

Graduate Council Minutes

Thursday 3:15 p.m., November 10, 2011
Foundation Room

Members Present: Nesli Alp, Roger Briley, Monte Coulter, Stephen Craven, Chris Cunningham, Beth Dodd, David Edwards, Tammy Garland, Virginia Magnus, Mike Owens, David Rausch, Gene Schlereth, Joey Shaw, Chris Smith, Joyce Smith, Randy Walker, Kathleen Wheatley, Li Yang

Members Absent: Diane Halstead, Linda Johnston, Brendon McDermott, Valerie Rutledge, Shela Van Ness

Ex Officio Members Present: Jerald Ainsworth, Theresa Liedtka, Shelby Thompson

Guests: Linda Orth

Summary

Gene Schlereth called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

I. The October 13, 2011 meeting minutes were approved as submitted. A quorum was not present for the meeting on October 27, 2011, therefore no business was conducted.

II. Standing committee reports

Curriculum Committee – Li Yang, chair of the Curriculum Committee presented a list of the following curriculum proposals stating all had passed the first reading.

11-0001G ENG Computational ENCM 5500

11-0002G CRMJ Add 5040 Prof Dev Seminar

11-0003G COB BUS 5000r Sp Topics

11-0005G CHEPS EDS 6900r Capstone Project

11-0006G CHEPS EdD LEAD 700 Pre-Dissertation Seminar

11-0008G CHEPS LEAD GRE Scores, Act Enrollment Trans Crs, Dissrt Cmte.

11-0009G New PM Cert Clinical Mental Health Counseling

11-0010G New PM Cert School Counseling

11-0011G CHEPS SOE COUN 5590, COUN 5610, COUN 5720

The Graduate Council approved the second reading of the above proposals; 15-0-0.

Jerald Ainsworth reminded the Council that the catalog description guidelines called for a maximum of 25 words, excluding the title and words describing prerequisites and grading information. He also stated that if the proposal changes the program, print a copy of the current catalog program description and mark the changes in red to indicate the new program language.

Graduate Faculty Committee – Chris Smith introduced the new graduate faculty process (appended) that had been vetted by the Best Practices Committee as well as the Graduate Faculty Committee. If approved by Graduate Council, the new procedure will be faculty driven and similar to the promotion and tenure process. The proposed process will require the candidate to submit an application and an abbreviated CV to the department or college's Rank, Tenure and Reappointment committee (RTR) or a similar committee. After that review, it will go to the department head, the college dean, and then the Dean of the Graduate School who will make the final recommendation.

If needed the Graduate Council's Graduate Faculty Committee could review the standards and requirements across colleges and departments to ensure rigor, fairness and balance as well as make recommendations to college deans regarding any modifications in the standards of graduate faculty appointments.

Included in the process is a new graduate faculty application, CV and a recommendation to combine the Full Membership – Doctoral and Full Membership – Master's categories into one category; Full Membership. The three general categories would then be Full, Associate and Special. The Full and Associate membership appointments will be five years and the Special membership will be appointed for three years. If approved, the new process will be effective July 1, 2012.

After a discussion, the first reading of the new graduate faculty process was approved, 16-0-0.

Best Practices Committee – Randy Walker stated the committee was starting to look at grading of theses and would soon be sending a summary of information for the Council to review.

Graduate Student Association – Shelby Thompson said the Graduate Student Association was being restructured and they were accepting nominations for chair and vice-chair. She said that GSA members were working on several projects that included surveying graduate students, a GRE workshop in the spring and a marketing plan. She continued by saying that she had attended the Board of Trustees meeting in Knoxville and had the opportunity to meet with UT's Haslam Scholars and to learn more about the program.

III. Old Business

Graduate Coordinators Compensation Committee – Gene Schlereth stated that the committee had conducted two surveys, one in spring 2011 and then followed up in fall 2011 with a more directed survey to identify workload, responsibilities and compensation of graduate coordinators. The report is a culmination of their findings along with a recommendation that a reward system should be established in terms of release time, summer compensation, and or a specified stipend amount for graduate coordinators. The Council voted 17-0-0 to endorse the report and to move it forward.

Marketing Task Force – Nesli Alp said the committee had met and discussed how to effectively use the budget (\$3,500) that could benefit all programs. She said the committee is looking at short and long term strategies. She said that she was going to use the Engineering Management's department's GA to help collect information. She also asked that anyone interested in joining the committee to contact her.

