



**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH**  
Graduate Studies Advisory Committee (GSAC)

**Minutes (from Colleen)**  
**Meeting #2 11:00-12:30PM**  
**Thursday, October 21, 2021**

11:00: Call Meeting to Order – Chair, Dina Perrone  
Called to order at 11:02 am

11:01-11:03: Review and Approve Agenda  
Addition of an announcement  
Motioned and seconded - approved

11:04-11:05: Review and Approve [Minutes](#)  
Motion by Cory and seconded by Rod  
Approved

11:06-11:11: Welcome Members  
Student member could not attend today.

11:12-11:13: Thank you, Virginia, for taking minutes

11:18-11:23 Announcements

- Admissions, CSA, and OnBase
  - CalState apply is up and running for Fall 2023 admissions.
  - Thank you for submitting your graduate program splash page and Quadrant 4 materials.
  - Strongly recommend graduate advisors create a fake CalState application so that they can see how applications look and answer applicant questions.
  - There are videos about how to view applicants and submit decisions, created by Enrollment Services and Andrew Wright that is available on the ES site.
  - We now have a waitlist option and applicants have the option of choosing a second choice. One challenge is that once a department waitlists someone they will no longer have the option of pursuing their second choice. Second choices are visible to advisors, please consider if you want to allow the applicant the ability to be considered for their second choice program. Still working out deadlines regarding this feature because programs have different deadlines, but right now no way to inform applicants of differences in deadlines.
    - Question: Just to confirm, if a program did not designate themselves as a “2nd choice” program, when is the next cycle to do so?
      - Spring 2023

- Reminder: It is very important for programs to give detailed instructions about what goes in which place within Quadrant 4.
  - Comment: Kevin – program gave explanations about Quadrant 4 materials, but that material was not uploaded for some reason. Dina – please send an email with the missing information.
- Projects and ScholarWorks
  - Will now accept publication of project reports in ScholarWorks, which is now up and running. Dina posted documents in Beachboard that explain how creators must sign in and procedures for how to use ScholarWorks. If you have questions, please reach out to Brian and/or Dina.
  - Question – Suzanne – do we need training to use ScholarWorks. Brian – there will be a training for a department reps. Reach out to Brian for training.
  - There are detailed instructions that the library created for us. Dina highly recommends that we encourage students to post projects there. There is a document for students and materials for faculty who are entering the materials. This publication is separate from graduation process and ARS.
  - If multiple students complete the project, all need to sign the release.
  - Babette Question: How will ES know if the project was submitted through the library vs. activity clearance?
    - It can still be submitted for publication in ProQuest but then the clearance would not be entered in the ARS. The grad advisor needs to accurately track projects and theses, as well as input clearance activity correctly.
    - The grad evaluators will do a check on the back end and sometimes reach out to Library to confirm as well.
- Director of Grad Studies is transitioning to an Associate Dean of Graduate Studies position. The sole designation will be to work in graduate studies on our campus.

11:24-11:30: Summarize our “meaning of a graduate degree from CSULB”  
Sharing the Mission and Vision of CSULB

- Dina pulled together values we created last meeting in our mural and the differences between grad and undergrad: depth, maturation, independence...

11:31-11:41: BEACH 2030 Action Zone V: Build a Growth Strategy

- Reimagine post-bacc programs?
- Beach 2030 is being implemented across campus and action zones are meeting.
  - We want to make sure grad studies is not forgotten.
- Grad Studies needs to be included in making it a grad student-ready university; how to build equitable and empowering culture, making sure graduate faculty have support they need; how to ensure there is sufficient staff to support graduate studies, how can we reimagine staff; how do we build a growth strategy for graduate programs, many grad programs are in non-state side programs; how do we rethink graduate study in a way that can allow us to grow. How can we make sure that graduate program connections to partnerships are included in conversation? What is the future of grad programs? Calling on us, if we are in these groups or have the opportunity to join.
- Jody – leaders have been identified for each section (Chairs) and there will be attention to grad and post-bacc in growth section because Jody is a member of growth section

and right now they are working on identifying leaders. Still working out infrastructure in that area and there will be opportunities to participate.

- Call out now for Student Ready area – other calls will be distributed – if we know of someone who would be a good fit, put them forward or encourage them to join. These groups are not populated through Senate but AS is developing calls with specificity regarding skills and knowledge of faculty who are needed. They may directly target some faculty members based on their current leadership in certain areas.
- Grad studies really helped enrollment this year.
- Cory – What kinds of considerations should be considered in determining state-side or self support? If new programs go forward state-side,
  - Growth state-side means that enrollments have to come from somewhere else on campus because we are limited in overall enrollment. Whereas we are less limited in growth on the self-support side. There is an interest in approaching CO to see if we can increase our FTES.
  - Need to have justification on how the program will not pull FTS. Important to be clear that new programs always require additional resources because they pull from existing resources.

