

**Survey of Graduate Coordinators and Graduate Faculty:
Graduate Committee, Graduate Curriculum Proposals, and the CDS System
N = 13**

1. Have you used the CDS system to submit a program or course proposal (new or modify) in the last two years? (N = 13)

Yes: 92.31%

No: 7.69%

2. Have you encountered problems using the CDS system? (N = 12)

Yes: 83.33%

No: 16.66%

- It was unbelievable slow and not subject to altering problems after submission.
- Working with CDS froze my computer multiple times - CDS staff said it was a computer problem while IT Help Desk said it was a CDS program. Apparently CDS, the browser and my computer didn't work together. Took hours to accomplish what should take 10 minutes.
- Could not figure out how to prepare a 3+2 program.
- It uses undergrad designations and terms that do not fit grad curriculum process.
- Kill off 400/500 does us no good.
- For some reason not all the changes or proposals get through the system in complete form. There should be a reminder of completion / where the proposals have not been submitted even through the originator.
- Revisions are a problem.
- Cumbersome physically to work with. Slow response time during entry. CDS people can't make up their mind what they want. Primarily, the idea that we can use a one size fits all program is delusional. Also, I'm not a secretary, why are faculty struggling?
- Necessity to put things in multiple places. Inability to import existing courses as a block, have to enter each course singly.
- I was an early submitter for the change of program to 120 credits. The system added up my current program credits and insists that I only currently require 122 credits. This has led UCAP to reject my proposal because I have to show that the current program – which is being changed anyways – is at 128.

3. Have you consulted with or had conversations with other faculty in your department who have used the CDS system to submit a program or course proposal (new or modify) in the last two years? (N = 13)

Yes: 61.54%

No: 38.46%

4. Based on the consultation/conversation with other faculty in your department, have they had problems using the CDS system? (N = 8)

Yes: 100%

No: 0%

- It was unbelievably slow and not subject to altering problems after submission.
- Not getting feedback about how to fix the concerns. Subject of CDS was brought up at lunch and faculty from different colleges and departments all groaned and expressed frustrations saying things like CDS is such a headache.
- The same issue of one step at a time has been encountered e.g. a program proposal may include a new course, but proposal cannot be done at one time because a new course does not yet exist.
- When you are proposing courses for faculty who have not yet been hired, it is difficult. Interaction with committee in that situation is frustrating.
- Lack of clarity of expectations. Rubrics or templates would be helpful. It may not be as much a function of the technology as of the whole process itself.
- Proposals being sent back repeatedly for minor technical problems.
- It is a nice automated system that removes any trace of human judgment being applied, thus leading to proposals being rejected for insane reasons. This leads to extra work for the proposer to 'correct' things that should be editorial changes only. The system also has no means to notify the author if there is a problem. Unless the author regularly checks the proposal's status, he or she has no idea if the proposal has been accepted, sent back for review, rejected, or whatever. I personally have no interest in checking the system regularly. It should automatically notify the author of any status change.

5. Have you or another faculty in your department been asked by the Graduate Committee to make revision or provide clarification to a program and/or course proposal (new or modify) in the last two years? (N = 13)

Yes: 53.85%

No: 46.15%

6. Was the feedback provided by the Graduate Committee helpful in guiding you or another faculty to make a revision or provide a clarification to a program and/or course proposal? (N = 6)

Yes, helpful: 16.66%

Yes, somewhat helpful: 50%

No: not helpful: 3.33%

7. What can the Graduate Committee do to assist faculty in developing program and course proposals that do not require revision or clarification when submitted to the Graduate Committee? (N = 9)

- Invite proposers to meet with someone knowledgeable about CDS and Graduate requirements before submitting. A check list of guidelines with warning about the more common problems the proposers would read and check off before submitting.
- Workshops/FAQs on expectations and "terms of art" (like SOL)
- It would be helpful to know the timeline. Sometimes the committee only meets once a month, yet faculty are not aware of that.
- Have examples of successful proposals available
- Clarify the expectations. Does the committee truly know what it wants? If so, make those requirements exceedingly specific.
- Just make the rules simple and concise. Also, let the college and departments have control of their own courses.
- Simplify the forms, and clarify what needs to be where. Do not impose criteria that are not sanctioned by the department or college graduate faculty.
- The committee should facilitate fast approval.
- The issue I hear most about is that the committee has started judging content. The author and department are the subject matter experts. The committee has no role in judging content, other than to watch for duplicate content among classes offered by different departments – how many statistic classes do we need?

