Report of the University Graduate Council (2005-2006) to the University of Oregon Senate

To: University Senate President  
From: Mark Reed, Graduate Council Chair  

In the 2005-2006 academic year, the Graduate Council addressed two requests for degree program changes, issued four awards to 13 graduate students, provided feedback to the University 10-yr accreditation steering committee, and developed ideas for initiatives that we hope would improve graduate education at the University. These Graduate Council actions are summarized in the following statement, which, in accordance with the “Revised enabling legislation for university standing committees” (University Senate May 9, 2001), the Council chair (Reed) hereby transmits to the University Senate as the report of the Graduate Council for the 2005-2006 academic year.

Council membership
The 2005-2006 Graduate Council consists of the following members.
Faculty: Val Burris, Sociology; David Chard, Special Education; Michael Dreiling, Sociology; Karen Ford, English (On sabbatical); Mark Johnson, Philosophy; Huaxin Lin, Mathematics; Wayne Mikkelson, Finance; Ron Mitchell, Political Science; Brook Muller, Architecture; Jeffrey Ostler, History, Vice Chair; Harry Price, Music, Secretary; Mark Reed, Geological Sciences, Chair; John Russial, Journalism.
Students: Corbett Upton, English; Margot Osborn, Mathematics.
Ex Officio: Faye Chadwell, Knight Library; Marian Friestad, Graduate School; Richard W. Linton, Graduate School.

Graduate Education mission
In January, the Graduate Council discussed the mission of graduate education as a basis for identifying Graduate Council initiatives and to assist with the University accreditation process. The Council explored a number of concepts from large to small, that are listed in Council documents, but a statement written somewhat independently by Council member Mark Johnson is especially illuminating. It expresses clearly some of the concepts that the Council as a whole discussed, but Johnson adds a compelling argument for the essential role of liberal education. Mark Johnson’s statement follows.

Graduate Education Mission
Mark Johnson, Department of Philosophy
January 2006

It is difficult to formulate a single statement of the mission of graduate education, given the diversity of methods, values, institutions, and traditions that constitute the many disciplines and fields that typically define the contemporary research university. For example, what single conception will cover the practices and ideals of chemistry, business, art, music, philosophy, law, political science, and linguistics? However, I want to propose two quite traditional conceptions that still seem to me to be essential dimensions of our mission.

The first is simply that graduate education is an apprenticeship in the methods, skills, practices, history, and current state of any particular discipline or field. There are standards of excellence internal to the complex practices that are the sciences, the arts, and the humanities. Students have to learn these things by doing them, by coming to incorporate the values, modes of inquiry, and virtues distinctive of their chosen fields. To repeat, these things are learned only by engaging in them—by
doing—and not merely by reading or listening. They must be done in dialogue and interaction with people who have achieved a level of accomplishment and distinction in their field.

There is a second crucial aspect of our mission that is sometimes under-appreciated, even though it is perhaps the oldest ideal. I refer to the view that graduate education should realize the highest ideals and values of liberal education. Liberal education is what fits any person to take up their proper role as a citizen in a free society. Liberal education is thus about teaching citizens how to think—to think analytically, critically, creatively, and cooperatively. We are not born knowing how to think. We learn to do this, once again, by thinking in the presence of, and in dialogue with, those who manifest the virtues (excellences) of their areas of study. Thinking requires gaining knowledge of the underlying assumptions and the history of your discipline. It requires training in the aesthetics of inquiry, practice, and performance for each distinctive field. There is intelligence appropriate to playing basketball, doing logic, calculating economic rationality, throwing pots on the wheel, and solving quadratic equations. So, liberal education is not, and should not be, solely a matter for undergraduate education. We desperately need to carry this ideal forward at an advanced level of learning.

The first dimension described above is not a sufficient description of our most pressing mission. The reason for this is that learning to be an expert in your chosen field, however important and valuable that may be, does not necessarily fit you to engage your fellow citizens or to make the world a better place. We need professionalism, to be sure, but not merely a professionalism that cuts one off from the problems of our daily existence in a complex, ever-changing world that is wracked with tension and conflict. We need to bring the University into more direct dialogue with the community. More than ever, we need citizens who can think. But this ability is in short supply, and it is dramatically absent in much of what we, as a nation, are doing. It is in fulfilling its mission of liberal education that the university can make its most important contribution to life and to human and environmental flourishing.

