A. Call to order at 10:04 AM
Committee discussed the need for a member to fulfill the role of Chair for this meeting. Sandy Slater agreed to chair the meeting. Committee made a motion to change the order of the agenda in order to accommodate a speaker who needed to leave the meeting early because of his class schedule. All approved. The following agenda and notes reflects these changes.

B. Old business
a. English – requirement deletion
Discussion: Mike Duvall discussed that the foreign language requirement seemed unnecessary. The English Department was in consensus except for one person. Many people fulfil the requirement anyway and take Old English. The Citadel is also in favor of the change. Provost McGee noted that we need to have formal approval from Citadel (in the form of a letter). This could happen anytime in the spring. Robyn: Does the foreign language requirement impact recruiting? Mike said that they don’t have evidence of this; can’t say with certainty.

Kate moved to accept the change. All accepted. Christine will move paperwork forward in Curriculog. Robyn made some additional comments about changes needed in the text of the proposal.

C. Review and approval of the minutes from the November 3, 2017 meeting
Lyndsey motioned to approve. Kate seconded. All approved.

D. New business
a. MPA-URST-4+1
Kevin Keenan briefly discussed the proposed 4+1 program. Students would go through an admissions process; they would save about a semester’s worth of work in the MPA program. Phil Jos noted that this program would serve only a small number of undergraduate students.
The MPA faculty noted that the current numbering system needs to change. The Registrar’s Office asked, what is the timeline for the renumbering? Needs to happen sooner than later since the program will be implemented in fall.

What is the criteria for determining highly qualified students? Kevin Keenan explained admissions requirements. Overall in Urban Studies, there are about 32 majors. They estimate admitting 1-2 students per year; this is based on qualified students and interest in the MPA degree. These numbers could grow overtime. The rationale for admitting students into only one concentration is because it is most tightly linked to the MPA program. Phil Jos mentioned that they want to maintain a majority of graduate students in the class, so they would have at a maximum 2-3 undergraduate students in a class.

Lyndsey asked to clarify the program’s timeline. Students would apply in the beginning of Junior year and then courses would start spring semester. Faculty would start identifying students in their Sophomore year. Sandy asked, will this be rolling admission as not everyone has identified a major their Sophomore year. Robyn asked about the GIS course—this was removed. Students could do up to 12 hours of overlapping credit, but they could do fewer. They could do two in a semester if classes are available. Sandy asked, are classes offered with enough frequency? Kevin said yes.

Robyn asked about the graduate admissions process. Students would apply through the graduate admissions process and get a conditional acceptance. So they would not then apply again. Is the GRE required? No, the GRE is not required for the 4+1 program. Mary asked, what do other 4+1s do with regard to the GRE? Robyn said that the programs are different. Provost McGee noted that requiring the GRE after taking these classes is a bit odd because they have already shown success through coursework. So then the GRE becomes a box checking exercise, not because it is predictive of success. A 4+1 program requiring a GRE is creating an awkwardness. Phil said that current practice is similar to the practice of waiving the GRE for high achieving transfer students or for previous work experience. Divya asked, are we meeting the admission policy of the College? Provost McGee said yes—programs can have their own policy; they just have to state the policy per SACSCOC. We have to do what we say we do. Phil noted that the MPA waiver policy might need some revision so that it aligns with practice and the catalogue. Provost McGee noted that it is imperative that we do what we say we do, and that faculty are responsible for providing the rationale for waiving the GRE. Phil said that they need to work on the GRE rationale for the MPA program and the 4+1. Provost McGee noted that Graduate Education Committee can endorse the 4+1 plan and require a revision of the graduate admission MPA policy and also the 4+1 admission rationale. The proposal will be left open in Curriculog to allow for these changes.

Provost McGee noted that 4+1 programs create managerial problems; yet they have become quite popular. Clemson just created about eight. Divya noted having 12 shared hours is going to be challenging from the perspective of SACSCOC. SACSCOC must approve all 4+1 programs because we are changing hour requirements for both programs. With regard to implementing the approval timeline, Provost McGee recommended that the committee make its
recommendation. A prospectus for the 4+1 program has to be submitted to SACSCOC by December 31, 2017. This requires prior approval from the Graduate Education Committee, Graduate Council, etc.

Robyn asked about specifying a credit hour status for Juniors. She suggested that the proposal add 60 credit hours as a requirement. Robyn asked, could someone take a break and come back to complete a 4+1 program? Provost McGee asked that we table this discussion as it pertains to all programs. Robyn asked about earning a 4+1 degree plus a certificate. We can advise them to take another class/elective in order to earn the 4+1 and certificate.

Provost McGee concluded the conversation by enumerating the issues:
1. Clarify admission criteria/GRE requirement for the MPA program and 4+1 proposal;
2. Course renumbering;
3. Add Junior, 60 credit hour standing;
4. Timeline: Prospectus has to be in Dec. 31 2017 to SACSCOC. Prospectus requires all internal CofC approvals.