8. What do you think should be the role(s) for the Graduate Committee? (N = 11)

- It should clarify consideration of qualification to enter graduate school, qualifications of faculty for teaching and research in the graduate programs, requirements of graduate programs in general, and credit given to faculty for teaching and research.
- Develop and implement Graduate policies. Assist departments in developing and revising grad programs. Represent academic standards and faculty to administration. Identify and address challenges and solve problems.
- Shared governance at the college
- Committee members should be knowledgeable about proposals from his/her colleagues.
- Providing helpful feedback and providing clarifying information.
- Approval of grad curriculum. Advisory to grad department.
- Should do everything possible to encourage and facilitate the process of course develop for substance, creativity, and rigor at the same time recognizing diverse fields with specific standards. Develop a broad vision of graduate work.
- Encourage research by promoting lower teaching load, load credits for mentoring grad students, and for those that do research.
- Advise for faculty, assurance of concern for duplication in grad only (600) classes and for grad programs.
- Represent faculty in policy making processed by administration. It's not the role to make policy decisions without gaining faculty input. Should bring ideas back to your representation colleges and get faculty input. Then take ideas back to committee.
- Represent the interests of the faculty in the development of policy and programs. In order to do this, each unit representative should be talking to their faculty group so they know our will/opinion. The committee also judges whether proposed courses or programs that meet the

University requirements. The committee should work with the graduate Dean to develop appropriate means to distribute resources (University Graduate Assistantships, promotional materials, recruitment efforts, etc.).

9. The Graduate Committee is considering developing tools/resources to assist graduate faculty in developing graduate courses. Do you think that developing tools/resources to assist in developing graduate courses falls within the purview of the faculty on the Graduate Committee? (N =12)

Yes, please provide your ideals for tools/resources that would be beneficial: 58.33%

- Check list of standards, requirements, policies mentioned above. Improve web pages. Try to protect MSU credibility, academic freedom and standards to avoid turning us into a credit hour factory.
- The two handouts (writing outcomes and 4/5x distinctions) should be useful.
- Just some examples of acceptable proposal.
- But I am not certain what this means. I am also concerned that this will not work.
- I'm leaning toward no but only from the content side - I do think it would be wonderful to facilitate conversations among diverse fields to figure the essence of what should be included in a graduate course. Can be facilitated but not predetermined.

No, please explain your concerns with the faculty on the Graduate Committee developing tools/resources to assist faculty: 41.67%

- The contact area / program area people are all the experts for online, there are multiple tools and resources.
- Faculty should be able to design a course without assistance, except from those in their department. What might someone from another college possibly inform me to help my grads?
- These should be a wider discussion about the role of the grad committee in course design, which I believe is a faculty prerogative.
- Your ideas for tools and resources amount to setting criteria for courses that have not been agreed upon. Developing grad courses is in the preview of each department, not in some committee made up of members too diverse to make specific decisions.
- The faculty are completely capable to develop graduate courses on their own. Their big limitation is time to do so. I can't imagine anything you would develop that would be useful across all disciplines and, as a result, it would likely become more of a barrier than a resource.

10. Is there anything else the Graduate Committee should know about the CDS system, graduate curriculum proposals, or the role of the faculty on the Graduate Committee? (N =5)

- The CDS is too rigid - there is no way to "work around" the system. The CDS is not designed to handle cross-disciplinary programs/courses.
- It must reflect a broad base of stakeholders and as such could real be exciting and bring about a culture change.
- I'd like to know more about the extra requirements that seem to have been imposed by the grad committee without prior review by faculty. I'm concerned that this is an infringement on academic freedom.

- I will reiterate that the role of this committee is to represent faculty in the respective colleges, not dictate what faculty should be doing.
- Just to reiterate, the committee monitors courses and programs for consistency with University policies and procedure (appropriate credits, for example). The committee does not judge content.

11. With what college and Department are you affiliated? (N=13)

CAHN: 7.69%

- SHRS (CDIS) (1)

CSBS: 38.46%

- Psychology (2)
- Sociology and corrections (2)
- URSI (1)

CSET: 30.77%

- Biology (3)

CAH: 0%

COB: 0%

COE: 23.08% (3)

- Elementary and early childhood (1)
- KSP (2)

Unaffiliated: 0%