Graduate Council Meeting Minutes  
Monday, September 20, 2021

Graduate Council Members Present:
Heather Anderson, Emily Buck, Colette Dollarhide, Caroline Fitzpatrick, Danielle Fosler-Lussier, Jim Fuchs, Thomas Kerler, Steve Lavender, Mona Makhija, Nick Messenger, Mark Moritz, Sharon Schweikhart, Carolyn Sommerich, Jan Weisengerger, Fengyuan Yang

Graduate School Staff: Anika Anthony, Alicia Bertone, TJ Carpenter, Karin Jordan, Joan Lieb (recorder), and Matt Page

Guests: Darryl Hood, La’Tonya Stiner-Jones and Bob Mains

Vice Provost and Dean Alicia Bertone opened the meeting and welcomed all attendees. The Dean shared the schedule and information that will be covered in three upcoming Graduate School Forums scheduled on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday this week.

Graduate School Forums

- Enterprise Projects System Changes – Philosophy & Culture Changes
  - Graduate Program Salesforce/Workday Account Initiative
  - Annual Progress Reports w/Workday Student Update
  - Workday Fellows and GA Hiring
  - Grad School Nomination Review System and MTFA

Workday Update

Dean Bertone shared that with the implementation and subsequent use of Workday, it has become evident that the operating system requires a significant change in culture for the Graduate School. Historically, the Graduate School has operated in a very personal and accommodating manner. We have learned that the Workday systems are more deadline driven, and one small input error can backlog the system and keep it from moving forward. Corrections can no longer be made by the Graduate School staff, instead can only be rectified by those who created/input the information, most generally in the University’s Human Resources unit.

Fellows are now classified as new hires with supplemental pay, which is now managed in the Graduate School rather than at the program level. As a result, there are many more touch points for our staff, and the timing of approvals through
Human Resources are often delayed because of backlogs as everyone learns the new system and/or when approvers are out of the office.

In the future, we look forward to bulk hires, rather than hiring each individually, and the support of a Human Resources team to assist during the busy times.

Similarly, the Matching Tuition Fee Award (MTFA) system deadlines are no longer flexible in the Workday system. As a result, many deadlines need to be revised to ensure all decisions are made and entered in time. This is a significant culture/philosophy change for the academic units and the Graduate School.

The Dean shared that Workday Student is scheduled to go live in 2023.

**Salesforce System**

Bob Mains, Sr. Director for Application Services for the OCIO, presented the Salesforce product that comes on the heels of the Enterprise Project to help us efficiently log, document, report, and communicate all graduate student communications to centrally manage enrollment. The Salesforce product was rolled out in 2020 for undergraduate enrollment and support, and the Grad School currently uses it for case management.

**Comprehensive Review in Graduate Admissions Taskforce**

Taskforce Chair La’Tonia Stiner-Jones and Taskforce Co-Chair Darryl Hood presented the report of the Comprehensive Review of Graduate Admissions.

In Summer 2019, the Graduate School commissioned a Comprehensive Review by the Graduate Admissions Task Force (Task Force). The goal of this task force was to create an adaptable plan which offered guidance and resources for each graduate program on how to develop or improve comprehensive review practices for the evaluation of graduate student admission. This plan includes both internal and external best practices. In order to meet this objective, they: (1) assessed the current state of OSU graduate program admission practices, (2) evaluated internal and external comprehensive review criteria, and (3) developed a set of evidence-based resources faculty may consider when evaluating graduate candidates for admission that supports the mission of the university, student success, and program-specific goals.

The plan summarizes the work of the Task Force. It defines comprehensive review in graduate admissions and provides resources for our graduate programs on its benefits, strategies for incorporation or adoption, examples of how to implement these processes, and answers the following questions:

- What does “comprehensive” or “holistic” review mean and why is it valuable?
• What are the necessary and ideal elements of a comprehensive graduate admission review process?
• What exemplars of best practices currently exist across the university for programs of varying size and disciplines (e.g., STEM, Arts, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences programs)?
• What are the critical steps to effectively adopt or improve upon comprehensive review?
• What resources (time, finances, personnel, and other) will a program need to implement best-practices in comprehensive review?

Survey data from graduate programs:
• 129 programs responded
• between 33%-66% report using minimal components and evaluative criteria for determining admission.
• 1/3 of (HUM) to 2/3 of (STEM) graduate admission decisions are currently being made using minimal components and evaluative criteria for determining admissions.
• about 1/5 of (STEM) to about 1/2 of (SBS) graduate admission decisions involve consideration of 2 to 3 components and include consistent evaluation criteria in their admissions process.
• only 1/5 of (SBS) to 1/4 of (HUM) graduate admissions decisions consider more than three components and describe how these are used and whether these are applied consistently, using clear evaluative criteria.

Findings

Three Exemplar Graduate Programs and Guidance for Comprehensive Process Development
1) Physical Therapy
2) Materials Science and Engineering
3) Dance

Guidance
• Align comprehensive review process with mission, vision, and values of the program. Measure success by enrolling the most qualified applicants likely to complete the program
• Modify the application to provide the necessary information
• Create rubrics and training materials
• Set expectations for reviewers

Sample Rubrics and Guidelines for their Development
1) Public Health
2) Humanities

Guidance
• Include indicators of success and completion in the rubric
• Establish a rating scale to evaluate proficiency of each indicator
The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm.