A. Call to order.

Chair Christine Finnan called the meeting to order at 10:00am.

B. Review and approval of minutes from April 24, 2017

No changes to meeting minutes and minutes are approved.

C. New Business
   a. Welcome to new committee members and election of secretary for 2017-18.

      Kate Keeney volunteered to be secretary and the group approved.

   b. Identify revised meeting time.

      The members discussed the need for a new meeting time that did not conflict with current standing meetings that permitted the attendance of Ex-Officio members, Brian McGee and Lynn Cherry. The new time will be the First Friday of every month at 10:00am. This option will least disrupt the committee work moving to the Graduate Council and then Senate.

D. Old Business
   a. Curriculog update

      Members should become familiar with Curriculog. Any faculty member can be an initiator, access material, and make track changes. Christine is the only “approver” from this committee.

      The group discussed using an OAKS site vs Curriculog to manage discussion re: new proposals. They made the decision to use an email list for general
communications and to attempt to use the comment feature in Curriculog. If this does not work, they will revisit the issue.

b. Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of Graduate Education update

Some committee members served on this committee and commented on the success of the group last year. A major recommendation is to have a Dean of the Graduate School (different than the Provost). Committee work is now with the Board who will review content at the upcoming October meeting. A Dean would help provide an administrative structure to assist with controlled growth of graduate programs.

c. Work to carry over from 2016-17

i. Policies on stacking
Christine explained this term to the group. Jon mentioned “stacking” or modular education as a trend in graduate programs. Other schools have systems like this in place. The group discussed the pros and cons of stacking certificates (or other combinations) to lead to a master’s degree. This committee will continue to be involved in this discussion.

ii. Policies on changes in admissions
Christine addressed the need for keeping appropriate admissions criteria but having flexibility for students with a special need. “Bending the rules” needs to be done for everyone (policies across campus). Jon noted the constant balance between quality and quantity. Robyn noted that changes in graduate admission criteria will now come to this committee for review. Christine noted that this is valuable discussion for Graduate Council. We could invite program directors to address this committee. Also, the committee will work to develop policies around this topic in the coming year.

iii. Clarification of “meets with” and “cross list"
Christine discussed the benefits and challenges (including renumbering courses) of “cross listing” courses between undergraduate and graduate levels. Ben noted the advantages of being able to do this. Many students have a similar background and it makes sense to combine levels to have courses “make.” Christine said that it is critical to a number of programs. Jon noted the requirements of SACSCOC; there are different admissions and assessment requirements for undergrad/grad. We need clear policies across campus. The committee will continue to hear about this, but likely not be involved in developing policies.

iv. Other carry over?
Ben noted that the College seems to have a higher criteria than other schools for number of students in graduate courses in order to “make.” The number may be 8, but there are exceptions to this rule.
E. For the good of the order

The next meeting will be Friday, Oct. 6 at 10:00am. The committee will review the Data Sciences proposal. Because this is not in Curriculog, Christine will send the proposal with the meeting agenda in advance of the next meeting. She will also send the committee by-laws to all members to that they understand the charge of the committee. Robyn reminded the group that all meeting minutes and agendas are online.

F. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 11:05 am.
MINUTES
Friday, Oct 6, 2017, 10:00AM
Jewish Studies Center Room 319

Committee Members: Christine Finnan (Chair, TEDU & Anthropology), Ben Cox (Mathematics), Lindsey Drager (English), Kate Keeney (Arts Management), Sandy Slater (History)

Guests: Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office), Megan Gould (Academic Affairs), Julie Dahl (Registrar’s Office), Franklin Czwazka (Registrar’s Office), Lynn Cherry (Academic Affairs), Brian McGee (Provost), Karin Roof (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning)

Invited: Sebastian vanDelden (Computer Science), Paul Anderson (Computer Science)

A. Call to order

B. Review meeting minutes from Wed, September 6, unofficial meeting
   a. Approved

C. New business

D. Old business
   a. Proposal for Data Sciences and Analytics program: Passed at the last meeting with understanding that there were outstanding questions. Christine asked invited Computer Science faculty (Sebastian vanDelden and Paul Anderson) to review questions/changes.

      Sebastian vanDelden and Paul Anderson responded: Add BIO 611 and 612. Polled faculty about mentoring thesis. This spurred the curriculum change that has added to the elective pool. The courses have been through the approval process. Removed some grading discrepancies. Added some description to courses. Reworded summary memo to clarify timing/pathways. Many changes came from committee recommendations. Two big changes are on assessment; this needed to be stronger. First wave of assessment is after the first round of courses and then we assess them again. This will help us to understand the effectiveness of the entrance exam. We completed a comprehensive documentation of data sciences programs in SC. Job opportunities section has been made stronger based on Lynn Cherry’s suggestions. Divya and Josh’s feedback were incorporated as well.

   i.

   b. Other Questions on Data Science and Analytics:
Christine Finnan: Why is 13 month option only for practicum and the 25 months is for thesis. Why can’t you do the fast-track thesis?

1. Sebastian vanDelden and Paul Anderson responded: You need a faculty member to oversee the thesis. Most faculty aren’t going to agree to the thesis option for just 1 year. If someone found a thesis mentor, the curriculum does not prevent that. The two pathways are roadmaps, but students aren’t locked in. It is not a cohort model. Christine Finnan suggested that it might be useful to uncouple the practicum/fast and thesis/long. It reads like it is only available for the practicum.

Sandy Slater: Is it a stand-alone program or joint with Citadel/MUSC?

1. Provost McGee responded: We have only four joint programs with Citadel. This is a unique case because we will have a stand-alone degree in the same department as a joint program. A Citadel course could be taken. The MFA program cannot do this because we don’t have an existing joint agreement in place. Sebastian vanDelden and Paul Anderson noted that they do have a support email from the Citadel.

Christine Finnan asked about plans for conditional acceptance. Will you allow this? Maybe the person’s entrance exam score is a few points off?

1. Sebastian vanDelden and Paul Anderson responded: We did spell this out more clearly. Student has to take the entrance exam. We are envisioning a hard pass/fail with entrance exam. If you can’t pass the exam, wait until the next time. Provost McGee remarked that the history is that it will be hard to have that stance; when students are close to meeting the requirements. Paul Anderson responded: Right now, we need the program to compete at the highest level with others in the nation. Christine Finnan: We may see a request for admission requirements down the road. Paul Anderson: I don’t think exceptions will be necessary.

Lindsey Drager:

1. Looks like you need new hire; where are you in that process?
   Provost McGee: We don’t want to see a proposal that claims to be free. Tuition revenues should be sufficient to cover expenses. We will request a new line, or reallocate. If enrollments remain flat, then we take away a vacancy in the future. It takes new resources to start a new graduate program. The Dean is working on the proposal to get the new line.

Christine Finnan asked about enrollment projections:
2. You do a nice job of showing need. How solid are these projections? Paul Anderson surveyed current students (CofC SSM) to get general interest. We took that and went really conservative. There was a lot of interest. I get emails once a week inquiring about a master’s. Provost McGee: There are two programs that people want to talk about—cyber security and data science. Clemson pushed through their own version almost a year ago and our board members were very excited. Christine Finnan: Is that a problem? Provost McGee responded: No, everyone believes that more data science is better. Christine Finnan: There was a question about summer admissions that carry staffing and aid implications. Sebastian vanDelden and Paul Anderson responded: We are modeling after University of San Francisco and other schools; this is how they do it.

Robyn Olejniczak: This needs to be updated to reflect fall 2018.

3. Registrar’s Office staff noted a need a slight tweak to pre-reqs. Needs to say pass/fail grading somewhere. The Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning had not additional comments

vi.

vii. The Committee members made a motion to approve. All were in favor. The next step is graduate council on October 13. Computer Science faculty should be there. After that the proposal goes to Faculty Senate, then SACSCOC, and CHE.

viii.

c. Carry-over work from 2016-17

i. Distinction between meets-with, cross/list, and cross-level. Provost McGee: The complexity of managing this is significant. Quality assurance is essential too. One idea is to eliminate this completely. If you can’t succeed without it, then maybe eliminate the program. There are differences between undergrad and graduate and we need to assure quality. Math, MAT, Education have these programs. The pendulum swings back and forth. Christine Finnan: At next meeting in November, perhaps we can hear from program directors from Math and MAT (Martin Jones and Bob Perkins). This is an area for further conversation. Ben Cox: I taught in Sweden years ago. They graduate in 5 years, not 4. In the 5th year, they take upper level courses. Provost McGee: Yes, cross-listed courses are normal.

ii.

iii. Admissions: Program directors are trying to codify exceptions. We need to remain robust and flexible. Proposals will be coming. We should provide a forum for sharing suggestions. Provost McGee asked for this
topic to be added to the agenda for the November Graduate Council meeting. Provost McGee: We need to be transparent in admissions. If a program wants wiggle room, it needs to be acknowledged in admissions requirements of the program (using verbiage like typically or usually at least). This comports with needing to advertise in a transparent fashion.

Lynn Cherry: The Registrar’s Office is designing a form in Curriculog for program admission requirements. People can use Curriculog to go through the change process. Registrar’s Office: There are some questions about the work-flow; once this is figured out, it should be ready to use. Kate Keeney: So who is the approver? Lynn Cherry: Up to this point, there has not been a consistent process for documenting changes. The Committee on Graduate Education will be involved in reviewing the changes in the future; this was spelled out in the charge of this committee.

iv. v. Policies on stacking graduate certificates and degrees. Can you apply your certificate courses to earn a master’s degree? Provost McGee gave an overview of the problem. A certificate is not a degree. Graduate certificate policies are ancient and need some work. This is a global question--can courses earned toward one credential apply to another? The greater trend is YES. Academic Affairs’ position is permissible at undergraduate level; graduate level is different. Certificates carry some meaning outside academia. We need to answer this question for once and for all; there is a draw if you can get both credentials. Sandy Slater: Are standards for admission slightly lower for certificate programs? Provost McGee: Sometimes yes. Does the act of completing the certificate give you a leg up to apply? With appropriate design of admissions criteria and enforcement, we shouldn’t have that problem. Bob Cox: In Math, it depends on prereqs. Provost McGee: We need to sit down in the Graduate School and Academic Affairs and provide an update on the policies. We should address the graduate certificate policies and the stacking question at the same time: these are two parts of the question. Stacking does seem to be a trend of the future. There are arguments for giving someone something along the way and this translates to the business sector. Christine Finnan provided a summary: The conversation will happen at Graduate Council. Academic Affairs will work on the policy on stacking in the coming months. Provost McGee added: This may work for some disciplines better than others, like Math. This gets to questions about 4+1 and dual master’s degree programs.

vi. vii. Graduate assistantships. Provost McGee updated the group about a conversation at Graduate Council about assistantships across programs, and recruitment strategies about assistantships and fellowships. How much many can we offer is important; the Provost will look for more
money to add to the pot and there may be new models this spring. Ben Cox: Is the Foundation aware of this problem? Provost McGee: Yes, they are aware of the opportunities to raise funds for this area. Given the small size of our Graduate School, funding is not too bad. We have grant funded assistantships as well; we don’t want too much regulation around these. Its the institutional money (E&G funds) that we want to spend to attract high quality students. Ben Cox: I feel like we are a private institution because we don’t get much from the state; we can be more aggressive with Foundation funding. Provost McGee: Yes, our competitors have larger endowments than we do, but we’ve never been richer on the endowment side than we are today. In the short term, I am more worried about the allocation of money for assistantships and scholarships. Other assistantships are outside of that budget. We are putting more into assistantships than other, but we don’t waive in-state tuition, which is a problem.

E. Curriculog Workshop (Lynn Cherry)
   a. Curriculog is a two-step workflow process. Christine Finnan is the person who can approve proposals to forward onto Graduate Council, and is the only one who can edit proposals. Graduate Education Committee members won’t receive those. If you are developing a proposal yourself, it will have a green bar next to it. Under tasks, it has an orange bar. Lynn Cherry can only “approve” or “reject” (wording is poor). You will see examples under “all proposals.” Department Chair or Dean can reject, but usually it happens at the Academic Affairs level. The originator is the only person who can cancel or delete a proposal. Once it goes back to the workflow, it has to go back through the entire workflow; bubbles expand to show this process. The system is divided into two sections: proposals and summary. See attached documents in system, under “files.” This is more complete information than what you see in the digital form. Only faculty have access to Curriculog. See “view proposals” in order to view discussion/notes/changes. Anytime there is a course change or change to the proposal, the originator will have to have included an impact report. This lists the impact of this change on other courses, programs, departments, etc. The impact report would be part of the files if attached. Curriculog workshops/dates are listed on the Academic Affairs webpage.

   b. The Graduate Education Committee will not make comments in Curriculog (this was previously discussed as an option). The Undergraduate Faculty Curriculum Committee uses OAKS to organize, and then that information (minutes, annual reports, etc.) carries over from year to year. Their OAKS site lives on the Faculty tab in MyCharleston. Curriculog comments are permanent, archived, and publicly viewable. The curriculog comment section is not for conversations; it is for official comments only. The Graduate Education Committee discussed a formal request to IT to create an OAKS page for this use; the committee would maintain the
page and add any users. Megan Gould offered to help. Curriculoghelp@cofc.edu (Megan Gould and Lynn Cherry respond).

F. Adjournment
   a. The committee adjourned at 11:40AM
MINUTES
Friday, Nov. 3, 2017
Jewish Studies Center Room 319

Committee Members: Christine Finnan (Chair, TEDU & Anthropology), Ben Cox (Mathematics), Lindsey Drager (English), Kate Keeney (Arts Management), Sandy Slater (History)

Guests: Lynn Cherry (Academic Affairs), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Shawn Morrison (M.Ed faculty), Silvia Rodriguez Sabater (LALE), Mary C Bergstrom (Registrar), Franklin Czwazka (Registrar’s Office), Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office), Julie Dahl (Registrar’s Office), Divya Bhati (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning), Bob Perkins (TEDU), Brian McGee (Provost/Graduate School Dean)

A. Call to Order

B. Review and approval of the minutes from Oct. 6, 2017

   Sandy made a motion to approve the minutes. All accepted the motion.

C. New Business
   a. English proposal--requirement deletion
      Program director from English was not present. Lyndsey suggested tabling the discussion, to allow the program director to convey the departmental discussion regarding the proposal. Postponing a decision will still provide sufficient time for the action to be in the 2018-19 catalog. Sandy made a motion to table. Ben made the second. All in favor.

   b. LALE
      i. Program change to accommodate the two additions to the courses.
         Registrar’s Office gave feedback on course descriptions for both; they went through these changes to be sure that they were made in the proposal.

         Christine brought up the limit on credit hours that can be brought in from University of Charleston, SC non-degree catalog courses. This affects stacking certificates to degrees. The College’s rule is six transfer hours from another institution. LALE has a program restriction that is not a College policy so there is no way to enforce it. The decision was made to remove this program description and just follow the policy on limiting transfer hours from another institution to six credit hours.
Robyn noted to take reference out to (EDPD) and to take out the reference to an optional thesis under Program Requirements. Also, the committee agreed that there is no need to reference the residency requirement since this is an institutional requirement.

ii. Course addition LALE 695, 1-credit portfolio
Sandy: In History, we have something like this and faculty take on a student as opposed to a person teaching the course. Questions of compensation—will this count as a course release, merit/service? Director of LALE, Silvia, responded: We’ve had the portfolio since the program began. Students were completing it with no credit attached; students need more guidance. On one hand, it would be nice to give the students credit; people take it more seriously as a course. Also came out of assessment; portfolio was a measure of the SOLS. The Director will oversee the portfolio because this is already happening. If there are many students, other professors will contribute. It would count as service for the Director; similar to directing a thesis.

Registrar’s Office noted that LALE should take title and credit hours out of course description. Please clarify, “Is the course repeatable?” No, the course is not repeatable but students have two attempts.

iii. Course addition LALE 698, Independent Study
Similar question about faculty compensation. Silvia: This course is a last resort. We want them to take our courses. Students can only take 3 hours in a single semester. They cannot take 1-2 credit hours of independent study.

Registrar’s Office noted that LALE should take title and credit hours out of course description. Also, “permission” language should go under the prerequisite field. Different way to break out the data.

iv. Ben made a motion to approve LALE changes. Lyndsey second. All were in favor.

D. Old Business
a. Meets with and cross listing
Martin: In math we have always had cross-listed courses. Now with SACSCOC, we made an effort to improve rigor. We made a distinction in class and syllabi about the differences. A problem arose because of a no repeat policy for cross-listed courses. As students graduated, should they enter our master’s program, the student can’t attend our program because they cannot repeat a class that is required. We want to treat our own students as we did with those from other
universities. For one student, we created independent studies courses because there was no other way to get around it. In a meeting with the Registrar’s Office and Academic Affairs they agreed that this was a one-time fix. There was a suggestion to change from “cross list” to “meets with” in order to allow CofC graduates to take courses that are now cross-listed. Math courses do not fit the criteria of “meets with.” We talked to the Standards committee (as an admissions issue). We want to change one line so that it says you can’t repeat in a degree. But going across degree levels is a different issue.

Mary: We suggested making it “meets with.”

Lynn: “Meets with” is not a curricular designation. It is a scheduling mechanism.

Martin: So we are going to decouple them from “cross list” and Senate will then need to approve?

Ben: I am confused on the difference between “meets with” and “cross list.”

Lynn: If a course is cross listed, you are saying that a math course and science course are the same. That’s cross listing; the courses are equivalent. Meets with is a scheduling designation. If you have multiple courses, there may be some similarity in the work but they are not the same. Example, if you had 3 different drawing courses. Students have different ability. But they might meet all at the same time. The professor acknowledges that the students are different and the students are doing different work.

Brian: With cross list, content is the same. Undergrad/grad is a device we use limitedly. The content is similar, but there are more advanced course learning outcomes for grad students. But you would not repeat at grad level because the courses are so similar. If you can’t meets with, then it impacts enrollment mass. Meets with has significant overlap, perhaps co-location, maybe break-outs, significant similarity and significant difference. 95-100% similar is acceptable for cross-listing. At the undergraduate level, we don’t have a fine arts program if we don’t have a meets-with category.

Ben: I still feel they are the same.

Robyn: There is an inherent contradiction between cross listing across undergrad and graduate levels because they can’t be the same.

Ben: Can you marry the two?

Martin: I would decouple the courses and write the independent studies. I would like to decouple the courses, but is that de facto meets with?

Brian: Are Math 430 and 530 95% the same? Martin: They are 90% the same. The graduate students do extra assignments but we don’t meet separately. I find it problematic as well. In the past, we would waive the requirement (not give credit), and tell them to take another course. Academic standards is discussing this as well as an admissions issue.

Divya: We have to remember graduate standards rigor.

Bob: We have similar issues. Numbers in MAT programs are small, and if they are separated, they will disappear. In the past, we did meets with, and now we are considering cross listing, as it is more in line with the college’s policy. We are creating a “bucket list.” If the student has taken the undergraduate class, then
they have had the equivalent. So the admissions committee tells them to take a
different course from the “bucket list.” This would only happen in the situation
when the student has taken the undergraduate course already.
Brian: For Math, curricular design seems like a way to solve the problem without
disturbing the cross-listing option. Meets with was not meant to be an enrollment
strategy scheme.

E. For the good of the order
   Brian: We continue to discuss different models for graduate assistantships. We want to
see a different process in place by Spring 2018. We are seeking best graduate students
and more funding for stipends.

   The Board was updated on the Graduate Dean proposal at the October meeting. Intent
to search for the Graduate Dean in January 2018. Thanks to good work of the task force
and Graduate School staff.

   Divya: SACSCOC December meeting. College will receive a letter in January.

F. Adjournment

   Ben made a motion to adjourn at 11:09

G. Next meeting December 1, 2017 at 10:00am (Ben will Chair the meeting).
MINUTES
Friday, December 1, 2017, 10:00AM
Jewish Studies Center Room 319

Committee Members: Lindsey Drager (English), Kate Keeney (Arts Management), Sandy Slater (History)

Guests: Jon Hakkila (Graduate School), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Mary Bergstrom (Registrar), Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office), Julie Dahl (Registrar’s Office), Franklin Czwazka (Registrar’s Office), Lynn Cherry (Academic Affairs), Brian McGee (Provost), Divya Bhati (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning), Mike Duvall (English), Phil Jos (MPA Program), Kevin Keenan (Urban Studies and MPA Program)

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.
2017-18 Committee on Graduate Education

MEETING MINUTES

Monday, January 8, 2018

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Lindsey Drager (English), Kate Keeney (Arts Management), Sandy Slater (History)

Ex-Officio: Jon Hakkila (Graduate School), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), Brian McGee (Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Charleston, S.C.), Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources), Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office), Julie Dahl (Registrar’s Office)

A. Call to order. 9:04am

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the December 1, 2017 meeting. Kate made a motion to approve the minutes. Sandy seconded. All approved.

C. New Business
   A. Course additions to MTLA Curriculum & Instruction concentration
      Christine noted that the MTLA courses are already available, and she addressed the comment that there are many available electives in the program. The program addresses this through advising and works to avoid small enrollments. These courses already exist, so this proposal puts them in the MTLE concentration officially. Lindsay motioned to approve. Sandy seconded. All approved.

      We will have many proposals to review for the next committee meeting.