**Graduate Council Initiatives**

Starting with discussions in January, the Graduate Council produced a list of issues in UO graduate education. The list is summarized in the attached memo (Appendix A) from the chair to the Graduate Council, which also refers to the Johnson statement of graduate education mission (above). Upon discussion of the issues in the list, the Council decided to address a few in subcommittees, emphasizing the following points (from Appendix A):

1. The need to attract high quality applicants to our graduate programs.
2. The role of marketing, communicating, reputation in attracting high quality applicants.
3. Improving communication and interaction among departments with shared interests to foster research innovations, increase efficiency and improve teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels.
4. Improving connections of the university to the real world.

The subcommittee statements, some substantially edited by the Graduate Council chair, are attached in Appendix B.

*The initiatives and the list of issues, although relegated to Appendices A and B in this report, constitute the main contribution of this Graduate Council to the long term improvement of graduate education at the university.* We submit them here in the hope that some will form a basis for university action starting in the 2006-2007 academic year, and others will provide a basis for further exploration in near future.

**University accreditation**

Assessment of graduate education is an essential component of the university accreditation process. Under current senate enabling legislation, the Graduate Council is charged with
participating in the accreditation process, which is underway this academic year and next. To aid in the assessment, Dean Rich Linton, Associate Dean Marian Friestad and the Graduate Council Chair Mark Reed participated as members of the accreditation steering committee. The Graduate Council’s discussions of accreditation overlapped with discussion of mission and initiatives, and out of those discussions and written materials derived from them, Dean Linton, Associate Dean Friestad, and Chair Reed transmitted Graduate Council input to the accreditation steering committee. We anticipate further interaction with the committee by next year’s Graduate Council, but will also continue now by participation through the summer and by sharing of this report to the Senate with the accreditation committee.

Westmoreland

The Graduate Council, largely owing to the leadership of Council member Huaxin Lin, adopted by a nearly unanimous majority a statement expressing concerns about the essential role that the low-cost housing at Westmoreland plays in recruiting and retaining graduate students (statement attached in Appendix C). The statement includes three recommendations for addressing its concerns, including (a) spending some of the sale proceeds on easing hardship on current Westmoreland residents, (b) spending some proceeds to aid future graduate student recruits who would not have the low-cost Westmoreland housing available, and (c) establishing a task force to address how the availability of low-cost university-owned housing affects the health of the University's graduate program, particularly student retention and recruitment. The task force would evaluate how to meet the needs of lower income students, students with families, international students, and other graduate students with unique housing needs. As of this writing, the Graduate Council chair is not aware that any university actions have been taken on recommendations (b) and (c).

Graduate student awards

Subcommittees of the Graduate Council decided on the following award recipients in Winter and Spring 2006.

University of Oregon Doctoral Fellowship: Charles Johnson, Chemistry; Nicholas Malone, Anthropology

Donald and Darel Stein Graduate Teaching Award: Kevin Henrickson, Economics; Janet Fiskio, Environmental Studies

Gary E. Smith Summer Grant: Alison Alstate, School of Music and Dance; Annmarie Cholankeril, Psychology; Elisabeth Conradt, Psychology; Gwendolyn Lowes, Linguistics; Darrick Meneken, Literature–Non-fiction; Aaron Rosenberg, Music; Ethan Nelson, Planning Public Policy and Management

Margaret McBride Lehrman Fellowship: Serenity Hee Jung Joo, Comparative Literature

Graduate degree programs

The Graduate Council approved elimination of a degree and addition of a certificate, as follows.

16 November 2006: Motion passed to eliminate the D.M.A. degree in Graduate Education from School of Music and Dance.

19 April 2006: Motion passed to establish a Media Ethics Certificate in the School of Journalism and Communication.

On 17 May, the Council heard a proposal for a new degree program in Folklore. Examination of program details and a decision awaits the 2006-2007 Graduate Council.
Appendix A

14 April 2006

To: Graduate Council
From: Mark Reed, Chair
Subject: Potential Graduate Council Initiatives, 2006

What concrete steps can the Graduate Council take to improve graduate education? “Improve” implies that we have a mission or sense of direction. In his January 2006 statement (appended), Mark Johnson described a concept of mission that encompasses many of the ideas the Council discussed in its 18 January meeting, but Johnson’s statement steps beyond the basic ideas and frames a larger view. With some hesitation, I extract three essential points from Johnson’s statement:

a) “. . . graduate education is an apprenticeship in the methods, skills, practices, history, and current state of any particular discipline or field. There are standards of excellence internal to the complex practices that are the sciences, the arts, and the humanities. Students have to learn these things by doing them, by coming to incorporate the values, modes of inquiry, and virtues distinctive of their chosen fields.”

