Graduate School Resource Reallocation: Navigating the Waters of Historical Stasis and Financial Challenge

Bruce J. Cochrane, Ph. D.
Dean of the Graduate School
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

Miami at a Glance

- State supported
- 16,000 students, 1500 graduate students (2/3 full time)
- Over 50 Masters programs, 12 Doctoral Programs
- Founded in 1809

Excerpts from Strategic Goals, 2008

- Make the Miami Undergraduate Experience Among the Very Best in the Nation.
- Ensure Excellence in Graduate Education.
- Raise the Level of Scholarly Acommplishment

The Graduate School, by the Numbers

Division	Students	Assistantships	% Supported	Total Stipend
Arts and Science	770	421	55%	6.3 M
Education, Health & Society	338	79	23%	945K
Engineering & Applied Sciences	34	22	65%	306K
Farmer School of Business	82	46	56%	224K
Fine Arts	62	57	92%	306K
Total	1286	762	59%	9.6M

Tuition Waived

Category	Amount
E&G Funded	20M
Externally Funded	3M
Workshops	7.5M
Total Waived Tuition	30.5M

Goals of Review

- Reallocate existing assistantships to bring investment in line with quality and strategic goals
- Develop a framework for ongoing realloaction as programs and disciplines evolve
- (2008) Achieve significant reductions in stipend and waiver costs

Principles

- Program quality must be driving force
- Graduate investment must be aligned with mission and strategic goals of Miami
- Despite the need to prioritize all programs, disciplinary diversity must be recognized
- Review process must be shaped and informed by input from departments and programs

Time Line for Review

- December 2007 – review committee appointed by Provost
- March 2008 – “Phase 1” survey distributed to departments
- Summer 2008 – responses analyzed; “Phase 2” survey designed.
- August 2008 – “Phase 2” survey distributed
- October 2008 – Review committee evaluates responses
- November, 2008 – Committee report released
- December 2008- Consultation with Deans, Chairs
- January, 2009 – Reallocation Decisions Announced

Review Committee Composition

- Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School (chair)
- Associate Deans
  - Arts and Sciences
  - Business
  - Education, Health and Society
  - Engineering and Applied Sciences
  - Fine Arts
- Additional Faculty Members
  - Arts and Sciences (2)
  - Education, Health and Society (1)
- Graduate Student Association Representative

Phase 1 Structure

- Program Context
  - Goals/Mission
  - History
  - Demand
  - Factors demonstrating Student/Faculty quality
  - Modes of faculty engagement with program
  - Contribution to undergraduate education
- What are appropriate quality indicators?
- Additional information?

Phase 2 Quality Indicators

- Centrally gathered data (five year history)
  - Applied, Admitted, Enrolled
  - Average GPA, GRE (if relevant)
  - Diversity data
  - Support for Students – E&G; External
  - Total Grants and Contracts per Faculty Member

Quality Indicators – 2

- Faculty data
  - Number graduate faculty
  - Number chairing/serving on committees
  - Number teaching graduate courses
  - Number courses/average enrollment
- Scholarly productivity
  - Refereed Articles, books, chapters, conference proceedings
  - Invited presentations
  - Juried creative work
  - Honors and awards
  - Other

Quality Indicators – 3

- Student Outcomes
  - First time placements
    - Doctoral – tenure earning, non-tenure earning, postdocs, industry/nonprofit/others
    - Masters – doctoral program placement (Miami/elsewhere), professional position, non-academic careers

Quality Indicators 4

- Narratives provided by department
  - Program requirements
  - Philosophy regarding graduate scholarship
  - Graduate student involvement in undergraduate education
  - Program-specific mentoring by faculty
  - Student outcomes
    - Required by accreditation
    - Numbers achieving professional certification
    - Starting salaries of graduates
    - Other

Evaluative Criteria

- Attracts talented applicants and students
- Attracts a diverse student body
- Excellent record of scholarship with active student engagement
- Generates appropriate external support
- Graduate students have positive impact on undergraduate education
- Student outcomes are consistent with program mission
- Program mission is consistent with that of Miami

Resulting Classification Matrix

Tier	Program Category			
	Doctoral (CAS)	Transitional Masters	Professional Masters	Education
1 – High Priority	5	4	2	1
2 – Room for improvement	3	9	4	1
3 – Significant weaknesses	1	3	3	3
New Program	1			

Reallocation Results – The Good

- New programs funded – two doctoral, one masters
- New positions allocated – numerous category 1
- Stipend enhancements – 2 doctoral, 3 masters (category 1)

Reallocation Results – The Bad

- Loss of all assistantships
  - 2 doctoral programs (1 category 2, 1 category 3)
  - 1 professional masters program (category 3; reconfigured to attract paying students)
  - 2 transitional masters programs (category 3)
- Reduced asssistantship positions
  - 1 professional masters program (category 3)
  - 1 transitional masters program (category 2)
- Divisional decisions
  - Suspended program (category 3) not refunded
  - New program (not reviewed) no new funding

Reallocation Results – The Ugly

- Reduced stipend budget
  - $80,000 first year
  - $200,000 steady state
- Position reductions – 21.5 overall

Summary

- Major one-time reallocations accomplished
- Strategic priorities supported
- Some budget savings realized
- Long-term dynamism in allocations remains to be established

Reflections

- No matter how hard you try, you will not be sufficiently consultative or transparent
- A line between budgetary and academic decisions cannot be drawn
- Disciplinary and program diversity is both the strength and the bane of graduate schools
- Aligning review processes with faculty governance structures is important but challenging