2021-2022 Committee for Graduate Education Meeting Minutes
December 3, 2021. 3:00pm
Zoom Meeting
https://cofc.zoom.us/j/81103918645
Meeting ID: 811 0391 8645

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), Keonya Booker (Graduate School)

Guests: Franklin Czwazka (Office of the Registrar), Jerry Mackeldon (Office of the Registrar), Tom Buchheit (Office of the Registrar), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Navid Hashemi (CSIS), Judy Millesen (PUBA)

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