Committee members: Shawn Morrison (Chair; French, Francophone, and Italian Studies), Roxane DeLaurell (Accounting and Business Law), Kate Keeney (Secretary; Arts Management), and Emily Rosko (English).

Ex-Officio: Kameelah Martin (Graduate Dean), Keonya Booker (Interim Associate Graduate Dean), Tom Buchheit (Interim Registrar)

Guests: Mike Braswell (Accountancy), Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar), Ron Magnuson (MBA), Seaton Brown (MBA), Eric McElroy (EVSS), Judy Millesen (Public Administration), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School)

I. Proposals

1. Accountancy:

Accountancy, M.S. Admission Requirements
2021-2022 Graduate Program Admissions : Change

The above proposal was discussed and approved by unanimous vote.

2. Business Administration:

Business Administration, M.B.A. Admission Requirements
2021-2022 Graduate Program Admissions : Change

The above proposal was discussed and approved by unanimous vote.

3. Environmental and Sustainability Studies

a. EVSS - 627 - Marine Tetrapod Biology
Course : Change

b. EVSS - 671L - Biodiversity Management Laboratory
Course : New

c. EVSS - 722 - Marine Invertebrate Zoology
Course : Change
d. EVSS - 724 - Ichthyology
   Course : Change

e. EVSS - 725 - Marine Botany
   Course : Change

4. Master’s in Education - Languages

LALE - 690 - Special Topics in Language Education
Course : Change

All of the above listed proposals were discussed and approved by unanimous vote.

5. Public Administration

Public Administration, M.P.A. - MPA-PUBA
Major/Program/Certificate : Change

Significant discussion was had on this proposal and the internship requirement. There was concern that the language could cause confusion with students. Judy Millesen joined the meeting late and clarified the issues. The proposal passed by a unanimous vote.

II. Minutes

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved by unanimous vote.

Shawn thanked everyone for their service, and promised to update us once the new committee assignments are made. Kate Keeney is circulating off the committee due to her years of service. The committee thanks her for her extraordinary service.

Respectfully Submitted,

Roxane DeLaurell
Committee Member
2021-2022 Committee for Graduate Education Agenda
February 4, 2022, 3:00pm
Zoom Meeting
https://cofc.zoom.us/j/81103918645

Committee members: Shawn Morrison (Chair; French, Francophone, and Italian Studies), Brian Bossak (Health and Human Performance), Roxane DeLaurell (Accounting and Business Law), Brennan Keegan (Religious Studies), Kate Keeney (Secretary; Arts Management), Emily Rosko (English), Andrew Shedlock (Biology)

Ex-Officio: Keonya Booker (Interim Associate Graduate Dean), Mark Del Mastro (Associate Provost), Tom Buchheit (Interim Registrar), Divya Bhati (Institutional Effectiveness)

Guests: Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Ron Magnuson (MBA), Seaton Brown (MBA), Eric McElroy (BIOL), Emily Skinner (MTLA), Annette Watson (ENSS), Anton Vander Zee (ENGL), Brian Lanahan (TEDU)

A. Call to Order. Meeting was called to order at 3:01pm.

B. Approval of Minutes from January 7, 2022
Andrew motioned to approve. Roxanne seconded. All approved.

C. Curriculum Proposals:
1. Business Administration, MBA
   a. MBAD 500 – Law of Corporate Governance: credit hour change
   b. MBAD 505 – Creativity and Innovation: credit hour change
   c. MBAD 520 – Global Enterprise: course description change
   d. MBAD 526 – Infor Mgmt for Competitive Advantage: new course
   e. Program Change: add new course to requirements, increase degree hours from 36 to 39, add clarifying language to non-credit program requirements

Shawn called for questions.

Roxane noted that when you reduce the credit hour from 3 to 2, that you are excluding roster faculty from ever teaching that course. Also, will there be enough competent adjuncts to take on these courses?

Ron responded that they have permission from the Provost’s office to pay overloads to instructors.
Roxane asked about the basic goal of the proposal of the reduced credit hour change. Ron responded that there won’t be additional credit hours to the major.

