership policies. The Coordinating Board (CB) is extending the term of service for GEAC committee members. One-third of GEAC members will rotate off the committee each year. If a member resigns from GEAC, the CAO of the institution can appoint a replacement for the remainder of the member's regular term. The terms of the chair and co-chair will be two years.

VII. Consideration of electing a Co-Chair

Dorothy Flannagan was elected co-chair by acclamation.