2016-2017 Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

MINUTES

Monday, September 19, 2016
Beatty Rm 301

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Barbara Beckingham (Secretary; Geology and Environmental Geosciences), Ben Cox (Mathematics), David Hansen (Management and Marketing-Research), + [one vacant position]

Ex-Officio: Brian McGee (Provost, and Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources), Alice Hamilton (Director of Center for Continuing Education & Professional Development), Mary Bergstrom (Registrar)

Guests: Jon Hakkila (Associate Dean of Graduate School), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Allisyn Morgan (Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School), Godfrey Gibbison (Dean for the School of Professional Studies), Bob Perkins and Angela Cozart (TEDU), Joshua Bloodworth, OIEP

A. Call to order.

Chair Christine Finnan calls meeting to order at 3:04pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Wednesday, April 20, 2016 meeting.

Christine Finnan and Barbara Beckingham are the only committee members who were present at the last meeting. Barbara Beckingham moves to approve minutes, David Hansen seconds; all approved.

C. New Business

A. ENGL Proposal

i. ENGL 700: Change Number of Times Students can take a course

There is no representative from English to introduce the proposal. Chair introduces and asks for any questions or comments. The discussion focuses on the possible issue that students may take the same seminar topic twice, even though the proposal states that it would be “highly unlikely” that the same topic would be taught more than once within the typical time-frame of a student’s degree. Barbara Beckingham asks what is the procedure for checking on a student’s Program of Study when they’re registering for courses. Robin Olejniczak says some programs keep Programs of Study until students are close to graduation; others forward them to the Graduate School earlier. If a course is repeatable, there is no function in Banner to prevent re-enrollment.
Brian McGee recommends in the least that there is a change in the catalog description to specify that course cannot be repeated if same topic is covered. Committee also needs it on record what process would catch that it is not repeated by students. Chair proposes to table the proposal to the next meeting that a representative from English is able to join.

B. EDSP (Special Education) Proposal
   i. EDFS 692: Add existing course to requirements or electives

Bob Perkins introduces: the proposal provides for a second course option to fulfill the program’s technology requirement. EDSP program requires a technology course during program; the other three education programs subject to separate proposals today (EDMG, EDEL, EDEC) requires it as a prerequisite to the program. About “50%” of EDFS 692 course has overlap with EDFS 687, with 692 bringing in problem based learning model. EDFS 692 has also recently been offered online during Summer. Further, Bob Perkins explains that students would not be encouraged to take both EDFS 687 and 692; only 1.

Christine Finnan asks whether a student should have some prior knowledge of Problem Based Learning before taking EDFS 692. Bob Perkins replies no, and notes that the title of this course as “Advanced” is not entirely accurate anymore, as curriculum has changed.

Barbara Beckingham mentions that EDFS 692 has 687 listed as a prerequisite in the Catalog. Bob Perkins: this proposal was meant to go through at the end of last year to be included in the new Catalog. The program is working on making additional changes to course name and description.

Christine Finnan and Brian McGee suggest tabling the current proposal, and folding any changes to 692 and program into the updated set of proposals.

C. EDMG (Middle Grades) Proposal
   i. TEDU 436 or EDFS 692: Add existing courses to requirements or electives

D. EDEL (Elementary Education) Proposal
   i. TEDU 436 or EDFS 692: Add existing courses to requirements or electives

E. EDEC (Early Childhood Education) Proposal:
   i. TEDU 436 or EDFS 692: Add existing courses to requirements or electives

EDMG, EDEL and EDEC proposals are discussed together. Bob Perkins introduces, all students in these programs have an undergraduate degree but no teaching background. Prerequisite courses are not part of degree requirement.

David Hansen asks for some more information about these courses (TEDU 436, EDF 326). In updated proposal to be brought in upcoming meetings, please include full titles. Robin Olejniczak asks whether most MAT students enter with some technology background, and whether it should be instead added to degree requirements?

Bob Perkins: No, most do not have this background, and it’s instead listed as a prerequisite in order to keep degree requirements down.

Brian McGee notes that it’s not unusual for Masters students to take additional coursework to fill any deficiencies in their undergraduate record.

Chair moves to table these proposals for a future meeting when complete changes to EDFS 692 are proposed.
D. Update on Memo for Consideration of a New Committee for Continuing Education and Special Programs

Christine Finnan summarizes the status on the memorandum to focus responsibility of this committee to graduate education and change faculty make-up to 3 of 5 members who must be associated with graduate programs. Research has been compiled in the last few weeks that shows where oversight of continuing education lies in 5 other peer and aspirational institutions and summarized into a Table. Although it is unclear whether other institutions have faculty oversight, continuing education is not a duty of graduate council or graduate studies committees at these institutions.

David Hansen agrees that original memo from Jo Ann Ewalt (Chair 2015-2016) could be updated to include the compiled supporting information found on a) history of committee and b) where oversight lies in peer institutions.

Brian McGee recommends that the memorandum adds clarity on what is and what is not reviewed by this committee. Does this committee want to see every proposal to add/delete/change graduate courses and programs? (Yes) Does it want to approve changes to admission standards and criteria? (Yes?) On this last point, we need to consult with the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid since their duties are not limited to undergraduate education.

Christine Finnan: One approach will be to mirror this committee on undergraduate curriculum committee.

Jon Hakkila: Difference is students apply to Program, not school, so there are other aspects of graduate education for this committee to oversee.

Brian McGee: Could define the graduate school student universe and define what topics will be covered within this committee. Other aspects include academic standards and admissions, and financial aid. Could find many parts of the faculty by-laws that apply to graduate education.

Lynn Cherry asks – do grad students ever submit petitions (e.g. petition to withdraw late, petition to graduate late)?

Robin Olejniczak: They exist but these decisions have rested with program directors and Deans.

Lynn Cherry: Academic standards committee deals with a lot of petitions; not sure how many a graduate committee would have to handle.

Brian McGee offers that adding admissions as a charge of this committee would not suggest a retrospective review of admissions policies. Would also be part of the Committee’s discussion to not take charge of reviewing petitions, but could leave that to program directors/Deans as current practice.

Christine Finnan circles back to the issue of deciding who would take responsibility of deciding about scope of faculty input or oversight into continuing education. Should this committee make a proposal or leave it to Faculty Senate?

Ben Cox also raises the question of whether there will be a negative effect of releasing this Committee of oversight on continuing education; for instance, in case there is any overlap between graduate courses offered on campus?

Robin Olejniczak raises that the only remote case of overlap would be in professional development in education, but Godfrey Gibbison clarifies that those classes are not run by Continuing Education, so perceived possible overlap is not actually there. Continuing Education is for no credit, which is an important distinction. The only place that SACS pays attention to Continuing Education is that assessment is required.

Brian McGee offers that it’s strange marriage for Continuing Education to be with Graduate Education – could have easily belonged to Undergraduate Committee, but that also doesn’t quite match.
Christine Finnan: How are new committees formed?
Lynn Cherry: There are different routes. Provost can form an ad hoc committee that would then evolve/be approved as a regular committee. Proposals could be made to Committee on Bylaws. It has been nearly a decade since the last standing committee was formed.

Brian McGee recommends a proposal on change to this committee be accompanied by a recommendation for who should take on responsibility of continuing education oversight. Chair of this committee could arrange a meeting with the Faculty Bylaws Committee (Jason Vance-Chair).

Alice Hamilton: Curriculum is vetted, and so are instructors. Part of our aim is to service the community including the campus community. Would be good to know what types of programs would be beneficial for programs and students here.

Godfrey Gibbison: Committee could have broader base, and not be limited to faculty only.

Brian McGee: There are broad and narrow conceptions for what this new committee could do. Could broadly take on regulatory and exchange of information roles. In narrower sense, could focus on quality assurance.

Lynn Cherry: Could make it explicit that a new committee would give updates to Faculty Senate, as that could be appreciated.

Brian McGee summarizes that the committee moves to finalize proposal for amendment of Bylaws: renaming, describing duties and composition. Describing duties requires conversations with Committee on Bylaws/FAM (Jason Vance – Chair), Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid (Quinn Burke-Chair) and Institutional Effectiveness (Brenton LeMesurier-Chair); the latter two committees do not have an undergraduate-only charge. Committee would be appreciative if Institutional Effectiveness would continue to cover program review and assessment of graduate education. Also, a separate proposal by this Committee or Committee on Bylaws/FAM needs to be drafted to establish a new committee with oversight on continuing education.

The aim is to bring these proposals through Senate with hopeful ratification this academic year.

Brian McGee announces that there will be a review committee established to advise on the structuring of the Graduate School. Part of this process will be to looking at some graduate programs that have low matriculation and Committee will be informed on what programs will be urged to work on increasing enrollments.

E. For the good of the order.

Chair Christine Finnan raises concern about inconsistency in form completion. It is not clear on form how much of the form needs to be filled out for each type of change.

Mary Bergstrom describes that forms have been converted to electronic versions for Curriculog, and next step can be to customize them. Also, there can be logic implemented in Curriculog to prompt users to fill in certain sections or to include attachments.

Brian McGee: It may be possible to pre-populate some forms with information (e.g. program learning outcomes).

Provost office can help applicants with what information is required on forms for various types of changes, with Lynn Cherry as point of contact.

5th committee member has been named!
Michael Lee (Dept. of Communication) will join us at our next meeting.
F. Adjournment.

Motion to adjourn Barbara Beckingham, Ben Cox seconds; unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

*The next meeting will be held Monday, October 10, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. in Beatty 301.*
2016-2017 Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

MINUTES

Monday, October 10, 2016  Storm makeup: 10/17/16
Beatty Rm 301

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Barbara Beckingham (Secretary; Geology and Environmental Geosciences), Ben Cox (Mathematics), David Hansen (Management and Marketing-Research), Michael Lee (Communication)

Ex-Officio: Brian McGee (Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources), and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar)

Guests: Divya Bhatti and Karin Roof (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning), Eric Sotka (Biology), Mike Duvall (English), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Allisyn Morgan (Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School), Jerry Mackeldon and Franklin Czwazka (representatives from the Registrar’s Office)

A. Call to order.

Chair Christine Finnan calls meeting to order at 3:01pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Monday, September 19th, 2016 meeting.

Ben Cox motions to approve, David Hansen seconds; all approved.

C. New Business

1) English Proposal from 9/19 meeting – REVISED—see memo –edit description and change number of times students can take the course

Mike Duvall discusses edited proposal. The committee appreciates the clarifications. Motion to approve Barbara Beckingham, David Hansen seconds; unanimously approved.

2) Marine Biology Proposal – New Course

Eric Sotka is present to discuss. Barbara Beckingham asks for more detail concerning the extent of overlap with the Conservation Biology offering and whether there would be competition. Eric Sotka explains further that genetics and molecular techniques are only a small component of the Conservation Biology course. As a follow up, Barbara Beckingham asks with the multiple conservation offerings if Marine Biology is considering developing or highlighting programmatically a conservation tract. There has been no discussion of this with the program faculty but it could be in the future.
David Hansen: Would it be possible with the similar course titles that students would be confused?
Eric Sotka: The most similar title is shared with the seminar course, and descriptions will clarify.

David Hansen motions to approve, Ben Cox seconds; unanimously approved.

3) Marine Biology Proposal – Delete a course
Ben Cox motions to approve proposal, Michael Lee seconds; unanimously approved.

4) LALE Proposal: Moved to 10/31 meeting
5) Math Proposal – Change course requirements

Ben Cox introduces. Committee sees this as a straight-forward correction to the program record.
David Hansen motions to approve, Michael Lee seconds; unanimously approved.

D. Update on Memo for Consideration of a New Committee for Continuing Education and Special Programs

Chair Christine Finnan provides background on memorandum initiative. Jason Vance (Chair of the Faculty Committee on By Laws) recommended that we outline the duties of the new Committee on Continuing Education. Jason Vance has not seen this first draft as Committee will discuss first.

Christine Finnan explains a change made to one of the draft Committee duties, (3) which now reads “To provide annual faculty review for non-catalog graduate level education programming of an academic nature”. We clarified that this charge relates primarily to EDPD courses offered through the Office of Professional Development (OPD), an office under the supervision of the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance (EHHP). Courses and course sequences are currently reviewed and approved by EHHP’s Administrative Council, composed of the dean, associate dean, department chairs, and other administrative heads within EHHP; the Administrative Council has no faculty representatives other than department chairs. Courses offered through the OPD are also approved by the South Carolina State Department of Education for teachers to use for recertification credit. Christine Finnan suggested that annual review of the courses offered through OPD by the Committee on Graduate Education is appropriate because all EDPD courses are all post-baccalaureate, professional courses.

Brian McGee asks a series of questions to the committee to work towards clarifying the language of the memorandum (bullets).

- Duty (1). Will the Committee on Graduate Education or the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid be responsible for review of graduate admission policies? Christine Finnan reports that she has yet to meet with the Chair of that committee to discuss due to the Hurricane, but will be able to reschedule a meeting soon.
- Duty (2) What is the relationship of this committee with Graduate Council? Is Graduate Council the final approval body before a proposal is brought before the Faculty Senate? Brian McGee edifies the committee by explaining that Graduate Council is not described in Faculty By-Laws. Graduate Council is not a Senate committee; it is an institutional committee. It has been part of the custom and practice of our institution that Graduate Council approves programs and courses following approval by this committee. This is an extra step in comparison to the workflow for undergraduate curriculum. The Graduate Council (e.g. duties, etc.) are not outlined in the FAM.
It is further discussed that the language and terms used should be closely considered. Christine Finnan pulled much of the phrasing in this draft from the current description, and would like to work with the Committee to redraft.

David Hansen suggests that the Committee have a meeting with the Graduate Council. Barbara Beckingham asks Christine Finnan if there is some loss of perspective on proposals without the view from program directors. Christine Finnan notes that often there is not much discussion of proposals at Graduate Council. Brian McGee brings up that there are also several administrative ex officio members of this Committee that can help provide that perspective. Christine Finnan added that it is useful to have a program director on the Committee on Graduate Education, but if that is not possible, that Graduate Council provides that perspective.

- Assessment or Program Review of individual graduate programs is not included in the list of duties. Christine Finnan has emailed the Chair of the Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness committee but has not heard back; she will reach out again.

- Duty (5). This is a relatively recent addition to duties (2011). Would the only path to program termination be a proposal from the Provost? Or could it be from the Faculty Senate or other committees? What would we review, how would it be different from what OIEP does? What authority would this Committee have? Does the Committee want separate authority to independently review or recommend changes to programs?

Divya Bhatti defines program review: holistic review of a program; does it need strengthening in certain areas, based on data. There are consequences of program review. Institutional Effectiveness does an evaluation of the program (not an assessment of the program).

David Hansen would like to see a visual of where are the gaps in graduate program review, if any.

Christine Finnan and Barbara Beckingham: This Committee does not know the process for program review.

Divya Bhatti offers that the OIEP website has a flowchart for program review and some examples.

Christine Finnan: It may also be informative to have Jon Hakkila offer his insights on graduate program review.

Barbara Beckingham: It would be informative for this committee to be notified of program evaluation or to have access to previous reviews. It could help the Committee make decisions in certain cases, such as program expansion. Christine Finnan agrees. This committee could be at the information-receiving end of the program review process.

- Back to Duty (3). What is the definition of “programming”?

Christine: Bounded by prefix of EDPD, but not necessarily a sequence of courses although there are sometimes sequence of courses; Non-catalog graduate education. State Department of Education has to approve these courses in order for them to quality for teacher recertification credit.

Barbara Beckingham and David Hansen agree that this could be moved to the new Committee on Continuing Education.

Brian McGee: Need to differentiate why this Continuing Education review would go under Graduate Committee.

Christine Finnan will review this further.

- What is impact of “of an academic nature” language?

Christine Finnan: This is a carry-over from the original FAM description.

Christine Finnan moves to discussion of new Committee on Continuing Education, and raises a question about the composition of the membership of the new Continuing Education Committee. It was brought up at the last meeting that it could include staff or community members. Barbara Beckingham: I disagree with that idea; perhaps staff or community members can be invited as ex-officio.
David Hansen agrees on faculty member make-up, but does undergraduate : graduate faculty need to be suggested? Christine Finnan: Faculty By Laws Committee may have a recommendation. Probably faculty with interest in this area could come from across campus.

David Hansen: It would seem we do not have a role in termination of continuing education programs, but would oversee review and quality assurance. Brian McGee: Committee could slowly and incrementally approve, or periodically review. It may not be in the interest of the faculty to have the responsibility to approve.

Given this discussion, Christine Finnan will start a next draft if the memorandum and consult other relevant committees.

David Hansen will send Christine Finnan a list of Key Words to help with drafting.

E. For the good of the order.

Will discuss at next meeting a policy on “stacking” (def: use of courses for degree and a certificate). Christine Finnan cannot attend Graduate Council meeting this Friday, and Brian McGee offers to bring the proposals before the Council.

F. Adjournment.

Thank you Allisyn Morgan for working with us and good luck! Robyn Olejniczak will take over coordination of the Committee for the Graduate School.

David Hansen motions to adjourns, Ben Cox seconds; unanimously approved. Meeting is adjourned at 4:30pm.