Ron discussed the program change. This change is to make the international experience a 3-credit hour course.

Brian commented that box E on the curriculum proposal needs some grammatical attention. Brian asked about increasing to 39 credit hours as compared to peer institutions.

There was discussion about the new graduate tuition study. If approved, the MBA program would be able to charge additional tuition for the international study course.

Emily motioned to vote. Brennan seconded. All approved.

2. Biology
   a. BIOL 527 – Marine Tetrapod Biology: course renumber, course title change, credit hour change, pre-req change, remove lab, add cross-listing (BIOL 427)
   b. BIOL 532 – Biology of Fishes: course renumber, course title change, add cross-listing (BIOL 432)
   c. BIOL 535 – Marine Botany: course renumber, course description change, add cross-listing (BIOL 435)
   d. BIOL 537 – Biology of Invertebrates: course renumber, course title change, add cross-listing (BIOL 437)

Shawn called for questions.

Kate motioned to approve. Andrew seconded. All approved.

3. Creative Writing, MFA
   a. Program Change: add new course (ENGL 561) to requirements for new emphasis area in creative nonfiction; add new course to electives for studio and ARCM emphasis; add new courses (ENGL 577 and ENGL 578) to electives

Shawn called for questions.

Brennan motioned to approved. Kate seconded. All approved.

4. English, MA
   a. ENGL 709 – ePortfolio Tutorial: new course
   b. ENGL 710 – Revising for Academic Publication: new course
   c. Program Change: add new courses to program capstone options

Shawn called for questions.
Emily motioned to approve. Kate seconded. All approved.

5. Environmental and Sustainability Studies, MS
   a. EVSS 502/502L – Geospatial Science: new course, add cross-listing (GEOG 402/402L)
   b. EVSS 671 – Biodiversity Management: new course

Shawn called for questions.

Brian motioned to approve. Andrew seconded. All approved.

6. Teacher Education
   a. EDEE 507 – Creating Effective Learning Communities: pre-req change (remove EDEE 590)
   b. EDEE 595 – Field Experience: Advanced Curriculum, Instruction, and Literacies Assessment (2-6): pre-req change (remove EDEE 590)

Shawn called for questions.

Kate motioned to approve. Emily seconded. All approved.

7. Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy, MED
   a. New Literacies Concentration: terminate concentration

Shawn called for questions.

Emily motioned to approve. Kate seconded. All approved.

8. Community Planning, Policy, and Design, MA
   a. CPAD 525 – Introduction to Urban Design: course renumber, course description change, add cross-listing (HPCP 425)
   b. CPAD 526 – Architectural Design Studio Traditions in Practice: course renumber, course title change, pre-req change (remove CPAD 525), add cross-listing (HPCP 426)
   c. Program Change: decrease degree hours from 54 to 51

Shawn explained that we need to vote on the program change proposal only. Mark noted that it is just a credit hour change.

Shawn called for questions about the program change.

Andrew motioned to approved. Brennan seconded. All approved.

Shawn explained that we discussed this in the Fall. Robyn shared peer research that was completed by a graduate student in her office.

The group discussed the options for students in an extenuating circumstance. Robyn discussed that there are options to appeal academic dismissal and to make a grade change.

Shawn will share that the committee is comfortable with the policy as written. It is similar to our peers’ and there are avenues for extenuating circumstances.

E. For the Good of the Order

Shawn asked about having an OAKS page like the undergraduate committee. The group determined that the Graduate Committee volume is less and so this is not needed.

Tom reminded the committee to please attend the interviews for the Registrar candidates.

F. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:50pm.
A. Call to Order
Meeting started at 3:03pm

B. Approval of Minutes from December 3, 2021
Andrew motioned to approve. Kate seconded. All approved.

C. Curriculum Proposals:

1. Accountancy, MS
   a. ACCT 500 – Accounting Theory: course description change
   b. ACCT 599 – Contemporary Accountancy Issues: course description change

   Shawn called for questions for ACCT 500. Emily motioned to approve. Brennan seconded. All approved.

   Shawn called for questions for ACCT 599. Roxane motioned to approve. All approved.

