To: The Senate

From: The Graduate Council

Date: 4/17/2013

Re: Graduate Council Minutes – March 7, 2013

**Members Present:** Angela Abbott, Edmund Balsdon, David Ely, Damon Fleming, Dana Nurge, Ghada Osman (for Jill Esbenshade), Gregorio Ponce, Radmila Prislin (Chair), Caren Sax, Anne Turhollow, Satchi Venkataraman, and Larry Verity.

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Rita Baumann, Cristina Sanchez, and Margarita Pina-Harlow.

1. **Minutes:** The minutes for the February 7, 2013 meeting were unanimously approved.

2. **Report of the Dean (Dr. Prislin)**

   In the absence of Dr. Welter, Dr. Prislin gave a presentation on current admission numbers (see Appendix A). The first column on the graph presented, shown in blue, demonstrates current admission numbers, as of the morning after the deadline. The second column (green) demonstrates admission numbers for last year, measured at the same point in the semester (i.e., the morning after the deadline). The data demonstrate that all applications, other than the out-of-state students’ applications, have increased over last year. The international applications are showing a 43% increase over last year. This could be due to many factors, including the moving of transcript verification back to our campus, the addition of two new recruiters at the International Student Center (ISC), and the aggressive use of Hobsons by the GRA, with help from the ISC. The current 2013 admission statistics will change over time due to a variety of reasons. For example, some non-resident students receiving non-resident tuition waivers will be re-classified to residents. Additionally, some applications will be deleted due to duplication, and still others will be re-classified due to initial misclassification. Therefore, since the current numbers are dynamic, it is helpful to look at last year’s census numbers for comparison. The census comparison, seemingly unfavorable to the current figures, should be understood as very preliminary. As already stated, due to the dynamic nature of the admission process, our current figures will almost certainly change by the Fall 2013 Census. GRA will continue to monitor and report to the Graduate Council as we move through the process.

   Dr. Prislin reminded the Council that resident student enrollment management is dictated by the CSU system, which imposes penalties for either under or over enrollment. Resident-student enrollment limits were established based on the overall resident student allocation to graduate programs, with program-specific allocations determined jointly by GRA and each college’s dean’s office, taking into account a three-year average yield rate (ration between the number of enrolled and admitted students). Should a program reach its resident limit but still have excellent potential candidates, it may request a revision of its limit. GRA will keep a record of resident admissions and respond to such requests depending on the availability of unused slots.
3. **Committee Reports**

   **Curriculum Committee (Dr. Balsdon)**

   - Action Report 5A_03_13 – Public Health New Certificate
     
     Discussion: There was a slight adjustment made to the original proposal since originally all coursework was to go through Open University. However, if a certificate is to show up on the SDSU transcript, some coursework must be completed at the main campus. After this minor revision, the Curriculum Committee moved to recommend it to the Council.

     **Vote:** Unanimous approval. [Note: This action report was later withdrawn on 3/14/2013 by request of the department and was not sent forward to Senate.]

   - Information Report 5I-03_13

**Policy Committee Report - None**

**Student Affairs Reports - None**

4. **New Business**

   - NRTW round one versus round two distribution (Dr. Prislin)

In February’s meeting, the Council approved the use of the same ranking criteria for recipients as last year. However, since the total number of waivers had not yet been determined at that time, there had not been a discussion regarding whether or not to distribute the waivers in two rounds, and if so, the corresponding percentages. The number of waivers available this year is 181, which is 20 more than last year.

Dr. Prislin reminded the Council of the monetary value of each waiver that is allocated to a non-resident student (see Appendix B). Non-resident tuition fees are $372 per unit – therefore, for 181 students who are enrolled full-time (approximately 9 units) for two semesters, (181 x 9 x 372 x 2) the NRTW program cost is $6,696 per student, for a total of $1,211,976. These are monies that would otherwise be available for the university to pay for a wide variety of necessities. Thus, waivers should be used prudently, judiciously, and selectively. It is important that a student’s academic credentials should be worthy of a waiver. Waivers are a recruitment tool to be used selectively to motivate non-resident students with superior credentials to choose SDSU over other schools. Only by selectively awarding NRTWs to the most qualified students will SDSU prudently use taxpayers’ money and strengthen its graduate programs. In previous years, the distribution has been in two rounds to accommodate programs following two different application deadlines. Dr. Prislin asked the Council to decide whether to keep a two-round distribution or change it.
Vote: The Council voted unanimously for two rounds of NRTW distribution, with 80% of waivers (145) distributed in round one, and the remaining 20% (36) in round two. The deadline for round one had already been set for March 15th, and the Council approved a deadline for round two of April 15th.

5. Old Business - None

Adjournment 2:49pm
APPENDIX A

Fall 2013 Application

Fall 2012 Application
Deadline: 30-Mar (Apex Report)
NRTW – Important facts

- CA Education Code: $N_{\text{NRTW}} \geq 25\%$ non-resident student population
- $N = 181$ (20+ or 12.4%↑ compared to 2012/13)
- Financial value (revenue loss) = $372$ per unit
- $181 \times 9 \times 372 \times 2 = $1,211,976$
- $6,696$ per waiver
- Academic credentials must be worthy of a waiver

GC Decisions on NRTW Distribution

- Re-affirmed criteria
- Re-affirmed distribution model used last year
To Be Decided

- 2 Rounds? Proportions?
- If 80% (R1) 20% (R2) model:
  - R1: 145   R2: 36
- 71 committed to continuing students
- 74 to distribute to new students in R1