2015-2016 Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

AGENDA

Wednesday, Nov. 11, 2015 at 2:30 PM
Marino Conference Room, Cato Center

Committee members: Jo Ann Ewalt (Chair; MPA & Political Science), Barbara Beckingham (Secretary; Geology and Environmental Geosciences), Christine Finnan (Teacher Education and Anthropology), Anthony Varallo (English), Mike Braswell (Accounting & Legal Studies)

Ex-Officio: Amy McCandless (Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Conseula Francis (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources), Mary Bergstrom (Interim Registrar)

Guests: Jon Hakkila (Associate Dean of Graduate Studies), Robyn Olejniczak (Director of Student Records, Graduate School), Michelle McGrew (Research and Student Services Coordinator), Jerry Mackeldon and Franklin Czwazka (representatives from the Registrar’s Office), Bob Mignone, Annalisa Calini and Martin Jones (Mathematics), Tim Carens (English), Karin Roof (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning)

A. Call to order.

Chair calls to order at 2:33 pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Wednesday, October 7th, 2015 meeting.

Regarding last meeting’s minutes, Jo Ann Ewalt shares that Mary Bergstrom didn’t send updated draft of numbering scheme. Consuela Francis noted that an updated draft is not available currently but should be next week.

Tony Varallo motions to approve minutes, Barbara Beckingham seconds and all approve.

C. New Business
   A. M.S. Mathematics

Chair introduces and suggests we cover all 3 points listed below at once.

   i. Program Name Change
      1. M.S. in Mathematics to M.S. in Mathematical Sciences
   ii. Add New Emphasis
      1. Mathematics Concentration
      2. Statistics Concentration
   iii. Modify Admission Requirements
Annalisa Calini introduces the program change, walking through the current vs proposed program with 2 concentrations. The new framework outlines how students can develop a program of study with either a pure & applied or statistics focus. For someone taking the statistics focus, there would be a change in only 2 core courses at most due to the flexibility in selection of course sequences. Anna explains that it is a modification not a new program by citing CHE language on the definition of the two. Martin Jones and Anna reflect on how the name change better reflects the make-up of the department.

Christine Finnan asks, can students mix across concentrations? Annalisa, Bob Mignone and Martin Jones help clarify that question. Students can take classes within both concentrations (especially by taking electives), but need to declare one.

Jon Hakkila has a question to clarify involved language from depth requirements in proposed program stating: “2 sequences from 2 sets of 5 sequences...”. Annalisa and Martin explain that it sounds confusing but is more clear when the list of the sequences is read. This set up will provide structure to the students, who will take a full year of two areas to focus their program of study.

Jo Ann Ewalt summarizes some of the initial confusion about the proposal and how those concerns have been alleviated through discussions in email and in the meeting. She asks whether the program will need to do a “teach out” for requirements in the catalog for current students. Bob Mignone explains the concentration requirements will take effect with new incoming class.

Robyn Olejniczak asks: So what do the changes in admission requirements mean? Martin Jones answers that the newer requirements open up the program to sound more inclusive for students coming in with other degrees but with mathematical backgrounds, still emphasizing that prerequisites will need to be met for individual courses. The aim is to attract a broad audience. Annalisa adds that requirements as they read currently are too narrow.

Jo Ann Ewalt asks whether the acceptance notice will have to state that the students are required to make up for certain deficiencies. Bob Mignone says that requirements will be more at the course level rather than the “door level”.

A sentence will be changed in “Description of Changes” in the proposal, from: “Secondly, we will change the current MS in Mathematics to a concentration in Mathematics and add a second concentration in Statistics” to: “Secondly, we will modify the current MS in Mathematics to include two concentrations, in Mathematics and Statistics.”

Christine Finnan motions to approve. Seconded and all approve.

Bob Mignone points out that the new graduate program policy for CHE outlining program changes/modifications has changed and we may want to update our process to reflect it. Also, the CHE new graduate program policy linked document on the Graduate Curriculum and Academic Forms website is broken and needs to be fixed.