2. Marine Biology, MS
   a. BIOL 513/513L – Marine Conservation Genetics: course renumber, course title change, course description change, credit hour change, add cross-listing (BIOL 413/413L)
Shawn called for questions. Emily asked if all the changes can happen at one time? She was under the assumption that you could only make a few changes at a time. Mark responded that there is not a threshold.

Emily motioned to approve. Kate seconded. All approved.

3. Community Planning, Policy, and Design, MA
   a. CPAD 790 – Independent Design Field Study: credit hour change, pre-req change

Shawn called for questions. Andrew motioned to approve. Emily seconded. All approved.

4. Creative Writing, MFA
   a. ENGL 561 – MFA Workshop in Creative Nonfiction: add new course
   b. Admissions Change: add requirement of sample of creative writing for new emphasis area in creative nonfiction

Shawn called for questions. Brennan motioned to approve. Brian seconded. All approved.

5. Data Science and Analytics, MS
   a. DATA 507 – Scientific Computing in Data Science: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506)
   b. DATA 590 – Special Topics in Data Science and Analytics: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506)
   c. DATA 591 – Independent Study: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506)
   d. Admissions Change: remove entrance exam, add “must meet requirements,” add description to statement of purpose, add resume

Shawn explained the proposals and called for questions. Robyn asked about shifting from summer to fall admissions and wanted to clarify that this is part of the proposal. Navid stated that there will no longer be summer admission. Robyn also commented that an odd/incomplete sentence needs to be removed. “Lectures hours per week” needs to be removed. Shawn will strike this as a next step.

For DATA 507, 590, and 591. Kate motioned to approve. Roxane seconded. All approved.

For the Admissions change. Roxane motioned to approve. Andrew seconded. All approved.

6. English, MA
   a. ENGL 577 – Proseminar in Major Literary Themes: new course, add cross-listing (ENGL 477)
   b. ENGL 578 – Proseminar in Major Literary Genres: new course, add cross-listing (ENGL 478)
   c. Program Change: add new courses to electives
Shawn explained the proposals and called for questions. Roxane asked if they are cross listed, then are undergraduates getting graduate credit? Anton responded. Robyn noted that the 577 and 578 syllabi need to be updated with the graduate grading scale/policies. Anton will provide an updated syllabus.

Roxane motioned to approve. Brennan seconded. All approved.

7. Historic Preservation, MS (SEE attached e-mail: HSPV 620 is actually HSPV 801, and HSPV 840 is actually HSPV 829)
   a. Program Termination: effective Fall 2022
   b. Course Deactivations: effective Fall 2023
      i. HSPV 620 - Preservation Law and Economics
      ii. HSPV 802 - Historic Preservation Research Seminar
      iii. HSPV 803 - Building Technology and Pathology
      iv. HSPV 804 - Mgmt and Administration of Historic Preservation
      v. HSPV 805 - Preservation Studio
      vi. HSPV 807 - American Architecture
      vii. HSPV 808 - History and Theory of Historic Preservation
      viii. HSPV 809 - Historical Research Methods
      ix. HSPV 810 - Conservation Science Laboratory
      x. HSPV 811 - Advanced Conservation Laboratory Science
      xi. HSPV 819 - Investigation, Documentation, Conservation
      xii. HSPV 821 - Historic Preservation and Public Memory
      xiii. HSPV 822 - Vernacular Places and Spaces
      xiv. HSPV 823 - Historic American Interiors
      xv. HSPV 825 - Sustainability and Historic Preservation
      xvi. HSPV 826 - Historic Structures Report
      xvii. HSPV 827 - Adaptive Use
      xviii. HSPV 828 - Case Studies in Preservation Engineering
      xix. HSPV 833 - Cultural and Historical Landscape Preservation
      xx. HSPV 840 - Digital Tools for Historic Preservation
      xxi. HSPV 845 - Internship in Historic Preservation
      xxii. HSPV 891 - Thesis in Historic Preservation
      xxiii. HSPV 892 - Special Topics in Historic Preservation
      xxiv. HSPV 893 - Independent Study in Historic Preservation

Shawn asked to vote on this as a package. There were no objections. Shawn raised questions about the numbering and communicated with Jon separately. Roxane asked why is the program being terminated? Jon responded that the program is continuing with Clemson, but that they MOU is dissolving and that the program will no longer be at CofC. The undergraduate program will continue at CofC.