11:42-12:22: Update [PS 14-01 Requirements for Master's Degrees](#)

- See: [Draft Policy on Master's Degrees](#)
  - Dina would like to develop a game plan for reviewing the policy.
  - Suzanne suggestion: begin with controversial aspects
  - Cory – is there a deadline or any particular urgency? Maybe it makes sense to focus on controversial and then create subgroups.
  - Are the amendments in red?
    - Everything in red is something Dina or Jody added. When Jody refers to controversial conversation, she is referring to section 2.
  - Section 2 is in response to the following concerns: Are 300 courses worthy of counting toward a degree? If courses are not grad only, are they being taught at grad level and are students receiving a rigorous grad level degree?
    - Many programs find the restriction in Section 2.7 regarding course level and cross-listing to be problematic.
    - It is a problem for COTA as well.
    - Yes, depends on courses. We allow them in Math & Stat for some programs, as in that dept 300 doesn't usually mean less rigorous than 400 level.
      - 30% in a 30-unit program would be 9 units – what is the real difference between 300 vs. 400. In math the difference is not one of rigor, so why is there this concern.
    - Maybe we should have this conversation with Jody present.
    - For some programs, the cross listing is what makes the courses meet enrollment requirements. This limit will be problematic in terms of running courses.
    - Why are the cross listed courses being excluded? Is there an assumption that there is not distinction in the syllabi?
    - Also, if we have “upper division,” both 300 and 400 level are OK by policy. We need to ask Jody about the why.

- CLA does not provide sufficient section allocation for some programs to meet the rule.
- For other programs, tenure density poses a problem because they might not be able to meet the increase from 50 to 70%.
- In CLA this change from 50 to 70, it will generate more requests for exceptions.
- Sometimes having grads in a class with undergrads elevates the class because the grads enhance the discussion. It is also a resource issue. The undergrad program facilitates electives within some programs. Need more money put into graduate programs to meet the policy.
- It is clearly a resource issue and is also beneficial for all levels of students. One example from COTA – in Art it is how you study – sometimes you need to know how to make things and some of those courses are at the 300 level; graduate experiences isn't about what you are learning, it is about how you apply those techniques.
- Data from CHHS – survey of all grad advisors and 5 out of the 11 indicated this would be a significant problem for them.
- What are other CSU campuses doing?
  - Dina can get the information. But the language there without the edit is from Title 5 and Jody's edits are making it more stringent.
- Is this edit coming from a concern that is unspoken, such as an issue within a particular program? It would be helpful to know more about what is motivating this amendment.
  - Dina does not recall the data that motivated it. Jody wants to have a conversation about what we value in a graduate program.
- Dina is hearing a consensus of concern around the amendment.
- College of Ed concurs – not so much the excluding double-numbered courses but rather the exclusion of 300 level courses that affects the Masters plus credential programs.
- Maybe these issues need to be taking up by the new AD with attention to taking a look at which programs are generating the concern to see if there is a more focused way of addressing the localized problem rather than a larger sweeping amendment.
- Cory – motion to default to status quo, seconded
  - No objections
  - Amendment is rejected
  - RE: 2.7 ..Perhaps @ next meeting when Jody is present we continue the conversation to understand the context.
- Amendment Admissions Appeals
  - Should it be in this policy and if so where should appeals be submitted?
  - Which appeals are being referred to in the amendment? Appeals can be for various reasons - may be dept, but could also be the university. Babette has had two students contest how the GPA was being counted, she had to send a letter to ES, who rejected the appeal, and then she had to approach Jody. Maybe the Associate Dean would assist with this process.
  - Kevin – is there language that could address department stipulations?

- BIO and CHEM require students to have a thesis mentor before being admitted into the program. How will this aspect of the process be addressed if the appeals decision is made outside of the academic unit?
- There were appeals (Virginia) regarding transcripts and CalState Apply so department had to appeal decisions regarding late submission of transcripts.
- Should GSAC be the body that reviews appeals?
  - Maybe the appeal goes to the Associate Dean who takes it to the committee as needed.
- GSAC's charge states: GSAC also serves as a body that reviews any relevant graduate appeals for the Dean of Graduate Studies.
  - In the annual report... GSAC created a subcommittee comprised of the GSAC chair, two faculty/directors, and ES..
- How often are your programs part of the conversation for an admissions decision set by the university?
  - Babette has had two.
  - Most appeals are at University level and then applicant reaches out to department – Criminal Justice
  - Vesna – has a few, often international students where the GPA conversion is not reflective of potential for success.
- What kinds of appeals are being referred to in the policy text?
- Concern: the appeal being successful on merits is not sufficient because a department verdict might be overturned for the wrong reason.
- Why people appeal – some highly selective programs need to select based on what is in the application. It seems like decisions are in the purview of the program, so there should be language in the policy that addresses the rights of the program.
- This committee should not need to see an appeal if it is a technical issue.
- Dina is hearing need for separation between technical and non-technical; add language that directs the appeal to Associate Dean, who will consult relevant units, including the GSAC as needed.
- Laura – thinking about how these have been handled in the past by Jody. Who is the student submitting the appeal to? Who is making the decision? Can GSAC override a department decision with due process? Need to ensure the process is not arbitrary.
- Babette suggested that GSAC would review appeals that are not based on technical issues.
- Need to use a comma to indicate both Enrollment Services and Academic Unit are consulted.
- Concern about the 14-day timeline: typically, students contact graduate advisor first, who needs to investigate, so it often takes time to prepare and submit the materials.
- Concern that the policy right now is saying that the ultimate decision no longer resides with the program given the current language. The Department should be the one making the final decision.
- Should we be considering any of those cases that are about subjective decisions made by the department.

- Action: Need a subcommittee to look more closely at the Admissions Appeals section of the policy: Laura Portnoi, Andrew Wright, Virginia Gray.
- Should we create additional sub-committees?
  - Action: Dina asked that members carefully review the policy draft and make suggestions for discussion at our next meeting.

12:23-12:29: Good of the Order?

12:30: Adjournment – adjourned @ 12:30 pm

Next GSAC meeting: Thursday, November 18, 2021, 11-12:30pm,