The next meeting will be held Monday, October 31, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. in Beatty 301.
A. Call to order.

Chair calls meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Monday October 17, 2016 meeting.

Minutes are unanimously approved.

C. New Business
   1) Elementary Education proposal—Delete a course

Bob Perkins introduces the proposal. Part of this proposal is a result of growth of the program. Content has already been taken from this course and combined in other courses.

David Hansen asks: With removal of this course, it leaves Focus Area I with only 1 course. Does one course make a focus area?
Bob Perkins: Not sure. That may be revisited and realigned. Not a concern to have that focus area depleted as it is only a way to organized required courses.
Barbara Beckingham: Program may also want to pursue proposals to rename Field Experience II and III.
Also, proposal states that student admission requires prior evidence of working with children. Can you clarify?
Bob Perkins: Disposition forms aka recommendation forms are required. Can be any prior experience: nanny, camp counselor, etc. Hours in this course are given to observation, so these experiences are relevant.

Jon Hakkila: Follows up on Focus Areas. Each focus area has a different number of credit hours. 18 credit hours is a concentration. Should it be labelled as such?
Bob Perkins: This is part of the program, not a choice. So it wouldn’t be a concentration. It’s a way to organize the curriculum within the program. Could just be a list of courses.

Ben Cox motions to approve, David Hansen seconds; unanimously approved.

2) LALE proposal -- add a course

Silvia Rodriguez Sabater introduces the proposal and notes that there are two emphases in LALE program - Spanish and ESOL - and this new proposed course is for the Spanish.

It will be offered every third semester.

Barbara Beckingham: I noted that LALE 601 Applied Linguistics is a core course; is there overlap or background to make this a pre-requisite for the new course?
Silvia Rodriguez Sabater: New course will be offered in Spanish language, while LALE 601 is in English with many of the examples in the English language as well. Do not need Applied Linguistics as a pre-requisite.

Barbara Beckingham motions to approve, Ben Cox seconds; unanimously approved.

3) ESOL proposal – terminate certificate

Bob Perkins representing the proposal for Angela Cozart. While the proposal is to terminate the ESOL II certificate, the courses are meant to remain. Courses are taken by students in LALE and ESOL I.

Barbara Beckingham: Is it a large burden on administration to keep the program going without students?
Brian McGee: Issue is with the program appearing to be offered but not truly in effect. It is best to remove the program if it is not being actively pursued. There is a perception that our curriculum and resources are not being managed effectively to keep it on the books.
Aside: If a course is not being offered it should probably be removed as well. Many institutions have a 3-5 year rule to remove courses as a best practice.

David Hansen: Any reflection on reasons why it is not being pursued by students?
Bob Perkins: It is most likely simply that there is no need in the area.
Robyn Olejniczak: Were Certificate I and II proposed at the same time?
Bob Perkins: Yes. It was also the pioneer program for distance learning and it was funded by the State to facilitate ESOL certification across South Carolina.
Robyn Olejniczak: Is it 100% on-line?
Brian McGee: Courses are offered on-line but there is some face-time required.

David Hansen motions to approve, Barbara Beckingham seconds; unanimously approved.

D. Update on Memo for Consideration of a New Committee for Continuing Education and Special Programs

1) Graduate program admissions: Review of notes developed by Christine Finnan and Quinn Burke (Academic Standards, Admissions, & Financial Aid.
2) Oversight of EDPD courses: Presentation by Andrew Lewis, Director, Office of Professional Development (OPD)
3) Graduate program evaluation: See Graduate Program Review Process and Schedule and notes on meeting with Brenton LeMesurier (Committee on Institutional Effectiveness)

Presentation by Andrew Lewis.
Christine Finnan: We’ve asked Andrew Lewis today because of where OPD lies at the intersection of the two new proposed, split committees and it would be helpful to have their position explained.
Andrew Lewis: The Office’s position is that it would fit under a Graduate Education committee. Why? 1) All students must have an undergraduate degree to take EDPD course. 2) Same contact hour equivalency requirement as CofC courses. This is different from any continuing education courses. 3) EDPD courses are part of recertification of licensure in the State. Each professional development course hour equals 20 pts towards recertification. 4) Many EDPD courses require reflection and implementation, follow-up on content learned in course.
Office offers 40-50 courses per semester on average. However, we are not bound by start and end date of the academic semester calendar. But, must meet same hour equivalency.
Courses are vetted/approved: Course syllabi are submitted (from districts, etc. – whoever is going to be teaching the course) and must abide by policy. Syllabi are reviewed and content is made sure to abide by CoF & CHE Professional Development guidelines. Syllabi then sent to EHHP Administrative Council for review and acceptance. Students taking courses have a CoF transcript, which is used for evidence in their licensure.
In summary, there are many differences between what OPD does and continuing education.

Jon Hakkila: Seems there would be a natural place for a committee to be involved in review at the time of the Administrative Council.
Andrew Lewis: That is possible, but timeline for review needs to be fast. Administrative council meets every other week, including over the summer.
Christine Finnan: How would you see the role of a Graduate Education or Continuing Education committee helping the OPD?
Andrew Lewis: Could add review and accountability. But whoever is on the committee needs to also understand CHE Professional Development guidelines since it’s not only serving the College.
Christine Finnan: Could there be a less frequent involvement? Not just for courses but instructors?
Andrew Lewis: Wouldn’t work for course approval. All instructors must have Master’s degree, some have terminal degrees. There is a list of criteria for credentialing that is overseen by the College administration.
Brian McGee: EDPD has different credentialing criteria than graduate faculty, and it is transparent. EDPD courses cannot apply to graduate programs at CofC.
Andrew Lewis: And for institutions that do accept some EDPD courses for graduate credit, usually it is at most 6 hours towards their degree. State licensure for some programs allows 1 course (3 hr) of EDPD credit.
Jon Hakkila: Does CofC accept EDPD courses from other institutions for graduate credit?
Andrew Lewis: No.
Brian McGee: What is the course evaluation process?
Andrew Lewis: It is similar to what is done for CofC courses; evaluation is done at end of course using Qualtrics. Evaluations are actively reviewed in a formalized process and actions taken with instructors if warranted.
Brian McGee: Are there direct measures of student learning?
Andrew Lewis: Syllabi have student learning outcomes. Self-reporting by students is an indirect measure of SLO assessment.
Brian McGee: Any student complaints over last 12 mo?
Andrew Lewis: OPD has services ~2000 students over last 12 mo and there have been an estimated 15-20 student complaints. In addition to student assessments, we have staff member perform in-person observation of 10-20%.

Andrew Lewis: OPD Welcomes involvement of committee to strengthen EDPD. It is a competitive arena to offer EDPD. We service entire state but 60% of students are from the Lowcountry.

Brian McGee: We can highlight that EDPD courses are internally approved at CofC, have faculty credentialing process and review, and these decisions were made long ago under this Committee.

Robyn Olejniczak: What’s the difference between EDPD and cohorts that go through licensure?
Andrew Lewis: EDPD is used to enhance educational growth. With TEDU catalog courses, we facilitate courses being offered, and help fill a need with a cohort of students, i.e. from a school district. OPD helps make connection between the need and the catalog courses offered. Credentialing of instructors for EDPD and TEDU is different. Some courses are taught on site, off-campus.
Christine Finnan: Would not recommend courses to be reviewed on a monthly basis by a Committee on Graduate Education. Instead, this Committee could take the role of advisory on policy and receive an annual report.

Andrew Lewis: Currently do an annual report to the Dean.

Andrew Lewis is thanked for his presentation! We will discuss the specific role of a future committee later.

Next item:
Brian McGee offers update report on Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC). The three universities comprising the Center are unlikely to renew the agreement (last signed 2012). It has been funded since 2001 by the state legislature to further graduate education in this region. It is frankly not performing to it’s full potential. Presidents and Provosts have had discussions about a future LGC. Legislature has kept LGC alive through budgeting, and it is currently a center that is managed and operated at CofC until agreement has been reached with other universities. There is no graduate program offered only through LGC.

Next item:
Christine Finnan explains the table she organized on potential functions of the CGE. For the listed Committee duties there are related committees identified. “Related” literally means that policies would be reviewed together with those committees or there would be significant interactions.

Brian McGee: Based on Christine Finnan’s meeting minutes with Quinn Burke, Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid is obviously looking to expand from their current operations in oversight. Lynn Cherry does not recollect that committee has actively reviewed admissions or financial aid.

Jon Hakilla: What does it mean to develop policies for assessment in this committee? Review goes through programs with help of Graduate School, depending on program and content of review.