Emily moved to approve. Roxane seconded. All approved.

8. Public Administration, MPA
   a. PUBA 512 - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the Public Sector:
      course title change, course description change
   b. PUBA 522 - Intergovernmental Relations: course deactivation
Shawn called for questions. Brennan motioned to approve. Andrew seconded. All approved.

**D. Old Business:** Transfer Credit Policy: Approval of policy revisions. Google Link also sent in e-mail with this agenda. The proposal is also attached to the e-mail with this agenda as a word document.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qk60mvhdwpNm4euaAp0WWJZnUgZDPwggZcHaHcbTB40/edit

Shawn reviewed the changes with the committee. Kate discussed the draft language and notes on the document.

Do we mean calendar or academic year? Robyn said for the time to degree policy, we use the academic year. Roxane said that this logic makes sense.

The committee reviewed the language and made changes. The group decided that the proposal will be presented to Graduate Council by Dean Martin and/or Shawn Morrison. Shawn will explain this discussion at the next Graduate Council meeting.

Robyn also asked if this needs to go to Faculty Senate. Robyn and Mark discussed and will look at previous similar changes. Robyn will investigate next steps.

**E. For the Good of the Order**

Franklin announced his new position with the College and thanked the group.

**F. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:19pm.
A. Call to Order 3:04 PM

B. Approval of Minutes from November 5, 2021
Emily moved to approve. Kate seconded.

C. Curriculum Proposals

1. CSIS 638 Implementation of Database Management Systems: pre-req change (remove DATA 505 and DATA 506)
   
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3592/form

   Shawn explained the proposal and asked for comments. Andrew motioned to approve. Roxane seconded. All approved.

2. PUBA MPA-PUBA. Program change (Number of hours as required by external accreditation agency: add one elective to require 36 hours).
   
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3543/form

   Shawn explained the proposal and asked for comments. Roxane motioned to approve. Brennan seconded. All approved.

D. Old Business: Transfer Credit Policy (Report from research by the Graduate School)
Robyn reviewed the summary document and asked for comments from the group. Roxane asked the Graduate School team if they preferred one of the policies that were reviewed? Robyn noted that 5 years seemed reasonable. Kameelah also supported 5 years but is happy to hear about other time frames.

Kameelah said that degree time limit also adds some noise to the conversation/policies.

Andrew noted that the policies seemed to vary by size of school. He focused on William and Mary and JMU.

Brennan suggested a time at start of the program and then a time at the time of graduation.

Roxane noted that schools do need some flexibility depending on the nature of the program. Disciplines differ. Who will be in charge of making the decision? Will there be an appeal process?

Robyn brought up setting a long time for the max (10 years) and programs could set a shorter timeline.

Shawn suggested 5 years before acceptance with a total of 10 years.

Robyn asked about what if someone is dismissed? A student could have multiple points of admission. Brennan thought that maybe this is an argument for the 10 years at time of degree. Robyn didn’t see this in any of the policies from peers. Shawn noted that we need an “out” for these kinds of rare instances.

CofC credit comes with a student no matter what (5, 10 years, etc.)

Robyn also brought up double counting graduate credit that was earned and applied in another degree. Double counting graduate degree credit between institutions. This does not include certificates.

Related, Emily said that some students in the MFA program come from MA programs and then ask to have a course count for the MFA program. So some double counting is happening and we might not want to prevent all instances of allowing this kind of transfer.

Shawn offered a summary. The group talked about 5 years prior to acceptance (term of matriculation) for no more than 10 years between the time the student took the course and graduates from CofC.

Brian said that there is no clear and consistent policy from the peer institutions. Acceptance, admittance, and matriculation are different. When does the clock really start?
Robyn responded that matriculation is the semester that the student begins. Kameelah said that our current policy is unclear and has created issues. She is hoping that a recommendation come from the committee.