b) “. . . graduate education should realize the highest ideals and values of liberal education. Liberal education is what fits any person to take up their proper role as a citizen in a free society. Liberal education is thus about teaching citizens how to think — to think analytically, critically, creatively, and cooperatively.

c) “We need to bring the University into more direct dialogue with the community. More than ever, we need citizens who can think. But this ability is in short supply, and it is dramatically absent in much of what we, as a nation, are doing. It is in fulfilling its mission of liberal education that the university can make its most important contribution to life and to human and environmental flourishing.”

The Graduate council has developed ideas pertaining directly to mission point (a), above, but we have not addressed points (b) and (c). The following issues pertaining to point (a) are a distillation from the Council’s earlier discussions.

1. On the need to attract high quality applicants to our graduate programs:
   a. Funding levels are inadequate, both during the academic year and especially during the summer. We have no routine or systematic program of support for our doctoral students during the summer, especially in the non-sciences.
   b. A small amount of additional funding to be offered up-front to accepted graduate students to improve the competitive appeal of the Oregon opportunity would go far in attracting top students. Such funding might include summer research stipends, summer travel to conferences, or school-year support for research.

2. Attracting high quality applicants: marketing, communicating, reputation.
a. In some fields, The University of Oregon is not adequately recognized for strong graduate programs. We need improved marketing by University development specialists of the UO as a place of high quality graduate programs.

b. University development specialists need to sharpen their focus on graduate education and devise ways to communicate the needs of graduate education to potential donors.

c. Recruiting high quality graduate students depends not only on the strengths of individual graduate programs, but also on the larger reputation of the University, including its undergraduate colleges. Policies that strengthen or weaken the perceived quality and standards of undergraduate education will also impact on our ability to achieve our goals with respect to graduate education.

3. Should the university examine the relationship between the graduate education we offer and the opportunities for students once they leave here? Should we be putting our efforts into disciplinary categories where the potential for employment is minimal? We also recognize that a liberal education commonly leads to work outside one’s academic disciplinary focus, but that the academic experience nevertheless provides an essential basis for the future endeavors.

4. On research ethics: should the graduate school assert a “values” expression of what research is ethically appropriate? Is there a problem? How should we address ethics in research at the University of Oregon?

5. The disparate disciplines at the university share common threads in subject areas, technology use, research methods and links to the real world. How can we improve communication and interaction among departments with shared interests to foster research innovations, improve efficiency and improve teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels? Thread examples:

   a. Links to the real world
      i. Some folklore and myths arise from natural phenomena such as tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, climate change and supernova explosions
      ii. Effective land use planning must respond to fundamental properties of the land as described and interpreted in geography and geology
      iii. Ethics in journalism, scientific research, law

   b. Subject areas:
      i. Applications of statistics and applied math in sciences, social sciences, business
      ii. Use of geographic information systems (GIS) in geology, geography, anthropology, sociology, planning

   c. Technology and research methods: GIS, data mining, GPS, image analysis, remote sensing.

In his statement of mission, Mark Johnson challenges us to consider that the mission of graduate education goes beyond the practical issues listed above. He argues that we should engage students in liberal education wherein we teach them to think so as to enable them to “take up their proper roles as citizens in a free society” (quotation altered to plural form). Johnson then argues that we, need to reach out: “We need to bring the University into more direct dialogue with the community.” If we accept this larger view of mission, what are we to do to advance toward those goals?
Appendix B
(Three Sections)

1. Graduate Council Sub-committee on Graduate Student Support

Subcommittee: Mark Johnson (chair), David Chard, Wayne Mikkelsen, and Corbett Upton.

The Problem: It is widely recognized across campus that the UO loses top graduate student recruits to other universities that offer substantially higher stipends, often for longer terms. In the College of Arts and Sciences, for example, there are several departments whose GTF stipends for a 0.40 appointment range from approximately $8,200 to $10,000, depending on level, and typically for a four-year commitment. Such departments are routinely “competing” with universities whose stipends run from $16,000-$20,000, often for a five-year term. Every department has its stories of graduate students who “got away” because the difference in the support was just too large for them to ignore.