Brian McGee: Assessment is vague within charges of OIEP in By-Laws. External reviews look at program quality and currency, management, etc. These reviews do not address questions of financial health.

Barbara Beckingham: Financial review is internal, and done on an annual basis?

Brian McGee: Yes, but content and level of detail depends on the year.

Barbara Beckingham and Christine Finnan: This committee could benefit from being on the receiving end to have access to these reviews in making curricular decisions.

Brian McGee: OIEP is an institutional office, not within Academic Affairs. Need some faculty ownership (i.e. Graduate faculty ownership) of program assessment. OIEP would be facilitating our own assessment process.

Josh Bloodworth: Yes, OIEP provides framework, but cannot dictate what a good program looks like within a given discipline.
Christine Finnan summarizes her discussion with Quinn Burke and the split between whether changes need to go through the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid. Minor changes to admissions policies could be approved by the Comm. on Graduate Education (i.e. change in GRE score required, number of reference letters), and major changes (i.e. adding or deleting requirements) could be approved by both committees and brought before Senate.

Brian McGee: There does need to be a change from current practice in admissions requirements. As of now, no changes will be made to admissions criteria for the Catalog unless it goes through this committee, Academic Standards Committee and Senate.

Christine Finnan: Recommends scheduling another meeting this semester to discuss non-curricular action items.

David Hansen will help organize the table into functions (review and approval) and types of proposals (change, add, remove).

Lynn Cherry makes a suggestion to also choose dates in December and January. The Committee identifies November 21\textsuperscript{st} and December 5\textsuperscript{th} as new additional meeting times for this semester.

\textbf{E. Discussion of “stacking” courses for multiple certificates, endorsements, or degrees}

\textit{Not Discussed}

\textbf{F. For the good of the order}

\textit{Not Discussed}

\textbf{G. Adjournment.}

Meeting adjourned 4:40pm.

\textit{The next CURRICULAR meeting will be held Monday January 23, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. in Beatty 301.}
2016-2017 Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

MINUTES

Monday, November 21, 2016
Randolph Hall Rm 307

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Barbara Beckingham (Secretary; Geology and Environmental Geosciences), Ben Cox (Mathematics), Michael Lee (Communications), David Hansen (Management and Marketing-Research)

Ex-Officio: Brian McGee (Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources)

Guests: Josh Bloodworth (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Jon Hakkila (Associate Dean of the Graduate School)

A. Call to order.

Chair calls meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Monday October 31, 2016 meeting.

Michael Lee motions to approve, Ben Cox seconds; unanimously approved.

C. New Business

No new business.

D. Review spring dates for curricular changes

Spring curricular review meeting schedule was distributed. Meeting on Mondays 3-4:30 pm on 1/23, 2/20, 3/20, and 4/24 is fine with committee so no changes to the schedule are required.

E. Set dates for Curriculog training

Dates set for training for the Curriculum Committee do not work for this Committee. Tentative dates for this Committee to be trained are set for Mondays Jan 30th, Feb. 6th and Feb. 13 at the usual meeting time (3-4:30pm). It is important that at least the first two training dates are attended.
F. **Update on Motion to By-Laws for Consideration of a New Committee for Continuing Education and Special Programs**

1) Action map explanation – David Hansen
2) Review of updated motion – Christine Finnan

Chair initiates and directs a discussion on the table “Functions of CGE, CCE revised.”

**First function: policy.** This committee has some standing precedent in forming and reviewing policy, in addition to implementing. For example, Barbara Beckingham notes the “learning outcomes” syllabus policy developed with Chair Joann Ewalt in 2015-2016.

Ben Cox asks about the relationship between this committee and the Graduate Council. Brian McGee explains that Graduate Council is an institutional, administrative committee with an important coordinating role. Jon Hakkila also notes the importance of checks and balances on graduate education decisions.

Graduate Council, being comprised of faculty administrators from each program, may provide some additional insight as to curricular decisions especially considering that this Committee does not have representation from each program.

A discussion about whether to include examples of policies in language of Committee duties ensues. Josh Bloodworth: Program “evaluation” and “review” would cover all of the indicators of a program’s functioning that may be of interest for this Committee.

Jon Hakkila asks about who/what would be responsible for external program review into the future. Brian McGee: External review has been undertaken on a cycle with management and review by the Graduate School. This has been a helpful process, but coordination and shared governance needs to be better defined.

Committee discusses that it is appropriate to have a stake in program evaluation and review policies, but not in actually conducting reviews.

There are many potential overlaps between the charge of this Committee and the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid. Previously, it was considered that there may be a separation of duties that would be “minor” and covered by this Committee, and “major” and would be covered by this Committee in addition to the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid. It will be important to follow up and define what is meant by “minor” and “major”, not for explicit inclusion in the FAM duties but as a record and policy.

Barbara Beckingham double checks that committee wants to keep language “via the Graduate Council” in the functions. Unanimously the answer is affirmative.

**Second function:** Review of program and course proposals. No changes recommended

**Third function:** Review of non-catalog graduate courses of an academic nature. Christine Finnan asks for feedback regarding wording “of an academic nature” – what does this mean? Ben Cox suggests adding OPDE as a specific example. It is also specified that we provide “review” but not “approval”.

**Fourth function:** Faculty development. Christine Finnan wonders if we are in the practice of faculty development. Barbara Beckingham notes that this could take many forms; as examples, workshops on crafting graduate syllabi. Jon Hakkila mentions Graduate Faculty series a few years ago. Better to include to keep this possibility open.

**Fifth function:** Program termination. It is suggested that this Committee recommends in a letter to the Speaker of the Faculty Senate that all committees with charges that include the language of program termination “by recommendation of the Provost” be reviewed. Brian McGee explains that technically only the Board of Trustees can terminate a program. A termination proposal should have the backing of
the Provost before a proposal is brought public because such a proposal can impact the perception of the program. But it shouldn’t be the only route.
Barbara Beckingham notes that a program deletion falls under a “change” in our current workflow. Robyn Olejnizcak confirms that this is included in the current forms. Therefore, a proposal for program termination can come via other routes.
Barbara Beckingham notes redundancy in new language that includes evaluation in the last row of the Table on Committee charges. This can be removed, and charge would be kept the same as existing.

Move to discussion of Draft memo with compositional notes from Brian McGee as follows:
- “G”raduate “F”aculty should be capitalized.
- VP of OIEP should be “Associate VP”
- Retain “or designees” as appears in proposed new version

Chair directs discussion to setting charges for new Committee on Continuing Education.
First function: Review and recommend policy. No discussion
Second function: Review continuing education offerings. Currently there is oversight of continuing education, but individual offerings need not be approved. It would be cumbersome to approve an accelerated timeline of a large number of courses. Language changed from “programs” to “offerings” and “potential” is removed.
Third function: Outreach programs. Remove this function.
Fourth function: Faculty development. Would faculty development here relate to TLT? No - TLT has it’s own advising structure.
What would be included as faculty development programs related to continuing education? Brian McGee answers: programs related to helping the faculty offer continuing education. Therefore, these offerings may be limited, but it is beneficial to keep the possibility open.
Fifth function: Evaluation and program termination: There is no “approval” process for offerings of continuing education, so there is no need for a “termination” process. Brian McGee suggests that the “policy” component would cover this. Also, the addition of “to review and make recommendations concerning evaluation of continuing education offerings” is important.
Christine Finnan will clean up the Table and Memo and will send to Committee before forwarding to the By-Laws Committee.

G. Discussion of “stacking” courses for multiple certificates, endorsements, or degrees
Lynn Cherry notes that at the moment, this phenomenon is unique to the Graduate School, although there is a new certificate program at the undergraduate level. Christine Finnan notes that group working on this may like to consult with the Graduate School, where there is a longer history of certification. Brian McGee notes that policies from other undergraduate institutions are being reviewed.

The Curriculum Committee is discussing “stacking” policies at the undergraduate level on November 30th. We may be able to receive an update on paper, in addition to getting an update from Robyn Olejnizcak and Mary Bergstrom in person on proposed changes on December 5th since Lynn Cherry and Brian McGee will be traveling.

H. For the good of the order.
I. Adjournment.
Meeting adjourned unanimously at 4:15 pm.

The next meeting will be held Monday December 5, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. in Randolph Hall Rm 307
A. Call to order.

Chair Christine Finnan calls meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Monday November 21, 2016 meeting.

Barbara Beckingham notes that the minutes incorrectly state that the next meeting was to be on December 5th, but that meeting was not held. Noting that correction, minutes are unanimously approved.

C. New Business

A. EDSP co-req & pre-reqs

Bob Perkins introduces proposal. It is discussed that the program of study for students is very structured. Special instructor permission to avoid some pre-requisites is to be granted to in-service teachers.

