2012-2013 Faculty Committee on Graduate Education,
Continuing Education, and Special Programs

Minutes

Thursday, November 29th, 2012 at 3:00 PM
CRAIG Room 108

Committee members in attendance: Michael (Rohn) England (Math), Valerie Frazier, Secretary (English), Mary Blake Jones (Teacher Education), Brooke Van Horn, Chair (Chemistry), and Robert Westerfelhaus (Communication)

Ex-Officio: Amy McCandless (Dean of the Graduate School), Godfrey Gibbison (Dean of the North Campus – serving as designee until Director of Continuing Education is selected), Cathy Boyd (Registrar).

Attending Meetings: Julie Dahl (Student Records Data Manager), Lynne Ford (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration and representative for Provost’s office), Dave Owens (Associate Dean of the Graduate School), Regina Semko (Assistant to the Dean), Penny Brunner (Interim Associate Vice President, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning)

Guests: Meta Van Sickle and Angela Cozart (both in Teacher Education), and Dan Greenburg (Psychology, and chair of the Committee on Undergraduate Education)

I. Call to order
II. Review and approval of the minutes – from meetings on October 4th and November 1st, 2012

The minutes from the October 4 and November 1 meetings were approved with one correction: Lynne Ford was not present during the November 1 meeting. (Rohn England moved and Mary Blake Jones seconded the motion).

III. Graduate Program Change/Cross-list Proposal from Master of Arts in Teaching – Special Education:

A. EDFS 428 with EDFS 741 – both courses serve a small audience of students, covering the same material, and resources could be used for cost savings if a single course was taught.

Angela Cozart gave a short justification of the efficacy of cross listing EDFS 428: Procedures for Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities and EDFS 741: Educational Procedures for Students with Learning Disabilities. Both classes focus on teaching strategies to address the individual needs of students with learning disabilities, specifically in the areas of mathematics, modification of content areas, and the development and use of course materials. EDFS 741 contains a component for up to twenty hours of field work. Since the classes are so similar in the content they deliver, it would be cost effective if a single course was taught, without compromise of the content presented. Robert Westerfelhaus made a motion to approve the proposal, and it was seconded by Rohn England.

IV. Other Items to Address/Discuss

A. Graduate Curriculum Forms and Process of Review prior to presentation in Committee
   i. An update to the graduate curriculum proposal forms and the general graduate process to include time for Registrar’s Office review and SACS review prior to
There was some discussion about the need for additional review of proposals before they reach the Graduate Committee, so that discrepancies can be eradicated and incomplete information can be corrected. Rohn England emphasized that more time is needed to add increased oversight to the process. It was suggested that the timeframe for presenting proposals to the Graduate Committee be pushed back one week. Amy McCandless and Cathy Boyd could serve as expediters in this review process, vetting proposals and communicating with chairs if additional information is needed. Chairs could be kept abreast of the status of their submitted proposals through carbon copying them on important communications. We must also give sufficient time in the process for SACS review. It was asked if the course mode of delivery should be included on the graduate forms. Cathy Boyd indicated that this would be information needed at the time of scheduling courses. The Graduate Committee could model the procedures and flow chart used by the Undergraduate Committee. Dan Greenburg offered assistance in providing materials for the committee. He directed us to http://currcomm.cofc.edu/ for more information about the procedures that the Undergraduate Committee follows. Brooke Van Horn will draft a proposal and update the committee at a later date regarding the progress on implementing changes to the forms and the process of review.

B. Addition of a Graduate Student Member to the Committee Roster

i. How we would like to proceed regarding the addition of a graduate student member to the committee? How do we want to solicit feedback and when do we want to make a formal motion in the Spring – first or second meeting? Do we ask for specific feedback from Graduate Council and Faculty Senate members directly by presentation of our opinion prior to a general call for feedback or a formal motion to By-laws?

The discussion centered on the addition of a graduate student member to the Graduate Committee and the question of whether the student should be a voting or nonvoting member.
It was argued that designation of a graduate student as a voting member would be a sign of support and give students a voice in the graduate curriculum decision making process. The Graduate Council, in past meetings, has also discussed the importance of incorporating graduate students on graduate committees.

It was emphasized that if we include a graduate student as part of the Graduate Committee, we must make sure the student is seriously engaged with the process and upholds his or her committee duties. Robert Westerfelhaus raised the issue of the lack of long term investment of graduate students (who usually only have a tenure of two years at the college) in graduate curriculum decision making. Robert also talked about institutional memory and the potential for the dilution of faculty power. Rohn England mentioned that adding a voting graduate student would raise the potential for a voting tie, and that a voting graduate student member could potentially represent 20% of the voting power of the committee. Dan Greenburg thought it unlikely that a graduate student would wield too much power or be placed in the position of a swing vote. Brooke Van Horn emphasized that there are seven committees on campus that have graduate student members with status as voting members, so by approving a voting graduate student committee member, we would be aligned with the college at large. A motion was made to approve a graduate student as a voting member. The motion did not pass, with a vote of 2-3. Rohn England then made a new motion to include a graduate student as a nonvoting member. Robert Westerfelhaus seconded the motion, and it unanimously passed. The decision will be communicated to the Graduate Student Association (GSA). The GSA president will more than likely be the designee to attend the graduate meetings.
C. Meetings for Spring 2013 – submit your unavailability (conferences, courses, office hours, research time, etc.) to Regina Semko ASAP to get our Spring meeting calendar complied

IV. For the good of the order

V. Adjournment

The next meeting will be held in Spring 2013 (TBA)