A Proposal: In a brief discussion among members of the Graduate Council, it was generally agreed that some form of additional support could make a significant difference in a number of cases where there is a serious gap in the amount of support offered by competing schools. We are proposing that this support should take the form of a summer research stipend in the amount of $4,000, to be offered in the admission letter and awarded for the summer after the completion of the student’s first three terms of successful study. Funding of the stipends is addressed by another subcommittee (Section 2, below).

Issues: Assuming that there would be any money allotted for such a program, the obvious issue is how this money would be dispersed each year. There are at least three options:

1. Disbursement of equal amounts to all departments each year. This idea has the merit of apparent equity, and it would be extremely easy to administer, since no difficult decisions need to be made. However, it has the downside of providing only very small amounts to each department each year.

2. Targeted programs. This would provide larger sums to programs that demonstrate significant competitive pressures in attracting new students that could be alleviated by a program of up-front support. This would mean that certain programs would know, up front, that they had this additional recruitment money. The downside is that this would no doubt engender some hard feelings among departments who are not the “chosen.” Moreover, some individual or committee would each year have to do the hard work of deciding who gets rewarded and who does not.

3. Targeted individuals. This would provide limited funds to departments that make a strong case for particular individuals who have applied. The downside would obviously be the need for an individual or committee to assess each request that is made each year, with the necessity of responding very quickly, so that offers of additional support could be made to students who are being offered admission to specific graduate programs. This would essentially have the form of another Fighting Fund award, with all of the work and difficult decisions that go with such a program. Another potential problem is that
different disciplines may have different calendars for recruitment, in which case a “first come first served” approach would be unfair to some departments.

Recommendations: A draft of this current proposal was submitted to the Graduate Council for discussion at the May 17 meeting. That discussion resulted in a general consensus in support of the following proposal:

1. For the purpose of recruiting department’s top candidates for graduate study, a summer research award of $4,000 would be available on a competitive basis.

2. Departments would make specific requests to the Graduate School for such awards by forwarding selected parts of the candidate’s application plus a short letter explaining why the candidate is especially meritorious.

3. Following the model currently used for the Fighting Fund awards (although not necessarily tied to diversity concerns), the Graduate School would make every effort to get a very quick reply (typically 1-2 days) to each request.

4. These supplemental recruitment awards are intended for departments where such funds could make a significant difference in whether they are able to get a top candidate. Departments and programs that currently offer GTF awards at the top of the scale (and for whom such a small addition would make little difference) are not appropriate candidates for such awards.

5. Some consideration will be given to the size of departments and the comparative number of graduate students they admit each year, realizing that larger programs might be eligible for proportionately more awards than small programs.

6. The Graduate School will attempt to be as equitable as possible in spreading these awards around to various departments in need.
2. Graduate Council Sub-committee on Funding and Marketing of Graduate Programs

Subcommittee: Jeff Ostler (Chair), Brook Muller, Michael Dreiling, Harry Price

**Goals:** a) Communicate the high quality of our graduate programs and the great value of Oregon GTF awards as support for graduate students, b) Raise a $5 million endowment to fund 50 graduate recruits per year with $4000 each in summer research stipends (as explained in Section 1, above).

**Improve focus on graduate education in fundraising.** In some fields, the University of Oregon is not adequately recognized for its very strong graduate programs. We need better recognition by the general public and by potential donors. We suggest that University development specialists, who do well in promoting undergraduate education, need to sharpen their focus on graduate education and devise ways to communicate the needs of graduate education to potential donors.

**Graduate Teaching Fellow (GTF) value.** In the recruiting of graduate students, we need to communicate our high quality, but we also must communicate better the value of an Oregon GTF award by making clear that GTF appointments carry a tuition waiver and generous health benefits as well as salaries that are competitive with comparator institutions when adjusted for cost of living. Given that essentially all potential graduate students explore the graduate education opportunities using UO department web sites, we should provide obvious links from department sites to a graduate school page that describes the high value of an Oregon GTF, including particulars of salary rates, health benefits, etc., and comparisons of UO to other institutions. The Graduate School should take the lead in developing the necessary web page and in promoting it to departments.