D. Old business
   A. Change to Admissions Process
      Christine reviewed the issue. It seems sufficient for graduate admissions changes to go through the Graduate Committee and then to the Graduate Council. Provost McGee noted that it is in the authority of Faculty Senate to approve admissions changes. However, this has not been the practice, and a change like this can be reflected in the Faculty Senate minute meetings. Provost McGee believes that Faculty Senate will likely be comfortable with this proposal. The Committee on Graduate Education will report at the February Faculty Senate meeting that this will be the process. This will allow for Faculty Senate to raise any issues/concerns. Christine will draft the paragraph and have Provost McGee review before giving the report. Lynn Cherry suggested that we report any graduate admissions changes to Faculty Senate at the end of the year. Henceforth, changes to graduate admissions standards will go through: the program, School Dean(s), a Graduate School Dean or Associate Dean, the Provost, Graduate Committee, and Graduate Council. The Committee on Graduate Education will report any changes to Faculty
Senate annually during the spring semester. Provost McGee made the motion. Sandy seconded. All approved.

E. For the good of the order.
   A. Provost McGee noted interest among programs regarding GREs and/or other exam scores. Programmatically, there is interest in creating more pathways to graduate admission. Rather than treating these all as one-offs, the Provost would like this committee to have a broader discussion about graduate entrance exams. The assumption of the Graduate School is that students are taking exams, and exceptions are not the standard. A larger umbrella conversation would be useful to establish a baseline/standard for the College.

   B. Provost McGee noted the continued discussion of graduate assistantships and fellowships. This impacts recruitment and will be continued work for the spring semester.

   C. Provost McGee provided an update on a program cost study (costs to operate a program), that is based upon last academic year. Results will be available to School Deans shortly. The College completed a study in 2010-11. The study generally showed that programs were either small and efficient or large and efficient. The study includes undergraduate and graduate programs. This time, the Provost believes that the study will show that costs are up for graduate programs, but generally still efficient. An example of a program that was uncovered from this type of examination is the previously held athletic training program, which was eliminated because of accreditor standard changes and resulting cost implications. Sandy asked, if programs are flagged for cost balance problems, will there be opportunity for redevelopment or will it just be eliminated? Provost McGee said that it depends on the options for redevelopment. Nothing will be cut immediately--there will always be discussions prior to. Decisions will be based on quality and institutional mission. We recognize the need for programs to be redeveloped and/or eliminated in some instances. Provost McGee noted that the trend for graduate programs is away from 36 and 43 credit hours, and towards a 30 credit hour design that is completable in three semesters.

   D. Christine asked about the Graduate Dean search. Provost McGee noted that this conversation will happen in January, 2018. The goal will be to bring candidates in before the end of the semester. The search will be open to internal and external candidates.

   E. Christine asked, is there more clarity to a substantive change and what needs to be approved by SACSCOC? Provost McGee noted that each case is unique. A new program or a new kind of program is a major change. A mode of delivery can in some instances be a substantive change. Any level of complexity requires us to potentially consider a proposal as a substantive change.

   F. Christine suggested that we discuss the GRE admissions requirements since the committee had no more business to conduct. Some programs ask students to take the GRE, but then they don’t publicize a cut-off score. So why ask them to take it if it is not being used as a criteria for admission? Sandy noted that in her experience, the GRE is part of an admissions package; the GRE score may indicate a red flag as part of an overall package. Provost McGee read the policy from the Graduate School website, and noted that this section is not clear. Robyn noted that program directors and students look for a “back door” to taking graduate entrance exams for admission. The committee continued discussion on the merits of the GRE. This committee will continue to have a role in identifying admissions standards that find the right balance of rigor
and flexibility. Additionally, the committee has to be sure that programs are enforcing their own admissions standards. Sandy noted institutional integrity. Provost Mcgee stated that by writing policies poorly, we can impact students. Programs need to develop admission standards that are reasonable and that they can stick to.

Lynn Cherry asked about undergraduate admissions and tracking students’ applications to other schools. For graduate students, are we tracking students’ applications to other schools or admission to other schools? Robyn noted that we do not have these date. There is no common application for graduate admission.

G. Robyn clarified the workflow for graduate admissions changes. There is currently a built-in “graduate school stop” in the process. Who in the Graduate School signs off administratively before it moves through committees? This should be the Graduate School Dean or Associate Dean. Franklin will set the process up in Curriculog. Robyn motioned needing to add this to the workflow. Sandy seconded. Henceforth, changes to graduate admissions standards will go through: the program, School Dean(s), a Graduate School Dean or Associate Dean administrative step, the Provost, the Graduate Committee, and Graduate Council. The Committee on Graduate Education will report any changes to Faculty Senate annually during the spring semester.