Phil asked if Fall 2018 implementation was impossible? Provost McGee noted that we can only proceed with taking the actions that the Graduate Education Committee can take. Lyndsey motioned to approve the proposal with amendments. Kate seconded. All in favor.

c. 4+1 Programs General Discussion
Provost McGee spoke to the complexity of 4+1 programs in general. We are committed to getting this proposal through as it serves students, even though a modest number. He is not sure in each case that we would reach the same conclusion. We have no general policy statement at present regarding 4+1 programs. Should we require students to remain continuously enrolled? Provost McGee believes that we should require this. Otherwise, the programs are impractical to manage. We want to develop this as a catalogue rule. The continuity is not about the cost of the credit hours. It is about each additional year of separation—this increases the risk that there will have been changes to the program. In some cases, there would be no disruption. But if we have continuous enrollment as a top-level rule, this will streamline the process.

Mary noted that the shared hours of a 4+1 program are a “golden ticket.” When students leave, the ticket expires. The credit is marked as undergraduate credit only; it can’t be counted as graduate. This could be an issue for a department like Math because of the frequency of course offerings. In this instance, the Graduate School can accept other requirements for exceptional students.

Provost McGee noted that in Computer Science and Math, there is overlapping coursework. Would it be desirable to insert a rule that you can only be admitted into one 4+1 program in your lifetime? Someone might be interested in a double major in Math and Computer Science. They cannot do two 4+1 programs. This creates an unacceptable risk of error with complexity in curriculum rules, and may be considered pedagogically unsound.
Mary posed another question about 4+1 rules and double dipping. Provost McGee asked that we continue to develop 4+1 rules for the College.

d. Change to Admissions Processes
Provost McGee noted that in the past, there have been some issues with graduate admissions processes. At the undergrad level, we have one admission scheme. At the graduate level, individual standards are unique and there are exceptions. It is okay to recognize differences in graduate admissions standards. However, we must be transparent in what we do. Admission standards belong to the graduate faculty—not the program director, nor the program faculty. We expect faculty and shared governance for when admissions standards change. So we need a scheme for approving changes. We would need Graduate Education Committee and Graduate Council approval at a bare minimum. We have shared this message with Program Directors.

Lynn noted that Franklin has created a form in Curriculog for admissions changes. Franklin needs to know the process for the form—who touches the form? Is it the same as every other proposal? Is it Program Director to this committee? Many iterations could be possible. Sandy noted that this is also speaks to timeline concerns; something could take a long time. Provost McGee remarked that this move forward through shared governance. One could make the argument that admissions changes should go through Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid (FCASFA). Provost McGee noted that in his opinion, the Graduate Education Committee and Graduate Council may be enough.

Kate remarked that Christine’s proposal keeps final approval of admissions changes with Faculty Senate. Perhaps we can discuss the need to have Faculty Senate approval as a group. Provost McGee noted that in this scheme, changes are blessed by four levels before Faculty Senate. I am not sure that this kind of change needs so much approval. Sandy recommended starting simply, and then adding Faculty Senate if need be. Perhaps think of Faculty Senate as an advisory group for very complex issues/changes. We will table the issue and hear from Christine (keep as old business item for the next meeting). This committee does not need to make a decision about the topic, just contribute to the discussion.

E. For the good of the order
Divya brought up the issue of courses offered off campus. We have no way of knowing additional sites. They have met with Brian, Lynn, and Jim Posey about the topic. She proposed a box to check that there may be offerings off-campus. Same issue with distance learning. More distance learning is a good thing, but we have problems with reporting. At the time of inception, as the course is being proposed, we could have an option to say that in the future it may be offered at a different location or as a distance education class.

Mary asked, why can’t we say that all courses could in the future be offered online and at another site? Provost McGee responded that one option would be Faculty Senate approving a statement as such. Currently, departments get to decide. But when (older) courses were
approved, Faculty Senate did not get to comment on them as being an online course. Should all faculty have oversight of mode of delivery? We assumed that the class was face to face instruction. So should we now have a policy that says everything that is approved can change modalities in the future? Jon noted that as an SSM faculty, this became a heated discussion around science labs. Provost McGee remarked that we cannot deny transfer credit just because something is online. Mary asked, so if we go in this direction, where is this kept and tracked; where is information stored? And how is it enforced? Lynn asked, and in 15 years, what happens? Divya noted that we must send SACSCOC a prospectus if a course is over 50% online. Provost McGee noted that the clean policy solution is to let programs decide, and not require greater faculty approval.

Sandy noted that moving forward, we need to generate proposals on admissions and this mode of delivery question is for our awareness. Both will be on the agenda as old business for the January meeting.

F. Adjournment
Kate motioned to adjourn. Lyndsey seconded. Next meeting is January 12, 2018 at 10:00am.