**A $5 million endowment.** As explained by the subcommittee on graduate student support (above), graduate recruiting would be substantially enhanced by offering $4000 summer stipends to potential recruits. Fifty such stipends would come from a new $5 million endowment assembled through a University development program focused on enhancing graduate education in the humanities, arts and social sciences. We, the Graduate Council and Graduate School, need a dialogue with the development specialists to devise strategies for raising such funds, including communicating our needs, the high quality of programs, the value of GTFs to the teaching and research mission of the University, and appeals for endowment for graduate scholarships named after donors.
3. Graduate Council Sub-committee on
Communication and Interaction among departments and
“Links to the real world”

Subcommittee: Ron Mitchell (Chair), Faye Chadwell, John Russial, Mark Reed

Improving communication and interaction among departments

**Interdepartmental sharing of course information.** Complementary and closely related research methods exist across disciplines but information about what is available and where is hard to find. We need to compile and disseminate every year (or term) information about the existence and content of courses on complementary methods offered by various departments. A simple note on courses offered, course descriptions, and welcoming students from other fields is all it would take.

In Journalism and Communications, for example, students benefit from methods courses in other departments, and students in other disciplines can benefit from offerings in Communications. Examples are history (historical methods), sociology (survey methods), psychology (experimental methods), anthropology (ethnographic methods) and education (experimental and survey methods). Journalism and Communications offers methods coursework that other departments might use, such as quantitative content analysis, text analysis, visual ethnography and political economy. Word of mouth is not sufficient. To make such communication work, we would need term-by-term attention from a central organizer, most likely one based in the Graduate School.

**Crossing disciplinary boundaries.** Disciplinary boundaries, as currently configured, are what they are for good historical reasons, we assume, but those boundaries preclude ready access to related knowledge by graduate students within single disciplines. This is a statement of the obvious, of course, but what are we doing to address it? In many instances, the faculty, whose experiences are also limited by traditional disciplinary boundaries, are not aware of the value of knowledge from outside their fields. As an example, effective land use planning must respond to fundamental properties of the land as described and interpreted in geography, geology and ecology. It is likely that many students of land use planning would benefit from a basic- to intermediate-level knowledge of forest and grassland ecology, river hydrology, ground water hydrology, hillslope evolution, and the occurrence statistics of floods, earthquakes and hurricanes. How many similar examples could we identify and describe in our graduate programs and thereby raise the level of awareness of heretofore missed opportunities to improve our education of graduate students?

**Statistics and applied mathematics in natural sciences, social sciences and business.** Statistical methods are essential to addressing quantitative problems in sociology, economics, business, psychology, geology, geography, biology, land use planning, environmental sciences, among others. Statistical methods are a fundamental part of graduate education (and some undergraduate education) in these disciplines. Certainly, it makes sense to teach some statistics within departments where particular methods and examples can be emphasized; however, teaching of statistical methods may be unnecessarily widely dispersed among the departments,
and it is likely that there is substantial duplication within the patchwork of campus statistics courses. We also perceive that addressing a greater breadth of statistics topics would be valuable as would the ability to address some topics at a higher level than current resources allow, including topics for which the departments lack faculty with appropriate knowledge and experience (e.g. geostatistics, which is very widely applicable in social and natural sciences).

To address this issue we need to define the possible problem areas, determine specific statistics needs, and survey current statistics teaching. Toward those ends, we should organize a “statistics interest group” that would survey department faculty and graduate students to collect information on specific needs, existing teaching, and problems. Out of that information, combined with statistics course information from a few other universities, we should develop a plan to do one or more of the following: (a) hire outstanding teachers of statistics for a new department of Statistics and Applied Mathematics, (b) coordinate course offerings to avoid duplication and provide a structured interdepartmental path through statistics courses, (c) develop new statistics courses to address neglected needs (using resources freed by eliminating duplication).

A second issue that is especially significant in physics, geophysics, chemistry, biology, economics, computational sciences, geography and neuroscience is the need for courses in applied mathematics and computational methods. For example, in applied math, we could use courses in practical scientific computing, digital signal processing, Fourier analysis, vector analysis, calculus of variations, asymptotic methods and perturbation analysis. Some kindred courses to this list are currently offered in the Math Department, but we understand that those emphasize the theoretical rather than applied aspects. We also need courses in computational methods and languages that relate to the applied math needs—courses in FORTRAN and C++ for science and engineering, discrete mathematics, parallel processing and code optimization. Such courses are readily available on campuses with engineering schools, but since the UO does not include engineering, we are at a distinct disadvantage in addressing the need for applied mathematics in advanced graduate studies. To address this problem, we need to follow a path similar to that outlined above for statistics, but with added emphasis on adding substantial new teaching capacity in both applied mathematics and computational science.