Andrew noted that 10 years is the edge of the universe compared to our peers.

Roxane reminded the group that the undergraduate limit is 10 years. So maybe 10 allows for the most flexibility and then program directors should be supported if they have a shorter timeline.

Shawn suggested that we table the question about double dipping credit from one graduate degree to another. The committee agreed.

Tom noted to include the following in any new language, "Students should check the individual programs for their specific transfer credit policies."

Roxane noted that in the future, it may be more efficient for the Graduate School to draft the policy language that it needs. Then the Graduate Education Committee would endorse it for approval. No one on the committee knows the intricate processes of the graduate school.

Mark brought up the optics of the Graduate School Office writing policy.

Emily asked Robyn and Kameelah if we are on the right track with 10 years? Robyn said yes.

Andrew noted the important process of data-driven decision making. In the future we should have that as a working protocol especially when we are struggling for definitions.

Shawn asked if Robyn’s office could do peer research regarding “double dipping.”

Kate will circulate a document with policy language for review and comment. In January we can advance the draft language to the Graduate Council.

We need to find out if Senate needs to vote or just be updated with this information.

**E. New Business: New Grading Option of IP (In-Progress) rather than Incomplete that becomes an F due to time limit. Proposal Attached.**

Shawn wanted to start the discussion for the IP option. Mark asked where this came from. Shawn shared that this idea came from a colleague who expressed the need for something like this given some issues with students and the current Incomplete policy.

Robyn noted that we already use an IP process.
Tom Buchheit spoke on behalf of the Registrar. They do not support having an “incomplete” forever. Tom asked, what is the issue that needs to be resolved? Shawn said that the concern is about the penalty and the timeline of the Incomplete.

Robyn remarked that graduate students can have the Incomplete for the entire semester. Then the student can request 30 calendar days.

Tom asked about getting more information as a comparison. For example, some schools allow one calendar year for Incompletes.

Andrew said that this is a way for students to accumulate Incomplete transcripts.

Robyn suggested instead revisiting the timeline for the “Incomplete” instead of creating a new grade. There are processes in place for students, but yes, if a student receives an F, he or she is kicked out and must reapply and be readmitted.

Changing the Incomplete timeline and/or adding a new grade would have implications for the remaining joint programs. Computer Science, History, English, and two certificates in Computer Science.

Robyn suggested more peer research for the Incomplete window.

We will table this discussion until February with the research in hand.

F. For the Good of the Order

Andrew asked about meeting on a Thursday. Yes, there is a conflict with the undergraduate curriculum meeting and so this committee will meet on a Thursday one time in the Spring semester. Andrew and Roxane also teach on Thursdays.

G. Adjournment 4:36 PM
A. Call to Order at 3:03 PM

B. Approval of Minutes from October 1, 2021. Kate motioned to approved. Brennan seconded. All approved.

C. Curriculum Proposals

1. ESOL graduate certificate: Add personal statement to admissions process, remove priority application deadlines
   
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3460/form

   Shawn explained the proposal and asked for comment. There was discussion about the personal statement being required but not disqualifying an applicant. Roxane noted that if you aren’t going to use the statement as a criterion of admission, could the statement help but not hurt? Shawn says yes, it could help them but not penalize them.

   The committee discussed that they are ok to approve as is but are suggesting that it could be helpful to indicate the use of the statement to applicants. Andrew agreed that if the applicant knew that they could not be penalized, then they may make the statement more genuine.

   Roxane moved to approve. Andrew seconded. All approved.

   Franklin asked to be notified of any updates to the language. Shawn will follow-up on this item before approving to the next step.

2. PUBA 554: Deletion of course
   
   https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3441/form
Shawn explained the proposal and asked for comment. Kate motioned to approve. Roxane seconded. All approved.

3. Math 700: Update course description, pre-requisite, and mode of grading (pass/fail)

https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3277/form

Kate asked if the pass/fail is common. Alex said that this was the motivation of the change. Yes, the pass/fail is common in other programs.

Roxane suggested an A and B like the bachelor’s essay. Alex responded that the course description makes it clear that two semesters are required and is in place instead of the A/B format.

