
I. Welcome and Introductions
Chair Linda Shea called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m. She started the meeting with introductions and announced that she had heard from some members that they would not be able to attend today, then moved to the approval of minutes.

II. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of May 4, 2011 were approved unanimously.

III. Comments by the Graduate Dean
Dean John Mullin noted that John McCarthy, Special Assistant to the Provost, was in attendance.

1. John McCarthy will coordinate the Doctoral Program Review which he will discuss later in the meeting. He will also be working with the Graduate School on developing PSM (Professional Science Masters) programs.

2. PSM is now a system effort & it became clear in a meeting at UM Lowell that Lowell has already established several. The Provost was concerned that we have only one.

3. Commencement: half hated it, half loved it this year (May 2011). Those who hated it found the ceremony less intimate than in prior years and those who loved it liked the shorter ceremony. There will be changes next year; faculty want to walk in the processional, and want to be able to greet their students on their way off stage.

4. Applications: we had approximately 900 more applications than the previous year, the yield was nearly constant and the GPA was up a little. Approximately 88 or 89 percent of new students were funded.

5. Cotutelle: We have been granted approval for one person & we are trying to get approval for second.

6. ESL: demand for English language training is likely to increase; we have ten new Iraqi students but it was discovered when they arrived that they had very little training
in English. Dean Mullin will discuss this with Provost Staros at their next regular monthly meeting.
7. Graduate School courses: Dean Mullin noted that we want to be able to offer a variety of professional development courses in areas like professional/research ethics, public speaking, as no-credit or 1-credit courses. Other areas might include certifying teaching experience and training, certified researcher, human subjects & so on. Staff member David Lafond is researching what our peers are doing in these areas. He will provide a summary of his findings to the dean for next meeting.
8. Latest version of the Draft Plan: calls for some reorganization and becoming a ‘division of Graduate Studies’; most changes would be internal, appointment of an associate dean for academic matters, with oversight of certificate programs, IGERTs, and course/program development.
   a. Graduate Records: consolidate with undergraduate Records;
   b. make some decisions about post-retirement appointments v. new hires.
Dean Mullin gave a copy of the latest draft to the provost but has not gotten comment from him yet.
9. Gateway Project: town residents are resistant to development of additional undergraduate housing closer to town residential areas but not so with graduate housing. This is a good opportunity for the GSS to work with Student Affairs and press for development of additional graduate housing.

IV. Old Business
There was no old business.

V. New Business
Election of new Chair of Graduate Council
Linda Shea said the Council should discuss selection of a new chair. She added that she would of course do what’s needed to insure a smooth transition. Dean John Mullin proposed that members submit nominations to Linda Shea by e-mail over the next two weeks (rather than open nominations at a meeting) and then the Council could determine final selection at the next meeting. The members present agreed. Dean Mullin added that he will be stepping down at the end of this year & that an interim dean will likely begin shadowing him January 1.

Filling Committee vacancies
Linda Shea noted the vacancies on several committees and there was considerable discussion of the importance of filling these vacancies, especially in light of coming changes in the Graduate School, the campus and the University and in the current difficult economic and political climate. There was some additional discussion of the important liaison role of Graduate Council representatives on the Research Council and the Academic Priorities Council. Linda Shea currently serves on Research Council and there is a faculty vacancy representing Graduate Council on the Academic Priorities Council.

VI. Committee reports as necessary
There were no committee reports.

VII. Comments from Administrative Officers and Others as appropriate
Linda Shea asked if the Fellowship & Travel Grant budgets are at the same levels this year. Dean Mullin noted that the Fellowship budget is at $500,000 this year, down from a high of $700,000 last year but up from the prior year level of $350,000. Susan Chinman noted that the Travel Grant budget remains at $50,000. We spent a little under $40,000 in FY2011 for Travel Grants.

Doctoral Program Review

John McCarthy presented the plan for completing the Doctoral Program Review. The goal is to achieve the level of the public universities in the Association of American Universities (AAU), defined mainly by quality and quantity of research and doctoral education. He noted that the review will focus on “aspirational” peers. The review will be useful in identifying programs that will benefit from strategic investment to move toward achieving the AAU level or to maintain a position in that direction. The review will take more than a year and probably be completed at the end of next Fall (2012).

The review will be guided by three principles: transparency, flexibility & fairness. The data and process are fully open to scrutiny and criticism by deans, chairs and directors of the programs evaluated. Programs will be allowed to propose more suitable peers for comparison purposes and to offer quantitative or qualitative evidence beyond the information developed centrally. There is room for dissent at every stage. Programs will only be compared with other programs in the same field. No recommendations will be made until programs and deans have had an opportunity to respond to them.

Most of our programs will be compared with their counterparts at 13 peers. There is a list on page 2 of the document I distributed here. Most of them were part of the “Delaware Project”--Stony Brook, UConn, Delaware. Some of the usual peers were dropped, for example, Nebraska/Lincoln because they were kicked out of the AAU, and Iowa State because they have no matches to most of our humanities and social science programs.

Key points of discussion were as follows. Every program will be compared with an equal number of peers when possible. In some instances there will not be comparable programs at our peers to maintain this. McCarthy discussed the limitations of the data to be used for the review. Data provided by Academic Analytics and drawn from Scopus has some real limitations.

On grants there is no data on Co-PIs though the point was made that the dollars going into a lab are more important than documenting Co-PIs & that data focused on Co-PIs artificially inflates the numbers. Journal article and citation data issues include the fact that Scopus does not include all journals or indices. The time window in the data source for journal articles, citations and books is also somewhat limited. The question of numbers (enrollment, graduate faculty) came up & the point was made that there is often a fixation on size in such reviews and that one size does not fit all. The review should consider that there are differing models and cultures in different fields.

The number of (our) programs in the review is at this time indeterminate; it depends in part on how areas like the School of Public Health or ISOM choose to be considered, either as one or by their separate programs or tracks. In general, the review will not use aggregate numbers but numbers per student for quantitative review items. Free software, “Publish or Perish” will be
used for a ‘hand search’ in data gathering by the review team. The review team will do the data
gathering and departments will be asked to clarify or explain information found as needed and
appropriate.

**VIII. Announcements**
There were no announcements.

**IX. Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.