IV. New Business

Gene Schlereth said Victoria Steinberg, president of the Faculty Senate has requested a report describing how Graduate Council operates. Schlereth said he would work to update the manual. The possibility of autonomy for Graduate Council was also discussed.

The next Graduate Council meeting will be on Thursday, December 8, 2011.

Without further business the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice I. Uhles, CPS
Administrative Assistant
The Graduate School

APPENDED PROPOSALS

Preface to the Proposal for Modifying the Graduate Faculty Appointment Process at UTC

Concerns

The current process for appointing graduate faculty at UTC has procedural inefficiencies that delay the appointment of faculty to graduate faculty in a timely manner. Aside from the time it takes an application to move through an academic department and college, the primary bottleneck to the appointment process is the need for all requests for appointment to graduate faculty to be reviewed by the Graduate Council Graduate Faculty Committee and then be approved by the Graduate Council (GC) as a whole. This process requires posting of the applications, time for review by the GC Graduate Faculty Committee and typically voting by electronic means. If there is concern regarding an application, the GC Graduate Faculty Committee will usually schedule a meeting for discussion. Once the voting step is completed a recommendation is acted on by the entire GC at the next regularly scheduled meeting. Although GC meets the second and fourth Thursdays from September – April (except for December), there can be a delay of up to an additional two weeks for the GC to act. An additional inefficiency is the fact that no appointments are acted on from May through August, which in reality could mean that an application may not be acted on (approved) from mid-April until mid- to late September; thus a period of 5 months may lapse before GC action. These inefficiencies could easily be remedied by modifying the approval process.

In addition, the appointment categories should be simplified to remove unnecessary stratification of graduate faculty. The full doctoral and full master's categories should be combined in to one category identified as full.

Objective

Implement a procedure that would ensure that graduate faculty applications are thoroughly vetted and are approved within 2 working days of being received in the Graduate School Office and reduce the number of appointment categories to eliminate unnecessary stratification of faculty.

Procedure for eliminating the concerns

See the attached document.

Justification for the change

The justification for the modification is primarily due to the belief that faculty and administrators within specific academic disciplines are the best sources for ensuring that the scholarly expectations for appointment to graduate faculty in a discipline are met. Just as promotion and tenure are a faculty driven process, the appointment to graduate faculty should be a faculty driven process with an application being reviewed and acted on by departmental faculty, the department head, college faculty and then the college dean. The Dean of the Graduate School would provide ultimate action (approve or deny) on all graduate faculty recommendations (analogous to the Provost acting on promotion and tenure recommendations / applications).

The role of the GC in this process would be to review the standards and requirements across colleges and departments to ensure rigor, fairness, and balance of standards across departments and colleges. GC could make recommendations to college deans for any modifications in the standards for a department and/or college.

Proposed Changes in the GRADUATE FACULTY APPOINTMENT PROCESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA

***Deletions in this document are noted with strikethrough and additions are underlined.

Membership in the Graduate Faculty

In support of continuing high quality graduate education at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga and in recognition of accreditation standards, the following policy for a Graduate Faculty has been adopted.

In terms consistent with the mission of the University, this policy defines a Graduate Faculty, describes the criteria for membership in the Graduate Faculty, and articulates the process by which individual selection is made.

Definition

There are ~~four~~ three general categories of membership in the Graduate Faculty at UTC: ~~full doctoral, full master's, associate, and special.~~

Graduate Faculty may teach graduate courses and undertake other responsibilities, as described below.

1. **Full Membership –~~Doctoral~~**

Full members of the Graduate Faculty for ~~doctoral programs~~ may teach graduate courses; direct theses, dissertations, and doctoral projects; and serve on thesis, dissertation, and doctoral project committees. They are eligible for election to the Graduate Council. Membership in this category is provided for individuals who are full-time tenured, tenure-track, or research or clinical faculty.

2. **~~Full Membership – Master's~~**

~~Full members of the Graduate Faculty for master's programs may teach graduate courses, direct theses, and serve on thesis, dissertation and doctoral project committees. They are eligible for election to the Graduate Council. Membership in this category is provided for individuals who are full-time tenured, tenure-track, or research or clinical faculty.~~

3. **Associate Membership**

Associate members of the Graduate Faculty may teach graduate courses, serve on thesis and dissertation committees, and are eligible for election to the Graduate Council, but are not eligible to direct theses and dissertations. Membership in this category is provided for individuals who do not meet all the criteria for full membership but are full-time tenured, tenure-track or research or clinical faculty.