Ben Cox motions to approve, Barbara Beckingham seconds; approved unanimously.

B. CSIS IS Cert
C. CSIS SE Cert

Aspen Olmsted introduces the CSIS certification proposals. The program would like to add these two new certificates in response to a need to connect to local employment
opportunities. Many local companies offer tuition reimbursement for courses. The certificates bundle existing courses.

Christine Finnan: In education there are state requirements for certificates. Anything analogous for this type of program?
Aspen Olmsted: No.
Divya Bhati: These certificates need to be approved by SACSOC. Fall 2017 implementation date will not be possible because usually the timeline is 6-9 mo out. Likely the Software Engineering certificate will be stand alone (no parent major associated with it) and will need to be approved. Doesn’t need to be approved by CHE, but there will be notification to CHE.

Christine Finnan: What is implications for approval at Citadel?
Divya Bhati: The proposals need to go in parallel through a substantive change process. It is more likely that Software Engineering would start in Academic Year 2018-2019. While Information Systems may be able to be approved on the requested schedule (Fall 2017).

David Hansen: How does the certificate compare to those offered at other institutions?
Aspen Olmsted: Comparable in number of credits and offerings. However, we are missing policy on overlap of graduate credits. These certificate programs are not very common.

Divya Bhati: SLOs can be strengthened. Targets are not exactly measures that are linked to specific courses. Need course-embedded assessment.
Barbara Beckingham: Need to make sure tables are consistent. It is discussed that the tables in the paperwork are the updated, and correct versions for the SLOs and assessment information.
David Hansen motions to approve Information Systems certificate with recommended edits, Barbara Beckingham seconds; approved unanimously.
David Hansen motions to approve Software Engineering certificate with recommended edits, Barbara Beckingham seconds; approved unanimously.

D. EDEL co-req & pre-reqs

Bob Perkins introduces the proposal. Pre-requisites for two courses are being eliminated to reflect that they are no longer program requirements. Christine Finnan notes that pre-requisites were originally implemented in order to have students go through the program in a given order, but now this is done through a program of study.

Ben Cox motions to approve, Michael Lee seconds; approved unanimously.

E. MBIO core

Craig Plante introduces proposal. The change from 4 required core courses to 3 will introduce flexibility for students. There is no change in program hour requirements, just a shift from a core course requirement to an elective.
Christine Finnan: Will students get the scope required for the degree program?
Craig Plante: There was a concern that students wouldn’t be prepared for their oral exam (one of program requirements and assessment endpoints), but this concern is alleviated through appropriate advising of students. If students are deficient in an area, they can choose to take the fourth “core” as an elective. Also, students often petition to remove a core course given their past course work and this change will reduce this practice.
Barbara Beckingham: Proposal achieves the flexibility for students that the program is seeking. One comment on assessment: measure 1.1 needs to be updated because it currently says “in four corse courses”.
Robyn Olejniczak: Proposes to amend paperwork by hand. Cross out “four” and the list of courses.
Barbara Beckingham motions to approve as amended, David Hansen seconds; approved unanimously.

F. EDGT Cert pre-reqs

Bob Perkins introduces EDGT proposal. The Gifted & Talented certificate is for in-service teachers, and there is no need for an introductory course as a pre-requisite to EDFS 760.

EDFS 760 is in EDGT and MTLA but not any other programs. Since MTLA are certified teachers, then EDFS 710 will also be removed as a pre-requisite for others enrolling in the class.

Robyn Olejniczak: Then this could be a proposal from several different programs: Everyone registering for EDFS 760 does not need EDFS 710.
Bob Perkins: Correct.

Michael Lee motions to approve, David Hansen seconds; approved unanimously.

D. Old business
A. Curriculog training

Lynn Cherry discusses that the aim is to transition from paper to digital paperwork beginning in Fall 2017. The submission and review process will be more clearly laid out in the software. Lynn would like to hold two “broad-stroke” training sessions to occur in the spring, and two more-specific sessions in the summer. There will be hands-on “labs” in the fall as people start to use it. Training dates are yet to be scheduled.

B. Motion to By-Laws for Consideration of a New Committee for Continuing Education and Special Programs

Christine Finnan has emailed Jason Vance and the By-Laws committee will be discussing it at their meeting this month. After the By-Laws committee, it will need to be approved by Senate. Then, any changes to the by-laws have to be approved by 2/3 of the faculty vote. It is unclear if this process will be completed for Fall 2017 and in time for nominations and elections for committees.
Christine Finnan: Is there a minimum number of faculty votes that need to be received for a by-laws change to be approved?
Lynn Cherry: No.

E. Discussion of “stacking” courses for multiple certificates, endorsements, or degrees

Robyn Olejniczak updates the committee that there has not been substantial progress on defining stacking in the graduate curriculum. Jon Hakkila attended a session on this issue at the National Council of Graduate School meeting. Our institution needs a plan for how to accept students, when to accept students into degree programs, and how to deal with funding.

Lynn Cherry: Last semester there was a series of meetings with representatives from North Campus, financial aid, Registrar’s office and Graduate School because of a new undergraduate certificate in Project Management. Last week, draft policies on “stacking”, admissions, catalog requirements, etc. were reviewed. Lynn will inform this committee about progress on the undergraduate policies.

Some students seek a certificate because an employer is looking for this to know the specifics of what was learned. A degree program title may not be as explicit.

Robyn Olejniczak: There are some statements within select degree programs to limit number of courses that can apply to multiple requirements. Another way to think of stacking is double-dipping.

Christine Finnan suggests that we do not have time in the schedule this semester to give this policy question thorough attention, and that it is tabled until more policy direction

F. For the good of the order.

Christine Finnan asks the committee if Kevin Keenan can call-in to our February meeting to discuss a proposal since he will be traveling. There are no concerns from the committee about this arrangement.

Christine Finnan reports on the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future Organization of the Graduate School and Graduate Education meeting from last week. Fran Welch is chair of that committee. Goal is to have some recommendation to the Board of Trustees by April.

Divya Bhati requests that we prepare and participate in the SACSOC visit. She will send the committee some information about a future meeting, and resources from OIEP.

G. Adjournment.

Christine Finnan motions to adjourn, Ben Cox seconds; approved unanimously.

The next meeting will be held at 3:00 PM Monday February 20, 2017 in Beatty 301
2016-2017 Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

MEETING

Monday, February 20, 2017
Beatty 301

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Barbara Beckingham (Secretary; Geology and Environmental Geosciences), Ben Cox (Mathematics), David Hansen (Management and Marketing-Research), Michael Lee (Communications)

Ex-Officio: Brian McGee (Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources), and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar)

Guests: Divya Bhati (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning), Josh Bloodworth (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Jon Hakkila (Associate Dean of the Graduate School), Julie Dahl, Franklin Czwazka, and Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office), Megan Gould (Academic Affairs).

A. Call to order.

Chair Christine Finnan calls meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Monday January 23, 2017 meeting.

Approved unanimously.

C. New Business

A. URBP – Certificate changes
B. MPA – PUBA 514, PUBA 614, PUBA 615

Kevin Keenan joins meeting remotely via telephone. URBP certificate changes proposal outlines a change in a section of the certificate program from “Development Practice” to “Geographic Information Systems”, with a necessary course deletion, a course shift to another section, a course addition and increase in credit hours for a course from 3 to 4 credit hours.

It is noted that there is a political science GIS course currently at 300-level. In the future, it is possible that this will be moved to 400-level and cross-listed with PUBA 514 Urban applications of GIS.

Robyn Olejniczak raises the point that EVSS 605 Environmental Law & Regulatory Policy, a course to be added to the certificate in the proposal, is cross-listed with MPA course PUBA 634.
Brian McGee emphasizes that it must be clear, and the catalog has to state, that when a course is cross-listed it is acceptable for either of the prefixed cross-listed courses to count towards the degree program.

David Hansen asks: What does it mean that “measure is set to baseline” for assessment?
Kevin Keenan: No data yet to suggest how students will do in SLO, so this means that assessment metrics will need to be updated in the future.

Committee discusses paperwork. Would be helpful for all changes to be listed clearly upfront in package, in overall program outline and/or in cover letter. Paper work should be more straightforward after the roll-out of Curriculog.

David Hansen motions to approve, Michael Lee seconds; approved unanimously.

C. MFA – ARTM Electives, CREW Electives
Chair Christine Finnan introduces proposal as there is no representative from the program. There are no questions. The proposal is a straight-forward addition of clearly-applicable courses to be listed as potential electives.
Barbara Beckingham motions to approve, Michael Lee seconds; approved unanimously.