B. M.A. in English

Chair briefly introduces the proposal.
i. Add Existing Course to Requirement
   1. ENGL 650

ii. Delete Courses from Electives
   1. Total number of electives will decrease from 6 to 5 courses (18 credits to 15)

Tim Carens presents the program change proposal. He explains that the program was originally designed without an introductory course, and the need to change this has been resurfacing for a long time. Assessments have shown some deficiencies among incoming students in formulating arguments, and basic writing and research skills.

Jo Ann Ewalt applauds the objective of this proposed change. But asks, isn’t this a new course, not a modification of a new course?

Tim Carens states that the new description for the newly titled course “Introduction to Graduate English Studies” is actually just a more specific description of the original 650 course. Course that is being changed, “Principles of Literary Research” has not been offered in many years. The only new aspect of the modified new course (10%) is on career paths and professional development.

Jo Ann Ewalt says that it is not clear how the committee would be able to assess the merit of the change, the goals, and whether or not this is a new course without a syllabus. A syllabus would be a good exercise.

Tim Carens: A syllabus was not made because we did not perceive it as necessary originally.

Mike Braswell asks: Is there an existing course at the undergraduate level that could solve the problem of graduate student preparation?

Consuela Francis reports that there is an undergraduate course but it is 299 so graduates couldn’t take it. Tim Carens adds that this wouldn’t help the problem of preparation of incoming graduate students.

Mike Braswell follows by asking, if the title is throwing off the committee regarding whether this is a new or modified course, what does creating a new title and description achieve?

Tim Carens: It achieves clarity of the course.

Consuela Francis adds that she understands the revision of this graduate course as a way to broaden the scope and better reflect its purpose and content.

Jon Hakkila raises the point that since it is now to be an introductory course then it should take a 500-level numbering.

Amy McCandless follows up that it indeed should be a 500 level course, especially as we need to provide a basis for course numbers for SACS review.

Tim Carens says that ENG 500 is already taken, so changing the course to a 500 level wouldn’t follow a logical order.

Jo Ann Ewalt notes that it is difficult for the committee to make decisions regarding numbering without knowing the new guidelines. Consuela Francis shares that the new course numbering scheme does not require logical sequencing, but does define 500 vs 600 level, etc.
Christine Finnan motions to approve the request to change the ENGL 650 course title and description, making this existing course a new requirement in the program and decreasing the number of elective courses to match. Seconded by Mike Braswell.

Chair asks if there are any other comments or questions about the proposal. Barbara Beckingham raises the point of changing the assessment of learning objectives away from specific grades, i.e. “80% of students should receive a B or higher for all relevant assignments”. Jon Hakkila says that the assessment is for within the class. Barbara Beckingham specifies that instead of grades the assessment should state what conditions would demonstrate different levels of proficiency. Jon Hakkila and Amy McCandless add that it can take the form of a rubric, or what a rubric would dictate grades would be. Jo Ann Ewalt adds that learning outcomes could also reflect higher order thinking. Tim Carens agrees and notes that the program is making changes with the very helpful advice of the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning.

Jo Ann Ewalt asks that if it is approved, that the program please make changes to the proposal before it goes to Graduate Council (11/20). Changes include: update the assessment method and course number. At Tim Carens request, Karin Roof’s office has some examples for assessment language.

Proposal is voted on:
Approve: Christine Finnan, Barbara Beckingham, Matt Braswell
Not approve: Jo Ann Ewalt
Recused: Tony Varallo

D. For the good of the order.

Jo Ann Ewalt advances that the committee is in need of some definition to our process; for example, what is difference between modification and new program of course? Policies are needed to guide curricular work.

Consuela Francis lays out that this committee is responsible for rules and recommendations on how the process is carried out. The Graduate School and Academic Affairs can then review them for consistency. Curriculum belongs to faculty, which is represented by this committee. Amy McCandless recommends finding policies at other institutions and bringing them forward for review.

Jo Ann Ewalt asks if Michelle McGrew can pull some policies from Clemson, CHE, etc. for review at the next meeting. Place on next meeting agenda.

E. Adjournment.

Barbara Beckingham motions to Adjourn. All approve.

The next meeting will be held December 9th, 2015 at 2:30 p.m. in the Marino Conference Room.