4. **Special Membership**

Special members may teach specific graduate courses or serve on specific thesis and dissertation committees. Special membership status of the Graduate Faculty may be granted to visiting or adjunct faculty of the University or individuals working in business, industry, or the government who have special academic expertise or professional experience and who demonstrate competence in a particular course of instruction or field of study but who otherwise do not meet all the criteria for associate or full membership. Faculty who hold special membership are not eligible for election to Graduate Council. Special membership is limited to a three year appointment and maybe renewed if necessary.

Criteria for Full Membership

The criteria for full membership in the Graduate Faculty are designed to advance the specific programs of the University, and it is expected that participating graduate programs, the Graduate Council, and the Graduate School will periodically review the selection criteria.

1. Evidence of Appropriate Degree

For full members of the Graduate Faculty in doctoral or master's programs: an earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline. The degree should have been awarded by a regionally accredited institution or its international equivalent. Associate members of the Graduate Faculty and special members who will teach graduate courses must have a graduate degree.

2. Evidence of On-going Scholarly and Professional Work

Graduate Faculty must have maintained active and recent scholarship in fields of expertise. While research and scholarly production may be defined differently in each discipline or academic competence, the following guidelines are relevant:

- a. The activity involves a studious inquiry or examination.
- b. The results of scholarship and other professional production are peer-reviewed, depending upon the mode of scholarly production. For example, in the performing arts, there may be a provision for formal, public, peer evaluation. In other disciplines there may be a provision for peer evaluation of products such as archival or published research, presentations before professional societies, licensure and certification, or significant consulting activity. Classified or "sensitive but unclassified" efforts will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

~~Note: Because institutions offering doctoral degrees must meet high standards of professional and scholarly expectations, graduate faculty in doctoral programs will be held to higher standards of scholarly activity than graduate faculty in master's programs. While expectations for faculty may vary from discipline to discipline, doctoral faculty must have substantial, documented evidence of excellence in scholarly and creative activities on a current and sustained basis. These scholarly and creative efforts must be peer-reviewed in the disciplinary area of their assigned graduate responsibility.~~

3. Documented Commitment to Graduate Education

Evidence for commitment to graduate education may have been demonstrated at this University or at another institution by activities such as the following:

- teaching graduate classes
- conducting scholarly activity
- directing internships, projects, theses, and dissertations
- serving on committees for projects, theses, and dissertations
- serving on Graduate Council, if elected
- serving on Graduate Council committees, if designated
- advising graduate students
- serving as a graduate program coordinator
- developing graduate programs and courses
- participating in graduate recruitment activities
- developing research facilities

Demonstration of a commitment to graduate education by new members of the faculty in the first year of hiring may be determined in the employment interview.

Processes of Designation, Continuation, and Appeal

IMPORTANT: The following is the sequential order that must be followed for Graduate Faculty appointment as a full or associate member. Any application not using the prescribed application form and C.V. form will be returned. (See appointment to special membership for exception to this requirement.)

1. Process of Designation

- a. ~~The process of designation (appointment) to the Graduate Faculty will~~

- ~~i. Originate with the individual and the graduate faculty of the instructional unit in a process that will~~
 - ~~ii. Include the recommendation of the Department Head~~
 - ~~iii. Proceed through review and recommendation by the College Dean, and in typical cases,~~
 - ~~iv. be recommended by a “membership committee” of the Graduate Council, and will be recommended to~~
 - ~~v. Graduate Council which will in turn recommend to~~
 - ~~vi. Proceed to the Dean of the Graduate School, who upon his or her approval, will make the appointment by letter.~~
- a. Full and associate membership appointment process:
- i. The faculty member will initiate the nomination/application process in his/her academic department / instructional unit with an application submitted to the department head. The application packet will include 1) the application form, 2) an abbreviated curriculum vita following the prescribed format and 3) documentation that the applicant meets SACS requirements to teach at the graduate level.
 - ii. The department head will route the application packet through an approved departmental review and recommendation process. For example a departmental Rank, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee could serve this function. If a departmental committee is not available for review then a college level committee can serve this role. Departments must have written guidelines that conform to the Criteria for Membership. The departmental guidelines must be approved by a majority of the departmental graduate faculty and the academic dean of the college.
 - iii. The recommendation of the departmental committee will be forwarded to the department head who, along with his/her recommendation, will submit under his/her signature the application packet to the dean of the college.
 - iv. The recommendation of the academic dean, along with the application packet will be forwarded to the Dean of the Graduate School. The final decision to grant a Graduate Faculty appointment will reside with the Dean of the Graduate School, whose decision will be based on the relevant departmental and/or college guidelines and the information provided by the applicant.