Bret Lott arrives to meeting after his proposal is approved. Thanks Bret!
Brian McGee requests that all handwritten notes are cleaned up before it goes to the Faculty Senate.

D. MTLA – Concentration changes
Christine Finnan introduces proposal as the MTLA Program Director. All students take 6 core courses in the program, but then decide upon and take a set of courses within a concentration area.

David Hansen: Are there Special Topics courses in all the other concentrations?
Christine Finnan: Yes. There is also a SMFT Special Topics for the Science & Mathematics concentration area (SMFT 697).

Ben Cox: Does the program outline differences in courses between the 600 and 700 level?
Christine Finnan: Core courses are spread out and the numbering increases following their intended progression. Also, the program borrows from other programs which adds to complexity. There is not a written policy.
Brian McGee: The current course numbering policy does not differentiate between 600-900 level. There is a general guideline to increase difficulty with increased number. A future discussion would be beneficial.

Robyn Olejniczak: Raises a question that confirms that in New Literacies concentration students must take 18 credits of electives total.

Barbara Beckingham: The part of the proposal that removes required courses from two of the concentrations and moves them to electives may remove a distinguishing element to the concentration. Could there be a benefit to anchoring the concentration using a required course? Otherwise, it may be possible to take a set of courses and have it be called two different things.
Christine Finnan: Notes that students may not be able to differentiate between these two concentrations because of overlap in Gifted and Talented course choices.

Brian McGee moves to table the proposal, David Hansen seconds; approved unanimously.

D. Old business
   A. Curriculog training – set dates

Christine Finnan makes the request that training be deferred until after the new committee is elected, since current committee members who do not plan to serve next year may not need the training.

Lynn Cherry: The purpose of this first training is to take a few hours to provide a broad overview of Curriculog. This could be beneficial for committee members to bring back to their departments and programs. During the summer and beginning of fall, there will be more involved workshops.

Barbara Beckingham: Is it going to be open to other faculty who might be interested in an introduction to Curriculog?
Lynn Cherry: Sure

Curriculog training is scheduled for April 3 and 10, 3-4:30 pm.

B. Motion to By-Laws for Consideration of a New Committee for Continuing Education and Special Programs -- report on Senate action

Christine Finnan reports that our motion was deferred to the next Senate meeting due to time constraints.

C. Progress of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of Graduate Education

There is progress to report. Forum with chairs, directors and Deans on big questions such as: mission; relationship between research and graduate programs, and; recommended new directions for graduate programming. Two more forums open to the entire faculty this week. Board of Directors will receive a report by April 7.

E. Discussion of “stacking” courses for multiple certificates, endorsements, or degrees

Stacking here refers to stacking of credentials.

Brian McGee: Consultants from the Education Advisory Board posed the question whether it’s possible to stack credentials to add up to another credential (e.g. 2, 18-hr certificate programs to add up to a Masters degree). Could make argument that a course can only count towards 1 degree; another argument is that a certificate is not a degree, but a credential, and therefore that stacking certificates would be legitimate. There is precedent to this, for example when courses for a Masters degree are automatically rolled into a Doctorate degree. Another view is to set up an actual modular degree program, although no one is proposing to do this. Courses earned under a certificate program could be allowed to count towards a Masters degree. There is currently no policy at the College to define the allowed approach.
Jon Hakkila: Notes that over the last few years he has attended meetings on stackable degrees, and there are many variations on the theme.
Christine Finnan: Is there a down-side to allowing stackability?
Jon Hakkila: When you take a certificate, you don’t need to apply to a program.
Robyn Olejniczak: It is the expectation that students must be admitted to a program after taking a certificate.

Brian McGee: The more radical version of stacking of where certificates could be stacked to a Masters degree is a larger question.
The College will allow undergraduate stacking and a policy is currently being drafted. Lynn Cherry is working with Academic Standards on this.
Robyn Olejniczak: We already stack internally.

Barbara Beckingham: Would there be a time limit to allow a course to be stacked?
Brian McGee: One solution would be to just start the clock for a degree program once the student is admitted. A policy statement is needed. If committee were to say no stacking, would change current practices and would also need to change course catalog and advertisements.

Divya Bhatti: Are we talking about certificates that are stand-alone or certificates that are combinable with the intent of leading to a degree?
Brian McGee: There is some complexity in the different forms of stacking. But any clarification will be helpful. Academic Affairs, the Graduate School and Office of the Provost will bring a set of policy ideas that can align with the undergraduate policy as soon as it’s ready.
Robin Olejniczak: What about courses that may be used towards two different degree programs? A certificate and concentration in the same exact thing exists in 1 graduate program (and will in the first undergraduate example).
Brian McGee: Would like to focus current policy on certificates.

F. For the good of the order

Brian McGee: On Friday, a letter was sent to The Citadel to establish for 3 phase process for a new policy for co-managing our 4 joint program agreements. Agreements span the dates of 1989 – 2009, may be written very differently, and need to be revised and made more consistent to program and institutional business practices.
Phase 1: Develop successor MOU for management of all joint programs to replace all previous agreements. Phase 1 is currently in progress, and will go through legal affairs before it is passed on to the Citadel.
Phase 2: Pattern of administration documents for all 4 joint programs to describe how programs run.
Phase 3: Strategic review of joint programs to improve programs.

Christine Finnan: Will there be a similar agreement with Clemson?
Brian McGee: Clemson agreement is from 2008, and stands up to review currently. The order has been made gooder.

G. Adjournment.

David motions to adjourn, Ben seconds; unanimously approved.

The next meeting will be held Monday March 20, 2017 in Beatty 301
2016-2017 Faculty Committee on Graduate Education,
Continuing Education, and Special Programs

MINUTES

Monday, March 20, 2017
Beatty 301

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Barbara Beckingham (Secretary; Geology and Environmental Geosciences), Ben Cox (Mathematics), David Hansen (Management and Marketing-Research), [Michael Lee (Communications), absent]

Ex-Officio: Brian McGee (Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources)

Guests: Karin Roof (OIEP), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Jon Hakkila (Associate Dean of the Graduate School), Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office), Bob Perkins (TEDU), Craig Plante (Marine Biology), Silvia Rodrigues Sabater (LALE), Abbie Cain (EVSS), Mark Witte and Alan Shao (MBA), Bret Lott (MFA), Philip Jos (MPA)

A. Call to order.

Chair Christine Finnan calls meeting to order 3:00 pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Monday February 20, 2017 meeting.

No corrections noted. Approved unanimously.

C. New Business

A. MFA – Add courses to electives

Bret Lott provides overview of proposal. Follow-up from last meeting with more clearly outlined documentation and courses to be added to additional concentration.

Christine Finnan: Do you have a vehicle for making sure that students do not take Special Topics courses with the same subject multiple times?

Bret Lott: Yes, through advising.

Motion to approve, David Hansen; seconded Ben Cox; approved unanimously.

B. MBA – MBAD 526 New course

Mark Witte introduces proposal; would like to make a previously-offered Special Topics course a required course.
Brian McGee: MBAD 525 is a pre-requisite course for this. Marketing communications courses are not unusual in communications programs – any consultation on offering it?
Mark Witte: Not at the present time.
Brian McGee would like to see some consultation before Graduate Council on Friday.

Typographical error in degree requirements listing. Should read “Complete three of the following courses for a total of 9 credit hours”. Also, incorrect start date on first page: should be Fall 2017.

Barbara Beckingham notes missing course-specific learning outcomes per the Policy on Syllabi.
Mark Witte: Notes that MBA is currently in the process of developing program-level learning outcomes.
Brian McGee suggests approving with contingency of providing course-specific learning outcomes and that Graduate Council approves the proposal for the course with the defined outcomes.

Ben Cox motions to approve, David Hansen seconds; approved unanimously.

C. MBA – Admissions requirements

David Hansen notes overlap between proposals for admissions requirements for MBA and LALE. Committee will address them separately.

David Hansen: There is vagueness in the phrase “In general, applicants should submit..”. In practice, applicants would not need to submit anything.
Mark Witte: Would like to be able to admit without GRE and/or GMAT, if applicants have strong work experience. We did not come up with the phrasing “In general…“, but we are adopting language from Accounting.
Brian McGee asks a series of questions on exception possibilities as would be possible under the language proposed (e.g. for examinations of applications).
Mark Witte: Often student applicants would make a request to admissions and the graduate school, who then goes to the director of the program to accept an admissions exemption. Would like the MBA program to be litho to accept students.
Robyn Olejniczak: It’s acceptable to waive the TOEFL, and there is a hard score requirement already posed by the graduate school.
Barbara Beckingham: Could define universal requirements, and a separate list of elastic requirements.
Brian McGee: Or we could have a “rare and exceptional circumstances waived by graduate program committee” clause – this would encourage prospective students to call and ask. Either of these approaches would provide transparency to applicants.