F. Adjournment. 10:03am
Next meeting February 5, 2018 – 9:00 – 10:30 AM -- Jewish Studies Center #319
2017-18 Committee on Graduate Education

MEETING MINUTES

Monday, February 26, 2018

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Lindsey Drager (English), Kate Keeney (Arts Management), Sandy Slater (History)

Ex-Officio: Jon Hakkila (Graduate School), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), 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), Julie Dahl (Registrar’s Office), Franklin Czwazka (Registrar’s Office), Nancy Muller (Lowcountry Graduate Center), Divya Bhati (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning),

Invited: Brian Lanahan (TEDU), Bob Perkins (TEDU), Judy Millesen (PUBA)

A. Call to order. 9:00

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the January 8, 2018 meeting.
   Sandy made a motion to approve the minutes. Kate seconded. All approved.

C. New Business
   a. Early Childhood Renumbering and Cross-listing
   b. Elementary Renumbering and Cross-listing

These two proposals are for the MAT in early childhood education. Bob Perkins spoke about the difference between the MAT and MED degrees. The MED is a master in education. The student already has an undergraduate degree in education. The MAT is for a student who has an undergraduate degree in something unrelated to education. Coursework for an MAT is similar to an undergraduate program preparing students to be teachers.

There is a decline in people wanting to be teachers and that is affecting MAT enrollment. The faculty are trying to come up with a way to make the MAT survive and be sure that the programs are cost effective. A solution was to have master’s students meet in the same classroom as undergraduate students. We cross-listed courses, but this became a problem. If an undergraduate student had taken “intro to exceptional children,” for example, then he/she could not count this again at the graduate level. So we changed the co-meetings to “meets with” instead of “cross listed.” Since then, we have put into place elective classes (currently there are no electives in the MAT program). These other courses will provide graduate course offerings if a student has taken a requirement as an undergraduate. The electives are not intended for everyone, but for those in this particular situation. The faculty met last year with the Registrar to discuss the options of “meets with” and “cross listing.” We determined the need for cross-listed courses instead. We now have different undergraduate and graduate syllabi with different
assignments, grading scale, and learning objectives. If we have enough students, we will put together an MAT cohort. Otherwise, we want the option to cross-list graduate and undergraduate courses. Mary Bergstrom commented on the unique nature of this situation.

Nancy Muller asked, what can the Lowcountry Graduate Center do to attract people to the MAT programs? Bob Perkins mentioned the teachers strike in West Virginia. There is a shortage of teachers nationwide because of the lack of respect, lack of salaries, testing and accountability, and multiple ways to get certified.

Brian McGee noted the constant angst about MAT programs. For historical reasons and because of the national trend, we elected to have the MAT program. We need to continue to find ways to articulate the advanced nature of the MAT, as compared to an undergraduate degree in education. The MAT is a distinct program. We need to enforce the notion that the MAT is more advanced than an undergraduate program in education.

Christine Finnan asked a procedural question. Does the committee need to vote on each course in the proposal, or may we consider them all together? Brian McGee suggested that the committee consider all the MAT proposals as a single motion for approval.

Robyn Olejniczak asked if the PRAXIS will replace the GRE requirement. Bob Perkins mentioned that the proposal under consideration includes cross-listing, electives (“bucket list”), and two renumbering changes. The PRAXIS is not included in the proposal under consideration.

Sandy Slater mentioned that she would be more comfortable if there was a requirement for additional readings in the graduate syllabi, as opposed to optional additional readings. Bob Perkins noted that extra readings was left as an option because objectives might be met through other means without additional readings. Brian McGee noted the ongoing burden of proving additional work for graduate students. Deans, chairs, and program directors are held accountable for the rigor of graduate programs.

Christine Finnan asked for a motion to approve the three issues together: cross-listing, electives (“bucket list”), and two re-numbering changes. All approved.

c. Other TEDU proposals

This proposal is about adding electives. Brian McGee noted that the catalogues had to match between joint programs and that the ⅓ rule had to be met. Mary Bergstrom noted that this elective list will be handled by exception; it will not show up in DegreeAudit. Franklin Czwazka asked a question about admissions requirements on the proposal. Bob Perkins and Christine Finnan noted that the admissions criteria are not changing in this proposal. Brian McGee noted that the vote on this proposal is not related to admissions changes. Robyn Olejniczak asked about a letter of support from the Citadel. Brian McGee noted that we can endorse the proposal and obtain the letter later. Robyn Olejniczak asked about the MAT in Performing Arts. Bob Perkins and Christine Finnan said that these course numbers will not change. Brian McGee asked that the MAT in Performing Arts be clarified for the Graduate Council meeting.