Emily moved to approve. Andrew seconded. All approved

D. New Business: Graduate School Transfer Credit, Dean Martin, Graduate School

https://catalog.cofc.edu/content.php?catoid=21&navoid=1007

Kameelah noted that the language of the transfer policy surrounding the time limit for which transfer credit can be applied to the degree program is unclear and there are wide interpretations. Kameelah is asking the committee to review this policy and make some recommendations.

A student was hoping to apply transfer credit and there was an issue with the time limit.

Does four or five years mean at the start of the program? There is room for improvement on the language.

1) What is reasonable time limit for transfer credit to be applied?
2) When does that clock start?

Judy asked about the intent of the policy. Is the intent that credit applied is current? The challenge to the policy is what happens when the credit is close to the window, but outside the range of the stated policy. Judy suggested that perhaps the time is about the point of application and the program looks back at transfer credit.

Kate asked about any program level discretion. Some programs might need a tighter timeline than others. Robyn suggested the Graduate School have a maximum time but that programs could make the requirement less.

Lisa noted that at the undergraduate level, transfer credit can be 10 years old and after that it requires a second look.

Brian agreed that this could vary upon program and because of that flexibility is important.

Robyn thinks the look back approach is helpful. Mark agrees that the intent does match the existing language/policy. We aren’t talking about transfer credit while you are in the program.

Andrew said rather than declaring a number which creates restrictive situations, instead communicate a formula. The duration of the program limit plus a reasonable transition, for example 5+5 years.

Emily said transfer credit is granted most often when a student is enrolling. Why is the transfer credit question coming up when they are already in the program? Kameelah noted that in this scenario, the transfer request came towards the end of the program. It is preferred, but students aren’t required to do it at the beginning.

Roxane noted that everyone is saying that we have varied programs with varied standards. The undergraduate policy is a very generous timeline. Having a strict number seems to be more of a burden than
a benefit. Is it too unstructured to allow transfer credit to be determined by the individual program directors? Does there have to be a defined time? Robyn noted that this would be outside of the norm, but that it may be possible.

Divya noted that there is a standard that 1/3 of the credit be taught by the institution.

Emily suggested a policy about evaluating transfer credit by the second semester. Judy said that this could still present obstacles. Andrew said, what about after the fourth semester? This would be a generous amount of time. Robyn asked for clarification on this idea. There are two components – the window of eligibility and a request window.

Roxane asked about the evaluation process. Doesn’t this happen at the program level? If so, could we get rid of the timeframe all together and give the decision to the program? Kameelah and Robyn noted that some timeframe would be helpful.

Kameelah suggested that it should be separate from the time for degree completion.

The look back should be at the entry point to CofC. Roxane suggested a 10-year time frame like the undergraduate level.

Mark also agreed that separate discussion/study would be helpful. Robyn suggested a project of peer institution research to be completed by the GA in the Graduate School office. Kameelah would like to take a proposal to Graduate Council with a recommendation from this group.

Roxane asked that the peer research be done by the Graduate School GA and then be sent to the Graduate Education Committee in advance of the next meeting. The group will then craft policy with this guidance. Emily noted that there still may be some discussion on the timeline to declare the transfer credit and/or have it evaluated by a certain semester.

E. For the good of the order

Introduction of Keonya Booker to the Graduate School office

F. Adjournment at 3:56pm
2021-2022 Committee for Graduate Education Committee Meeting  
October 1, 2021  
3:00pm

zoom link:  https://cofc.zoom.us/j/81103918645

Committee members: Shawn Morrison (Chair; French, Francophone, and Italian Studies), Brian Bossak (Health and Human Performance), Roxane DeLaurell (Accounting and Business Law), Brennan Keegan (Religious Studies), Kate Keeney (Secretary; Arts Management), Emily Rosko (English), Andrew Shedlock (Biology)

Ex-Officio: Kameelah Martin (Graduate Dean), Mark Del Mastro (Associate Provost), Lisa Chestney, (Registrar), Divya Bhati (Institutional Effectiveness)

Guests: Franklin Czwazka (Office of the Registrar), Jerry Mackeldon (Office of the Registrar), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Emily Beck (LALE)

A. Call to Order. Shawn called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM

B. Approval of Minutes from September 3, 2021. Two spelling corrections were made. Andrew motioned to approve. Emily seconded. All approved.