NOTE: In some cases—typically in an instance of trans-disciplinary research and teaching and in inter-disciplinary research and teaching where there may be no single departmental discipline to advocate the appointment—the Dean of the College or the Dean of the Graduate School may initiate the process. He or she will submit the case for approval by the graduate faculties of the program(s) concerned with the projected research and teaching, after which the normal process will be followed.

In the case of interdisciplinary programs or college-based programs, as opposed to department-based graduate program structures, case-by-case modifications to the above appointment process steps may be made as appropriate and as approved by the relevant department faculty, department heads, college dean(s), and the Dean of the Graduate School.

- b. Special membership appointment process:
The applicant must provide a completed application form and an abbreviated curriculum vita or resume specifically addressing his/her expertise to the department head in the program where the appointment will reside. The department head must provide a letter of justification for the requested Special membership request, the application packet, and his/her recommendation to the academic dean of the college. All of these materials along with the recommendation of the dean shall be forwarded to the Dean of the Graduate School. The final decision to grant Special Graduate Faculty status will reside with the Dean of the Graduate School.

2. Process of Continuation

Upon completion of a Graduate Faculty term, a faculty member's status will be reviewed for reappointment to the Graduate Faculty, in accordance with the relevant approved department and college guidelines.

- a. The process of continuation varies somewhat according to the four categories of membership.
 - i. For faculty holding Full Membership ~~at the doctoral or master's level~~, credentials are reviewed at the time of initial appointment and every five years thereafter.
 - ii. For ~~Full~~ Faculty holding Associate Membership, status is reviewed every five years for continuation as an associate member or for acceptance as a full member. At the request of an associate member, his or her status may be reviewed for acceptance as a full member at any time when a change in circumstances warrants such change in designation.
 - iii. For faculty holding Special Membership, appointments will be reviewed after two years and may be renewable.

All re-appointments require department head and academic dean signatures.

3. **Process of Appeal**

If a faculty member's application for membership in the Graduate Faculty is not approved in the normal process described above, or if it is approved for a category other than the one sought, a written appeal may be made to the next approval level in the process. For example if the department head does not approve a nomination, the applicant may appeal to the academic dean of the college. Applications that are not approved by the Dean of the Graduate School may appeal be made to the Provost and to the Chancellor.

REQUEST FOR **APPOINTMENT** (INITIAL and REAPPT) TO MEMBERSHIP
IN THE GRADUATE FACULTY AT
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT CHATTANOOGA

Information in the boxed area is to be completed by applicant.

Applicant's Name (type or print): _____ Date: _____

Applicant's Signature: _____

Applicant's Rank/Title: _____

Please check the appropriate blank:

____ Tenured/Tenure Track

____ Research Appointment

____ Clinical Appointment

____ Not a university employee*

Department: _____

College/School (or Employment Affiliation): _____

Category of Graduate Faculty Appointment Request:

____ Full Membership: Doctoral

____ Full Membership: Master's

____ Associate Membership

____ Special

* Individuals who are not University employees should list their place of employment in the College/School blank.

Please note that an abbreviated current curriculum vita using the form provided and a SACS credential verification must be forwarded with this form.

RECOMMENDATION

Signatures

____ Approved	____ Denied	Typed Name	Departmental or College Ctm Rep	Date
---------------	-------------	------------	---------------------------------	------

____ Approved	____ Denied	Typed Name	Academic Department Head	Date
---------------	-------------	------------	--------------------------	------

____ Approved	____ Denied	Typed Name	College Dean	Date
---------------	-------------	------------	--------------	------

____ Approved	____ Denied	Typed Name	Dean, The Graduate School	Date
---------------	-------------	------------	---------------------------	------

**CURRICULUM VITA FORM for GRADUATE FACULTY APPOINTMENT or
REAPPOINTMENT**

Provide the following information.