Alan Shao: I do receive a number of calls with these sorts of questions looking for flexibility for program admission for applicants with business experience. Difficult to make a comparison between business school and some other programs.
Christine Finnan: This would make for a good Graduate Council discussion.

Mark Witte: It is important for our program and program rank to have test scores, so we do not make exceptions lightly.
David Hansen: Is the only requirement that wouldn’t be required all the time the standardized test score?
Mark Witte: Standardized test scores, and TOEFL.
Christine Finnan: We have never actually voted on admissions criteria changes in the past, although it is in our charge.

Brian McGee: In this year, approval of admissions criteria changes should go through this committee and graduate council, with notice to academic standards. In the future, could go through Faculty Senate as well.

Alan Shao and Brian McGee craft language to amend the proposal.

Brian McGee moves to amend the proposal by striking “in general”, capitalize “applicants”, and immediately following the TOEFL bullet state: “The MBA committee shall have the option to approve substitutions in submission requirements and shall approve exceptions to admission requirements in unique cases, subject to the review and determination of the Graduate Dean. Contact the MBA Director for further information.”

Brian McGee motions to amend, David Hansen seconds; unanimously approved amended language in admissions criteria proposal. Amended version of the proposal will be provided to the Graduate Council.

Brian McGee: Is the MBA program a cohort program?

Alan Shao: It is a cohort based program for full-time students pursuing a degree. Non-degree seeking international students could take courses on a one-semester basis.

Brian McGee: Suggest a continued conversation about the definition of a MBA program as a cohort program as it is described in the catalog.

Motion to approve proposal Ben Cox, seconded David; unanimously approved.

D. EDEL – Title, co-req, descr, changes

Bob Perkins introduces: changing title for 3 courses, co-requisite changes and course descriptions for 2 other courses.

Barbara Beckingham: Is 695 a prerequisite for 614?

Robyn Olejniczak: 614 is a pre-req for 695 in the catalog.

Motion to approve, Barbara Beckingham, seconded Ben Cox; approved unanimously.

E. MAT and LALE – Add course to tech reqs

F. MAT – TEDU 536 new course

Bob Perkins introduces. This proposal is a re-submission from a previous proposal. The new course description and name change more perfectly represents what is offered in EDFS 692, and this is remaining on the books currently because there are students who are taking it and would apply it to their degree programs. The proposal adds flexibility for the technology course requirement for several programs.

Jon Hakkila: What’s the prerequisite?

Bob Perkins: There is no prerequisite for TEDU 536. EDFS 687 will not be a prerequisite like it is in EDFS 692. EDFS 692 will be offered one more time, this summer. Historically 687 was the intro to technology and 692 was advanced, but as M.Ed. is for existing teachers with certification and M.Ed. programs have reduced in number, 692 is not necessary and we include this content in the new course.

David Hansen: Why did you chose a 500-level number?

Bob Perkins: Because we’d like to cross-list with a 400-level undergraduate course.
Brian McGee: Will these courses be noted as cross-listed?
Bob Perkins: In the past, we’ve been informed to specify as “meets with”. MAT is similar to undergraduate pre-certification program.
Brian McGee: Can you take 436 if you’ve taken 526 previously? In any program, course, or registrar rules?
Bob Perkins: No, there would be no reason to take the same course twice. LALE is the only program where that could happen.
Christine Finnan: Is there a way to block a LALE student from taking 526 if they’ve already taken the undergraduate course?

Ben Cox: Another issue is when they take a similar course at another school.
Robyn Olejniczak: This is mostly a concern for a CofC undergraduate student pursuing a CofC graduate degree.
Christine Finnan: LALE could require 687 instead of 526.
Silvia Rodriguez Sabater: The objective to include this course was to have flexibility.
Bob Perkins: There are many “meets with” courses currently on record.
Brian McGee: Let’s consult with Mary Bergstrom on the explanation for “meets with” for MAT and have a special meeting of the committee on Friday at 2:30 pm at the Graduate School office.
Brian McGee moves to table discussion until this time, David Hansen seconds; unanimously approved.

G. LALE – Delete course from reqs

Silvia Rodriguez Sabater introduces proposal. There are no questions.
David Hansen motions to approve, Barbara Beckingham seconds; unanimously approved.

H. LALE – Admissions requirements

Silvia Rodriguez Sabater explains need for transparency and clarity in these updated admissions requirements language for the catalog.
David Hansen asks if any bachelors degree would be accepted. Silvia confirms, except in the case of the Spanish emphasis, which is specified in the language.
David Hansen and Robyn Olejniczak suggest starting first paragraph with “Applicants with a valid teaching license/certificate” to mirror the second paragraph that starts as “For applicants without a valid teaching license/certificate”.

Motion to approve with this amended language, Ben Cox; seconded, Christine Finnan; unanimously approved.

I. EDPA – Delete course from reqs

Laura Turner could not be in attendance, and Christine Finnan introduces proposal. There are no questions.
Motion to approve, Barbara Beckingham; Ben Cox seconds; unanimously approved.

J. MBIO – Elective reqs

Craig Plante introduces proposal to remove requirement for organismal course. Lynn Cherry suggested to remove language from the catalog description proposed that was advising in nature.
Jerry Mackeldon: Suggest a change to the proposal paperwork so the intended catalog entry is clear.
Robyn Olejniczak: The catalog currently states “Complete 7-8 hours of elective courses from the following. At least one of these courses must be organismal (denoted by *)”.

It is intended that everything that is currently written with strike-through text be included at the end of the MBIO entry as a “NOTE”.

Robyn Olejniczak: It could be a nuance of Acculo to automatically title certain bullets as “Notes” (e.g. transfer credit policy).

Jerry Mackeldon: In past, notes were under “degree requirements”. Now, this is a course-by-course heading that will not include notes.

Craig Plante: Reduce description of changes to “Remove requirements for organismal course”.

Motion to approve Ben Cox, David Hansen seconds; unanimously approved.

K. MTLA – Concentration changes

Christine Finnan describes the reintroduced proposal. To address Barbara Beckingham’s concern last meeting about substantial overlap between concentrations, Christine Finnan is planning to form a steering committee to formulate a future proposal to remove some gifted and talented courses that lead to overlap between concentrations. As currently written, the concentrations will be different although it is possible that they may differ by only 1 course.

Jerry Mackeldon notes a discrepancy in the introductory letter in comparison to the proposal body. Christine Finnan will follow up with Robyn Olejniczak with the correct list, although she thinks the actual forms are the correct listing.

Barbara Beckingham motions to approve, David Hansen seconds; unanimously approved.

L. EVSS/PUBA – Add and delete courses  
M. EVSS – new course, delete course  
N. PUBA – new course → permission to cross-list

Philip Jos introduces proposal. The existing 56 credit hour dual degree concurrent program needs to be extended to a 60 credit hour program. The new course will only be required for the concurrent students and will help integrate the programs, but it will be offered as an elective for the MES and MPA students.

Barbara Beckingham: Notes need to include that there will be some needed resources to support faculty salary for the 3-credit hour Graduate Core Seminar course.  
Additional minor corrections needed: Delete EVSS 646 proposal needs to correctly identify the new course number as EVSS 611; typographical error says 604. Need graduate school grading scheme on syllabus for the Add New Course proposal for EVSS 611.

Motion to approve entire pack, Barbara Beckingham, David Hansen seconds; unanimously approved.

D. Old business

A. Reminder: Curriculog training April 3 and 10, 3:00 – 4:30  
B. Motion to By-Laws for Consideration of a New Committee for Continuing Education and Special Programs -- report on Senate action!!! It passed!  
C. Progress of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of Graduate Education  
No time to discuss at this meeting.  
D. Update on policy ideas on “stacking”
No time to discuss at this meeting.

E. **For the good of the order.**

None.

F. **Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 5:14 pm.

*The next meeting will be held Monday April 24, 2017 in Beatty 301*
MINUTES

Monday, April 24, 2017
Beatty 301

Committee members: Barbara Beckingham (Secretary; Geology and Environmental Geosciences), Ben Cox (Mathematics), David Hansen (Management and Marketing-Research), Michael Lee (Communications)

Ex-Officio: Brian McGee (Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources), Mary Bergstrom (Registrar)

Guests: Sebastian van Delden (Computer Science), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Jon Hakkila (Associate Dean of the Graduate School), Julie Dahl and Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office), Josh Bloodworth (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning)

A. Call to order.

Chair Christine Finnan is at a conference, and Ben Cox will serve as acting Chair at this meeting. Ben Cox calls meeting to order at 3:06 pm.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the Monday February 20, 2017 meeting.

