

# Graduate Council Meeting Minutes

April 7, 2015

Members Present: Anderson, Kelly – Special Ed and Child Development  
Fodor, Anthony – Bioinformatics and Genomics  
Freitag, Alan – Communication Studies and Council Chair  
Hicks, Cheryl - History  
Hildreth, John – Engineering Technology and Construction Management  
Howarth, T. Joe – GPSG Student Representative  
Makas, Emily – School of Architecture  
McCarter, Susan – Social Work  
Reynolds, Tom – Associate Provost and Dean, Graduate School  
Schwarz, Peter – Economics  
Webster, Murray - Sociology

Also Attending: Flowers, Claudia – Ed Leadership  
Hancock, Dawson – College of Education  
Harris, Hank - Counseling  
Speights, Sabrina – Visiting Graduate Student (GPSG replacement candidate)  
Watson, Johnna – Graduate School  
Wyse, Matt – Academic Affairs

Absent: Walker, Judy – Atkins Library (at a conference)

## I. Report of the Chair

Chair Freitag called the meeting to order.

- Approval of the March 10, 2015 Meeting Minutes  
Chair Freitag called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes as submitted. McCarter made the motion with a second from Hildreth. The motion was approved unanimously.
- Chair Freitag stated that there was an upcoming meeting on Thursday, April 9 of the FEC and asked if someone from the Graduate Council could attend to answer any questions regarding the changes to the Graduate Faculty By-Laws. He noted that Graduate Council member Judy Walker would be there as an FEC member.
- Update on New Assistantships for Military Veterans – 6 candidates have completed applications. Awardees will be announced around 4-15-15.
- Graduate Dean's Annual Review – the subcommittee revised the set of questions. The survey will be going out in a few days and Regular Graduate Faculty members will have until April 27<sup>th</sup> to respond. Dean Reynolds added that he would be glad to provide his self-assessment which was sent to the Provost and Graduate Council Chair to include with the annual review survey questions.

## II. Report of the Dean

- Dean Reynolds communicated that he received three Accelerated Master's Program requests, but additional information is needed on these. He will communicate the status of these at the meeting in May.

### III. Course and Curriculum Proposals

#### A. CSLG 4-4-14: New Course – CSLG 6164/8164 McLeod Institute on Substance Abuse

- No page #s on proposal
- Bottom of Pg. #2 is a statement that refers to the course/institute being both an elective and a required course for some students. Nowhere else in the proposal is 'required' used.
- B. Credit Hour box not checked
- #5. Impact of SLOs - I suggest taking out the paragraph if there is no impact on the SLOs
- Textbook - no statement, not addressed
- Course Outline – needs clarification
- The assignments in the syllabus do not suggest three credits worth of work or time and do not appear rigorous. The description is more like a 1-credit hour course. Need to clarify and strengthen.
- How do you evaluate the students' work assignments?
- There are "contracts" for grades in the syllabus, but it appears this work is either submitted or not, rather than being evaluated by the instructor.
- There is no grading scale in the syllabus.
- Please clarify about the course being cross-listed with Social Work
- Please explain how a 3-credit hour course can take place in one week.
- Need to clarify that the conference takes place one week before summer term I begins.
- State that there will be feedback/evaluation that students will pick up at a later date.
- Restate grading scale for community practitioners for C.E.U.'s not for credit.

There being no further discussion, Chair Freitag called for a motion to return the proposal to the department to make revisions. Howarth made the motion with a second from Anderson. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### B. EDLD 04-07-2015: Establishment of a PhD in Educational Research, Measurement and Evaluation

Overall, a well-conceived and well-written proposal for a program that clearly has considerable merit in the emerging education environment. Just a few notes:

- In the RSCH 8410 syllabus, p.36, "Participation" constitutes 30% of the final grade. This seems excessive, but I would be receptive to a persuasive argument that this is appropriate given the nature of the course.
- In the RSCH 8411 syllabus, p.46, "Participation" constitutes 30% of the final grade. This seems excessive, but I would be receptive to a persuasive argument that this is appropriate given the nature of the course.
- RSCH 8411 -- On p.43, "Objectives of the Course," the language implies that this course may be repeated for credit. If that is the case, this should be made clear in the catalog copy.
- There remain content comments in the margin of the "Appendix C" component of the proposal. These will need to be addressed. Many, for example, call for updates based on the university's strategic plan now being developed.
- In Appendix C: Catalog copy, page 57, it is not very specific how the 6 credits can be earned for the secondary concentration. Perhaps adding a little to the description, like 'earned through elective course to be determined in consultation with advisor...'