DO NOT EXCEED THREE PAGES

NAME	POSITION / TITLE
------	------------------

EDUCATION / TRAINING (Begin with the baccalaureate degree or other initial professional education, listing advanced degree(s) and include postdoctoral training.)

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE (if applicable)	YEAR(s)	FIELD OF STUDY

A. Positions and Honors

Positions and/or Employment (begin with current position)

(Place of employment, position/rank, length of employment, role/function)

Honors

B. Peer-Reviewed Publications and Creative Works (list for the last five (5) year *only*).

C. Graduate Student Training & Teaching (List of the past five years (5) years, courses taught, students mentored as major advisor/professor/director or committee member)

D. Ongoing Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

An Evaluation of Graduate Coordinator Compensation at UTC Narrative Executive Summary

The Graduate Council (GC) consists of elected faculty from UTC departments that offer graduate degrees along with other faculty from other departments. It is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, but operates autonomously with regard to graduate education. A representative from the Graduate Student Association (GSA), a liaison from the Faculty Senate, and some administrators serve on the GC as well. Many of the elected representatives also serve as the graduate coordinators for their respective departments.

In order for the Graduate School to operate most efficiently and to continue to grow in quality and size, there must be clear communication and coordination between the departments and the Graduate School and within the departments and colleges as well. This is where the role of the graduate coordinators becomes essential given that the graduate coordinator serves as the direct link between the department and the graduate student. The graduate faculty in a department often look to the graduate coordinator as the person to recruit potential graduate students, organize and filter applications, provide administration of the program, file reports, and apply for accreditation (if necessary). Not all graduate coordinators execute all of these duties, but the success and growth of all graduate programs at UTC depends on these individuals performing a variety of valuable and time-consuming tasks throughout the year.

In the spring of 2011, the Graduate Council decided to examine the crucial role played by the graduate faculty and the graduate coordinators by re-evaluating the criteria for appointment to the graduate faculty and the workload of graduate coordinators. The Graduate Faculty Committee, a subcommittee of the GC, is currently developing more definitive measures for appointment to graduate appointment, while the Graduate Coordinator Compensation Committee conducted a preliminary survey in the spring of 2011 and a more directed survey in the fall of 2011 to identify duties, workload and compensation for coordinators. This survey indicated a heavy involvement in all aspects of graduate education and a significant variation in the recognition for this service. The data are summarized briefly in the following pages and are presented to the GC with a recommendation that a system of rewards be established in terms of release time, summer compensation, and/or a specified stipend amount for graduate coordinators. These should be negotiated at the department level with some degree of uniformity across campus. At the very least, there must be explicit recognition of the service for this activity if UTC is wants to create a stronger graduate component.

An Evaluation of Graduate Coordinator Compensation at UTC Project Summary

Purpose: To gather data that clarifies the current reward and support structure for graduate program coordinators at UTC and to use this information to develop recommendations for improving the existing reward and support structure as UTC strives to become a top institution of graduate education.

Sample: Graduate program coordinators ($N = 29$) for all graduate programs at UTC were contacted by UTC email. A total of 23 coordinators responded (response rate of 79%). All colleges within the university were represented: Arts & Sciences ($n = 7$), Business ($n = 1$), Engineering & Computer Science ($n = 6$), Health, Education and Professional Studies ($n = 9$).

Procedure: Graduate program coordinators were contacted by email on September 26, 2011 and asked to respond to a brief internet survey designed to gather their responses to a series of questions regarding the current reward and support structure, as well as regular work demands associated with the role of graduate program coordinator. Reminder emails were sent to non-responding program coordinators on September 29th, October 3rd, and October 4th. A complete copy of the survey is included in the appendix to this summary report.

Findings: Because the arrangement of graduate studies and the available resources for reward and support differ so widely across the four colleges within UTC, descriptive analyses to summarize responses to the survey questions were conducted at the level of each college. By presenting the information in this way, the intention is to provide colleges with information that can be used in planning a strategy for more complete, consistent, and relevant reward and support structures that can truly serve as a backbone for high-quality graduate education here at UTC in the near future.