C. Curriculum Proposals

1. LALE 695 Change Pre-Requisites  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3267/form

Shawn explained the proposal. Emily gave a more thorough explanation. Any core LALE core course will serve as a prerequisite for LALE 695 which is a capstone course.

Kameelah shared concerns from the Graduate School, but ultimately, they support the proposal. Is one core course sufficient for the capstone? Is the change being driven by scheduling or course content? Should it be a pre or co-requisite so that courses are before or concurrent?

Emily responded to the question about the co-requisite. Most of the students will have taken the courses in advance. If it is a co-requisite, then they must take it at the same time. The prerequisites satisfy some understanding of the teaching portfolio which is completed in the capstone course.

Kate motioned to approve. Emily seconded. All approved.

2. URBP (Urban and Regional Planning Graduate Certificate) Add PUBA 519  https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3442/form

Judy was not present. Shawn discussed the proposal and asked for questions.

Roxane motioned to approve. Brennan seconded. All approved.

D. On-going discussion: Policy on changing to grading scale with minus grades

Shawn discussed a memo that was written in October 2019. Shawn circulated the memo to the committee by email before the meeting.
Emily explained that she and Karen Chandler co-signed the memo, but that she was not part of any additional discussion.

Shawn noted that this may be a SACSCOC issue because of the joint programs.

Kameelah informed the committee of her communication with others on this topic. She sent out an inquiry and received a response from Computer Science at the Citadel who was generally supportive. History responded and was also generally in favor. She did not receive a response from the English program.

Robyn found conversation about changing the graduate grading scale as early as 2011.

It appears that faculty are generally supportive of this idea.

Kameelah also spoke briefly to the Provost about this proposal. Kameelah noted that we need a clear plan for next steps and for coordinating with the joint programs at the Citadel. We are dissolving the joint program with Clemson.

Mark suggested a preliminary step to be 1) a joint task force with the Citadel, 2) additional data, 3) Provosts’ review, 4) approval processes at both institutions.

Emily brought up the undue burden of those with joint programs.

Robyn asked if we must include the Citadel in the process. Divya responded yes, as it is one degree.

Shawn asked if it would have to go to SACSCOC. Divya explained the different types of notification that would be required.

Andrew brought up that it would be a problem if the Citadel had already changed the grading scale.

Kameelah also mentioned that the Registrar’s Office cannot prioritize this project right now. Provost Austin asked the same question.

Lisa said that this will be a multi-year process and that Banner would have to support two grading scales at once. Franklin said it would be like the undergraduate grade change in Fall 2006. Also, the vendor may not be able to fit this in right now.

Roxane asked what are we hoping to gain with the grade scale change? Shawn reviewed the rationale from the 2019 memo. Brian seconded Roxane’s question. Given some of the challenges that have been discussed, Brian noted that he is trying to conceptualize the benefits.

A- and B- would be the two new grades.

Andrew noted that this seems to be an issue for faculty but not with students. Kate noted that the current grading scale advantages the students. Students would not want the change.

Roxane asked if there is a way to give other distinctions to achieving students. Shawn noted the mechanism of “outstanding students.”

Brennan suggested a conversation about grade inflation as a substitute. It is ok to give Bs and maybe we need to be reminded of that.

If there is a group of faculty members that really care to push this forward, then the option is there.

Shawn will go back to Judy to discuss the challenges, including a 3-4 year implementation. The group talked about the implementation challenges. IT dimension is not trivial – there may be time and energy. Is it worth all the effort?