There being no further discussion, Chair Freitag called for a motion to approve the proposal with revisions. McCarter made the motion with a second from Anderson. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. MSRE 2-1-2015: Major Changes to the Master of Science in Real Estate Program of Study

- The proposal was done on an old form. Needs to resubmit using new form, which covers some of the items missing. Syllabus format does not have blue additions and red strike-throughs.
- Syllabus for MSRE 6238 is rather thin. For example, what is "homework"?
- A minor issue with the use of terms for course offerings (Yearly) or (On Demand). On demand is acceptable, although how do they plan and project future enrollment for scheduling. Yearly - seems too vague.
- What is the oral presentation?
- Where are the required statements regarding credit hours, SLOs, or textbook costs? Clarify Student Learning Outcomes.
- Will faculty teach this course?
- How will offering the capstone in all three semesters not affect the rest of the curriculum?

There being no further discussion, Chair Freitag called for a motion to return the proposal to the department to resubmit on the new template and revise. We can transfer the signature sheet to the revised version. Howarth made the motion with a second from McCarter. The motion was approved unanimously.

D. SOWK 1-5-15: Changes to Advanced Courses in the MSW Curriculum

- The following sentence appears on p.2, #2 of the proposal: "*In the first semester, we will substitute an opportunity for students to take a course in the second semester that reflects their interests.*" That doesn't make sense to me.
- The syllabus for SOWK 7126 first indicates that the "shoe box" exercise is worth 10% of the final grade but later indicates 5%. Also, it seems less rigorous than I would expect in a 7000-level course.
- The long form requires inclusion of catalog copy properly indicating changes (see instructions on the long form, section V.C.3.). Although there appears to be catalog copy included in this proposal, beginning at p.76, it is not annotated to permit determining any changes incorporated.
- There does not appear to be a syllabus for proposed new course SOWK 7035: Social Work with HIV and AIDS.
- The summary wording is a bit confusing when it begins "there are four major changes" and is followed by a list of eight changes; however the changes themselves are clear and thoroughly explained.
- In the catalog copy (proposal pages 79-80), most of the semesters shown require greater than 12 credit hours (up to 16 credits per semester). Is an overload in (nearly) every semester appropriate?
- The proposed SOWK 7035 course is not included in the catalog copy.

There being no further discussion, Chair Freitag called for a motion to approve the proposal with revisions. Makas made the motion with a second from Davies. The motion was approved unanimously.

IV. Course Cross-Listing Discussion

Addressing this issue will be extremely challenging. Frankly, it's a mess. I don't think an acceptable approach is to leave it a mess. After examining the remarkable list of cross-listed courses, I feel we need to quickly establish a procedure for proposing, processing and approving any course cross listing. It should be simple and straightforward with clear, unambiguous guidelines. Unless there is a compelling argument to the contrary that I have not yet discerned, I can't envision any appropriate

cross listing except 4000/5000, and then only with strong supporting arguments. To accept other combinations risks diminishing the perceived rigor of graduate courses. Proposals for such cross listing should simultaneously proceed through undergraduate and graduate approval channels, with full documentation provided to all reviewing bodies.

The problem of existing cross-listed courses is a difficult one, but not unsolvable. Consider including in cross-listing policy a requirement that all such courses be reviewed periodically, perhaps every five years. That would eventually lead to a cleansing of courses outside prescribed parameters.

- One suggestion was to scrap everything and ask the departments to resubmit those course descriptions in question or provide a proposed rationale for the existing cross-listing.

Chair Freitag asked for suggestions from the Graduate Council by the end of the week.

V. Other Business

Chair Freitag encouraged Graduate Council members to contact Jeffrey Leak if there was interest in serving as the Graduate Council Chair.

The meeting adjourned at 1:32pm.

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 5, 2015, in Cato Hall, Room 228 at 12 noon.

Respectfully submitted,



Annette Parks  
Secretary to the Graduate Council