Before presenting these college-level responses, it is important to highlight two overarching trends:

- 1) Coordinators were asked as to whether they are receiving both a course release and extra pay as reward for their coordinator duties – only 7 of the people receiving at least 1 course release are also receiving extra pay of some form, but only 1 of those not receiving a course release is receiving any extra pay → *bottom line: the current state of reward and support is all or nothing, with over half of program coordinators receiving nothing for their extra efforts.*
- 2) Most graduate programs have only one source of administrative support, but in two cases a combination of support options is being provided.

The following pages contain a summary and interpretation of participating Graduate Program Coordinators' responses to the core survey questions, separated by college. Where necessary and/or helpful, a brief interpretation of each result is also provided. ***Please note when reviewing the following pages that not all participating coordinators responded to each question. Where appropriate, percentages are reported and calculated out of the total number of respondents for a given question.***

1) Approximate size of graduate programs (in terms of number of current students):

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Median	35	300	24	37.50
M (SD)	34.71 (12.77)	n/a	57.20 (72.20)	76.75 (90.38)

It is important to note that the above numbers are influenced to some degree by rather anomalous responses from certain programs that are educating extremely large numbers of individuals.

2) Within your department, do you have any administrative support for your work as a Graduate Program Coordinator?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
No assistance at all	3	0	3	2

Yes, a full-time administrative assistant	0	0	1	3
Yes, a part-time administrative assistant	1	0	1	3
Yes, a full-time graduate assistant	1	1	0	1
Yes, a part-time graduate assistant	2	0	0	1
Yes, sub-coordinators for specific graduate programs in our discipline	0	0	0	1
Other (please specify):	0	0	0	0

It is important to note that respondents could select more than one response alternative from the options summarized above. The implication is that a particular program could have a mixture of full-time and part-time administrative help. In most cases, however, individual programs only had one form of support (if any at all).

3) Does your program have a graduate coordinating committee (which you chair)?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Yes	4 (57%)	1 (100%)	2 (33%)	5 (56%)
No	3 (43%)	0	4 (67%)	4 (44%)

If so, what are the primary functions of this committee?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Advise students	2	0	1	2
Evaluate thesis proposals	2	0	0	2
Approve independent studies	2	0	0	2
Consider curriculum changes	4	1	1	5
Other (please describe):	0	0	0	0

It is important to note that respondents could select more than one response alternative from the options summarized above. The implication is that the functions of graduate coordinating committees are not uniform across graduate programs, even within particular colleges.

4) Which of the following (if any) are application requirements for your program that you are heavily involved in managing/reviewing?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Personal statements	6	0	3	8

Letters of reference/ recommendation	6	0	3	8
Personal interviews	2	0	1	6
Background checks	2	0	1	3
Other (please describe):	0	0	0	0

It is important to note that respondents could select more than one response alternative from the options summarized above. The implication is that the application requirements and applicant review duties for Graduate Program Coordinators are not uniform graduate programs, even within particular colleges.

5) When is your workload as a Graduate Program Coordinator heaviest?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Fall semester	0	1 (100%)	0	0
Spring semester	0	0	0	1 (11%)
Summer	0	0	3 (50%)	0
It is even year-round	7 (100%)	0	3 (50%)	8 (89%)

6) Are you individually responsible for degree progress advising for most graduate students in your program?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Yes	5 (71%)	1 (100%)	6 (100%)	8 (89%)
No	2 (29%)	0	0	1 (11%)

In the few instances where the graduate program coordinator was not involved with advising directly, respondents indicated having either a committee or a professional advisor or general graduate programs coordinator in a particular discipline tasked in part with managing the advising process.

7) Are you individually responsible for handling communication with prospective graduate students who are interested in your program?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Yes	7 (100%)	1 (100%)	6 (100%)	5 (63%)
No	0	0	0	3 (37%)

In the few instances where the graduate program coordinator was not involved with communication with prospective students directly, respondents indicated having either a committee or recruiting coordinator to tackle these communications.

8) Does your graduate program require accreditation?

Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional
----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	--

	Studies			
Yes	1 (17%)	1 (100%)	0	7 (87%)
No	5 (83%)	0	6 (100%)	1 (13%)

When asked to describe the nature of the accreditation process and its demands on the Graduate Program Coordinator, responses were quite varied. Some accreditation standards apply to the degrees held by teaching faculty, while other programs require much more extensive and on-going recertification.