Divya also asked if there is a different system at the Citadel. Robyn shared the printed scale that is online.
E. For the good of the order

F. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 3:50 PM
Emily motioned to adjourn. Andrew seconded. All approved.
2021-2022 Committee for Graduate Education Agenda
September 3, 2021
3:00pm

zoom link: https://cofc.zoom.us/j/81103918645

Committee members: Shawn Morrison (Chair; French, Francophone, and Italian Studies), Brian Bossak (Health and Human Performance), Roxane DeLaurell (Accounting and Business Law), Brennan Keegan (Religious Studies), Kate Keeney (Secretary; Arts Management), Emily Rosko (English), Andrew Shedock (Biology)

Ex-Officio: Kameelah Martin (Graduate Dean), Mark Del Mastro (Associate Provost), Lisa Chestney, (Office of the Registrar), Divya Bhati (Institutional Effectiveness)

Guests: Franklin Czwazka Office of the Registrar), Julie Dahl (Office of the Registrar), Jon Hakkila (Associate Graduate Dean), Jerry Mackeldon Office of the Registrar), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School)

Emily Beck, Judy Millesen, Alex Kasman (Mathematics)

A. Call to Order 3:02

Shawn introduced herself as the new committee chair.

B. Approval of Minutes from April 9, 2021.

Brian motioned to approve. Emily seconded. All approved.

C. Curriculum Proposals

1. Mathematical Sciences: MS Admission Requirements
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3368/form

The proposal removes program admission in the summer. Roxane asked why they are moving towards this model. Alex responded that they would like to be more flexible, however they have not been able to offer summer classes because of enrollment. The thesis and independent study are offered in the summer, but this is limited to upper-level students. If the summer teaching policies and schedule changes, then perhaps the admission procedures would need to change.

Roxane motioned to approve. Kate seconded. All approved.

2. PUBA 623
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3404/form

The proposal is to deactivate a course. Roxane asked if they are really sure about ending the course. Judy responded that they are attempting to clean up their catalogue so that classes that appear are the ones being taught.

Roxane motioned to approve. Brian seconded. All approved.

3. SPAN 614
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3265/form

Proposal changes a course description.
Roxane noted that the proposal is both a description change and adds that the course is repeatable. Emily responded that the course is different each semester with different instructors. During student’s program, the same course would never be offered twice.

Kate motioned to approve. Roxane seconded. All approved.

4. SPAN 615
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3266/form

Similar proposal of changing the description and making the course repeatable.

Brennan motioned to approve. Emily seconded. All approved.

5. SPAN 655
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3259/form

Proposal is to deactivate a course. Brian asked if they are sure about deactivating the course. Emily responded that the faculty members have left the College. If another person offered a similar course, it would not be the same course. The course in question was very specific to one person’s research.

Emily moved to approve. Andrew seconded. All approved.

6. SPAN 671
https://cofc.curriculog.com/proposal:3260/form

Proposal is to deactivate a course. Emily responded that it was a similar situation to the SPAN 655 proposal.

Andrew motioned to approve. Brennan seconded. All approved.

D. Continuing Business

Discussion on Policies: Making sure policies match in student handbooks at undergrad and grad levels

Robyn commented on this was based on an experience that took place in Summer 2020.

Academic standing issues are different than the grievance policy.

Mark and Robyn noted that this has been resolved.

A- policy

Robyn remembers waiting for a formal proposal that would come from a faculty member or program director.

Kate and Emily remembered that this group wanted to offer some guidance to the faculty who are interested in pursuing the A-

Robyn suggested a memo that outlines the desire, peer research, and supporting signatures.

Roxane asked about the relationship between the Graduate Education Committee and Graduate Council. Mark read the policy. Roxane asked if we could put together a proposal and submit it Graduate Council.

Robyn noted that this would include all minuses, not just A-

Mark recalls that the next step is to ask a smaller graduate faculty working group to work on the proposal. Mark asked that we review previous Graduate Council minutes as a reference point.
Shawn will ask Judy to lead a subgroup. The suggested next steps include a memo, peer research, and supporting signatures.

Lisa reiterated that the grade change could not be a priority for the Registrar’s Office right now, but that it would be useful to have the supporting documents in place.

E. For the Good of the Order

Shawn asked for any other items to discuss this year. No additional items were brought to the Committee.

The Committee will continue to meet by Zoom during the Fall semester.

F. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned 3:40pm