No changes to meeting minutes needed. David Hansen motions to approve, Barbara Beckingham seconds; all approve.

C. New Business

A. Welcome to new committee members and election of chair for 2017-18

Lindsey Drager is in attendance – welcome! Sandy Slater is not able to attend. David Hansen will be on the new split-off committee for Continuing Education next year. Ben Cox will remain on the Graduate Curriculum Committee. One additional person for this committee will be elected forthcoming. Lyn Cherry shares that per conversation with Christine Finnan that she is willing to serve as Committee Chair again next year, if no one else is nominated. Ben Cox motions to nominate Christine Finnan, and the committee votes to elect Christine Finnan for 2017-2018 Chair.

B. New program. Master’s in Data Science and Analytics
Sebastian van Delden is representing the proposal from the Department of Computer Science.

Ben Cox notes an email from Christine Finnan which outlines several questions about the new program proposal. First, the program assessment does not seem complete.

Barbara Beckingham: Notes that it program assessment in the draft proposal to CHE appears to only involve a student exit examination and asks whether this is separate from the practicum or thesis, and whether it is common in this type of program to assess in this way.

Lynn Cherry: It is not common to have an exit exam for programmatic assessment. Is this for program or student assessment?

Sebastian van Delden: Notes that they currently do this at the undergraduate level in the Data Science major.

Discussion: What are admissions criteria?

David Hansen: How will you ensure that students are ready for this program?

Sebastian van Delden: Would like to make it so that in theory any student who did some good coursework in math or computer science and could pass the entrance exam would be welcome to join the program, and not just students who have degrees in mathematics or computer science.

David Hansen: It would seem hard for a student who doesn’t have an undergraduate degree in math or computer science field to do well in this program.

Sebastian van Delden: Two core courses in first summer semester would be very intensive.

Brian McGee: Would there be a conditional acceptance option after which students could catch up in deficient areas with some additional coursework?

Sebastian van Delden: Students who do not pass the entrance exam would have to take it the following year. Test is the arbiter. No exceptions.

Michael Lee: What majors would you imagine pulling from?

Sebastian van Delden: Engineering, math, statistics, computer science technical majors mostly.

Brian McGee: You could indicate that these would be the typical backgrounds for students in admissions criteria.

Robyn Olejniczak: Are they accepted before they take the exam, or will they be taking the exam after admission to the program? Will it be online or in person?

Sebastian van Delden: They will need to take the exam before they are admitted to the program.

Brian McGee: These flow-through questions are very practical. We need to outline how students not proximate to Charleston would take this exam.

Sebastian van Delden: Exam would have to be taken in a proctored environment.

Ben Cox: Raises question sent by Christine Finnan regarding the timeline and how non-traditional students could accomplish these paths.

Sebastian van Delden: These are roadmaps but are not the only paths. The 13-month route would be full time.

Brian McGee: Would 13 months be the minimum time needed for completion? 36 credit hours may be a stretch to be able to complete this program in 13 months.
More than 30 credit hours is difficult to accomplish in this timeline. Programs that are looking for professional entrants, may want more flexibility in admission time. This program is for Summer entrance.

Sebastian van Delden: These summer courses have been the model at other institutions.

Brian McGee: This would be the only program with a Summer admit.

To accomplish the proposed start date, at best you would have to ask that students be admitted on a non-degree seeking student to take Summer 2018 courses, which opens up some issues.

Jon Hakkila: Any way to offer DATA505 and DATA506 in Fall semester?

Sebastian van Delden: We will have issues staffing for these courses during the semesters. The idea was to offer both these courses in Summer II.

David Hansen: Could it be problematic to have your 2 core introductory courses in the summer when faculty are electing to teach?

Sebastian van Delden: The program director is available to be teaching them in the summers for the foreseeable future and would ensure that someone else took his place if needed.

Brian McGee: Send email to Don Griggs to check on financial aid implications. Further, Lynn Cherry will check whether Clemson has taken a Data Science masters program to CHE.

David Hansen: Could the DATA505 and 506 simply be set as admissions criteria instead of making them core courses. This brings credit hour requirement to 30.

Sebastian van Delden: They are designed to be graduate courses. We do not have a similar course in our undergraduate Data Science curriculum.

Ben Cox: MUSC has a biostatistics PhD program and may have a proposal for data analytics.

Sebastian van Delden: We were not invited to collaborate on that program.

Ben Cox: May be useful to coordinate with MUSC about courses.

Brian McGee: We no longer have graduate-level cross-registration agreements with any other institutions. So to take courses, outside of joint programs, students will need to matriculate as a non-degree seeking student. We would need to create a cross-registration agreement. We are currently considering an agreement between CofC, Citadel, and Clemson. If CSIS is taught by a Citadel faculty, we will need that agreement in place for students entering this Data Science Program.

Jon Hakkila: I am co-originator of this program. I envision that it would be a great opportunity to bring in Type II faculty from MUSC to help lead theses. It would be possible to bring in faculty from across disciplines at CofC as well. We have few highly quantitative masters programs and this proposed program intersects with faculty from multiple other programs who could work with students with quantitative abilities and interests.

Barbara Beckingham: Could create a list of faculty across different disciplines who would express interest in serving as research advisers for students in this program for the proposal.

The thesis syllabus seems unusual. The thesis is given a letter grade and there is no mention of a committee. Is there intent to have a thesis committee?

Sebastian van Delden: Intent is to have a thesis committee.
Brian McGee: Multiple faculty colleagues need to be involved on the committee to approve successful thesis completion.

Sebastian van Delden: The proposal did not articulate that, and so we can create a new draft for 699.

David Hansen: Check that prerequisites are correct (e.g. Math 540)
Robyn Olejniczak: Another minor note: Syllabi need correct graduate school grading scheme.

David Hansen: Can you comment on similarity to other programs?
Sebastian van Delden: UNC Wilmington just started a program very similar to this one. Ours may be more rigorous in terms of math.
Jon Hakkila: There are many different types of data science programs, as it’s a relatively new field. One issue is with credentialing faculty, and programs often make it heavier in one discipline over another.
Brian McGee: This will become a very popular program across mid-level universities. Many schools are in the process of building them.

David Hansen brings up a question that speaks to whether the program should build a “skinny” version that allows adaptability in the future.
Sebastian van Delden: Different credit hours were discussed, but this is the version we thought best.

David Hansen: Comment about the MBA courses: There was reference to an email from Dean Chao but did not see it in the package. Dean Chao raised a concern about whether there would be space in MBA courses?
Brian McGee: Increasingly it appears that the cohort model of the business school is becoming looser to allow students in who would augment the MBA course experience.
David Hansen: MBA courses are large (~50 students).
Brian McGee: Capacity could exist to begin the program.
Barbara Beckingham: How many students do you anticipate in the program?
Sebastian van Delden: Estimate about 35 students taking courses in the program in Year 5. Perhaps 10-12 students entering program per year. Did surveys of undergraduate students and partially based these numbers on the interest seen.

David Hansen: Did the list of companies formally endorsing the proposal provide some feed back on what they would like to see being taught?
Sebastian van Delden: We shared the general framework with these companies. We looked for common themes in responses from companies.

David Hansen: The practicum is like an internship. How many hours?
Brian McGee: 120 hours of internship for 3 contact hours. Programs can set the number of hours exceeding this minimum.

Barbara Beckingham: Any intention to cross-list with undergraduate courses?
Robyn: Or a future 4+1 program?
Sebastian van Delden: Not at this time.
Robyn Olejniczak asks if any revisions to the proposal will have to be submitted into Curriculog, and Mary Bergstrom confirms the answer is yes.

Brian McGee motions to approve, pending changes to paperwork. Michael seconded; All approved.

D. Old business
   A. Curriculog continued training – summer and fall (Lynn Cherry)

   Lynn Cherry announces that there will training this summer for department chairs and program directors, in addition to committee chairs who would benefit. In Fall, there will be additional training sessions for faculty who will be involved in new course proposals, as well as some open laboratories.

   B. Progress of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of Graduate Education (Brian McGee, Jon Hakkila and Robyn Olejniczak)

   Committee report will be finalized soon, pending timely completion of revisions. Jon Hakkila happily notes that the committee worked very well together, and Robyn Olejniczak adds that feedback was considered from within and outside the institution from a large cross-section.

   C. Work to carry over until 2017-18
      i. Policies on stacking
      ii. Policies on changes in admission

      We will discuss this next year.

E. For the good of the order.

   It’s been great! Thanks everyone.

F. Adjournment.
   Brian McGee motions for unanimous consent to adjourn.
   All approved!

Final meeting for 2016-17. Schedule of meetings for 2017-18 to be determined