9) Do you receive any course-release time during fall and spring semesters for your Graduate Program Coordinator Duties?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
No	2 (29%)	1 (100%)	6 (100%)	3 (33%)
Yes, Fall semester only	1 (14%)	0	0	1 (11%)
Yes, Spring semester only	0	0	0	1 (11%)
Yes, both semesters	4 (57%)	0	0	4 (44%)
If “Yes”, for how many courses are you released?	Varies – roughly 1 course	n/a	n/a	Varies – roughly 1 course

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they currently taught courses in addition to their Graduate Program Coordinator duties – all indicated yes, to some extent. Several also indicated chairing thesis or other graduate projects.

10) Do you travel to recruit prospective students?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Yes	0	0	2 (33%)	4 (44%)
No	7 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	5 (56%)

For those who indicated traveling for recruitment purposes, the amount of time spent traveling varied, and was extremely short overall (perhaps 1-2 days per month on average, but typically no more than a couple of brief trips per year).

11) Are you on a 9- or 12-month contract with the university?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
9-mo	7 (100%)	0	4 (67%)	5 (56%)
12-mo	0	1 (100%)	2 (33%)	4 (44%)

It should be noted that some Graduate Program Coordinators are also administrators at some level for the university and/or their departments. The individuals who reported being on a 12-month contract as a Graduate Program Coordinator also reported being administrators.

12) Are you currently compensated/rewarded for your work as a Graduate Program Coordinator?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health,
--	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	----------------

	Education, & Professional Studies			
No	1	1	6	6
Yes, with additional pay	3	0	0	1
Yes, with a summer course pay	1	0	0	0
Yes, with a course release	3	0	0	2
If you are compensated, approximately how much money does this equate to?	\$2500	n/a	n/a	1 report of a \$5000 salary increase

It is important to note that respondents could select more than one response alternative from the options summarized above. The overarching implication is that within most graduate programs at UTC, Graduate Program Coordinators do not perceive that they are being compensated and/or rewarded for their work.

13) Do you feel that Graduate Program Coordinators should ideally be experienced faculty rather than untenured faculty?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Yes	7 (100%)	0	6 (100%)	6 (67%)
No	0	1 (100%)	0	3 (33%)

14) Do you believe that Graduate Program Coordinator compensation should be independent of a reduced graduate teaching load?

	Arts & Sciences	Business	Engineering	Health, Education, & Professional Studies
Yes	6 (100%)	0	4 (67%)	5 (56%)
No	0	1 (100%)	2 (33%)	4 (44%)

Recommendations: Based on the data collected from Graduate Program Coordinators across the four colleges at UTC, the need for reform of the reward and administrative support afforded these individuals is apparent. The following specific recommendations are offered based on the data that were gathered:

- 1) All Graduate Program Coordinators should receive some level of additional compensation for their extra work. Being a coordinator requires these faculty members to dedicate additional time and effort to extremely important responsibilities that benefit the university as a whole, and particularly the departments in which these graduate programs are housed. It is necessary to reward and support these efforts if a department and college seriously desires to maintain a strong graduate program. Specifically, it is suggested that:
 - a. A system of compensation involving some course releases and / or a stipend be created at the college level to ensure fairness with regard to workload as graduate coordinator;
 - b. The compensation structure should reflect the similarities and differences among departments and among the various colleges, as well;

- c. The EDO process should reflect the work effort directed toward graduate coordinator activities.
- 2) Graduate Program Coordinator duties vary widely depending on the area of study and the presence/absence of accreditation standards and challenging graduate student recruitment initiatives. The need for administrative support likely varies across these programs due to these and other factors, but each department and college needs to seriously consider the administrative responsibilities that are currently managed by Graduate Program Coordinators to determine if there are creative ways to reduce the workload and improve the efficiency of coordinator task completion. Specifically, it is suggested that:

The university should be creative in use/application of support personnel (use full-time and part-time personnel and subcoordinators when necessary) so that faculty time is utilized most efficiently

- 3) Serving as a Graduate Program Coordinator is a demanding task that should be reserved for faculty who are at least within 1 year of tenure. Otherwise, junior faculty risk being saddled with a heavy administrative load at the same time that they are being expected to prove themselves academically to the department and university.

Approved 12/8/11