**Interdisciplinarity.** Improving interdisciplinarity among graduate students can be fostered by modeling it among faculty, yet it is unclear how to promote such modeling. It is not a long walk across campus to a relevant colleague’s office for most of us, but it’s a pretty rare event. Interdisciplinary interaction would increase if tenure and promotion committees had guidance in addressing it as part of their faculty reviews. For example, some in Political Science also work with the Environmental Studies Program, where interdisciplinarity is particularly relevant to promotion and tenure. One issue that arises is how to judge articles published in interdisciplinary journals, especially when such journals likely to rank lower than the main disciplinary journals. The faculty would benefit from explicit guidance on this issue so they can navigate the interdisciplinary divides more effectively.
Links to the real world

**Faculty connections to the larger community.** Many faculty members make connections between the university and the “real world” by participating in public lectures and forums, workshops, guest commentaries, public policy testimony to decision makers, assisting in legal cases, activities in public schools, and radio and television interviews. Such activities enhance the university’s reputation among the public, may improve town-gown relationships, may improve student recruitment and can build bridges between universities and professional communities. President Frohnmayer has spoken of this idea often in the context of public scholarship. Such community connections would be encouraged by breaking the current silence on this topic in University and departmental tenure and promotion criteria and specifically crediting community activities.

Some community connections lead to research opportunities and may help students find jobs. In professional schools such as Journalism and Communication, connections with professional communities and local journalists are valued as part of a comprehensive portfolio, but the same does not apply in other fields. Arts and sciences faculty, too, have a great deal to offer the real world, but it takes time to make these connections, especially by untenured faculty members, and we suspect that many do not attempt because it is not explicitly valued in tenure and promotion.

**Faculty connections to the larger community: another take.** Arguably, the university has a responsibility to society to promote application of the knowledge it cultivates to real problems. Although we probably do not want to add an “application” component to our traditional research, teaching, and service roles, the University could do more to proactively seek out opportunities for faculty and grad students to apply their research. This might include some means of linking scholars to government and business and non-governmental organizations—not merely internships for students, but regular meetings to identify and develop ways that the work of University faculty and graduate students could help inform decision-makers. The University should undertake such an initiative carefully; there are pitfalls and misperceptions to avoid and a need to protect the integrity and credibility our research, but much more can be done to foster connections for those faculty who are interested.
Appendix C

UO Graduate Council Statement on the Sale of Westmoreland,
adopted by vote of the Graduate Council on 8 December 2005

The University of Oregon Graduate Council has considered the ramifications to graduate education of the sale of the Westmoreland student housing complex. We base the following opinion on our personal experiences with supervising graduate students and on our review of data from the University on the Westmoreland sale issue. The Council maintains that helping graduate students meet their housing needs should be a goal of the University, and such help has value in its own right. We also know that in many instances, providing housing assistance to graduate students has played a crucial role in recruiting and retaining excellent graduate students.

Decisions by some graduate students to attend and to remain at the University of Oregon are critically influenced by the availability of following:
   a) Low-cost housing for those in financial need.
   b) Family housing with related family-oriented programs such as child care.
   c) University-operated housing, *per se*, which is especially important to international students who commonly do not have the references, credit scores, and other credentials that are necessary to renting apartments in the commercial market.

University-operated housing at Westmoreland addresses each of these needs, thus sale of Westmoreland could have serious negative consequences for existing and future graduate students. We maintain that the university should address graduate student housing as an integral aspect of graduate student recruitment and retention. Toward that end, we urge the University administration to adopt the following objectives:

1) The University should commit some portion of the proceeds from the sale of Westmoreland to ease the financial strain of graduate students currently living at Westmoreland as they move to other living situations.

2) The University should commit into the future an additional portion of the proceeds from the sale of Westmoreland to graduate programs to compensate partially for the loss of the long term support of graduate programs resulting from the sale of Westmoreland.

3) The University should establish a task force to address how the availability of low-cost university-owned housing affects the health of the University's graduate program, particularly student retention and recruitment. The task force should evaluate how to meet the needs of lower income students, students with families, international students, and other graduate students with unique housing needs. The task force should consider the full range of ways by which those needs might be met, including university-owned housing, university-subsidized housing, housing vouchers, housing stipends, and financial need based scholarships. The task force should be involved in the process of deciding how the funds identified in objective #2 are spent.