Jon Hakkila asked if the electives are being taught at both institutions? Brian McGee noted that the ⅓ rule needed to be met so that we are meeting the policies of the joint degree program.
Christine Finnan asked for a motion to approve this proposal. Lindsey Drager motioned. Sandy Slater seconded. All approved.

d. Early Childhood/Elementary program change

Brian Lanahan discussed the low numbers in the program and in the teaching profession. Currently the MAT is a two year program. The faculty decided to revise the MAT program to a one-year, 13-month footprint. This is the national norm. We have courses that satisfy both early childhood and elementary education. The faculty completed a survey to gauge interest in the revised program. There is interest in the program moving to a one-year footprint. The program includes more rigor, including a research methods course. Christine Finnan noted that by adding research, the MAT gives the value of a master’s program. The students who complete this program will be eligible for the pay bump that others earn with graduate degrees. Brian McGee noted that as a trend, if a program is more professionally aligned, then it is a one-year schedule. Other trends are 30-33 credit hour programs. The “timely completion” and “hybrid” model is a national trend. Bob Perkins mentioned that the program is now 42 credit hours (from 48 hours). National accrediting bodies and state laws stipulate some of the program requirements.

Robyn Olejniczak asked about admissions requirements in the cover letter. The cover letter includes changes in the current admissions requirements. Mary Bergstrom asked that admission requirement changes be reflected in the proposal and the meeting minutes. Admission changes will need to be submitted separately in Curriculog through the admissions form.

Brian McGee discussed the hard lines described in the revised admissions requirements. Will the program really be able to enforce these admissions requirements with no exceptions? Admissions criteria should be a predictor of success for the program. So what is it about a hard GPA that is predictive of success in graduate study? Programs need to be transparent that they are willing to entertain exceptions. Brian McGee suggested language like, “Exceptions will be considered by the program’s admissions committee.” As such, there will be an amendment to this proposal, and all changes will need to be submitted separately through the admissions change proposal.

Robyn Olejniczak asked if the PRAXIS is something anyone can take. Christine Finnan said yes. The admissions requirements need to clarify the choice of PRAXIS and GRE.

Robyn Olejniczak asked about clinical practice. Students could receive the MAT but not be recommended for state certification because they are not required to complete clinical practice. This has happened with one student who had dispositional issues. Brian McGee asked about comparison programs—what are they doing?. Brian Lanahan explained that some programs have different pathways where a student could receive a degree without state certification. Divya Bhati asked if this allowance would permit other students to take this pathway. Brian Lanahan noted that this would be very unusual. A student would not pursue this degree if he/she did not want to complete clinical practice.

Robyn Olejniczak noted that the credit hours need to be changed from 42+6 to 42 in the proposal.

There was discussion about the program moving forward for 2018-19 without CHE approval. Brian McGee suggested that we note that it was approved by the College in a management letter. The admissions change has a separate, expedited process.
Christine Finnan asked for a motion to approve the proposal without the admissions changes. Kate Keeney moved to approve. Sandy Slater seconded. All approved.

e. Public Administration

Judy Milleson reviewed the proposal. Public Administration is bringing forth a renumbering proposal that came about after the 4+1 degree program approval process. There are two speed bumps in the process—the Environmental Studies program and Arts Management program. Environmental Studies (EVSS) and PUBA are cross listed and will remain that way at this time. This will likely change in the future (one year) as Environmental Studies considers adopting the new numbering.

Jon Hakila noted assessing cross-listing courses. Brian McGee noted that these courses have already been cross-listed, and PUBA is trying to come into institutional policy with a new numbering scheme. We presume that cross-listed courses are identical at the graduate to graduate or undergraduate to undergraduate course levels.

The second speed bump has to do with Arts Management. Right now Arts Management is considered a change in prefix from PUBA to ARCM. There have been conversations about this and questions about this change remain at this time. Arts Management also considering content development for the current graduate certificate. Brian McGee noted that we should not let messiness get in the way of PUBA adopting appropriate course numbering policy. The committee should proceed with PUBA course numbering changes, and if another change comes related to the Arts Management prefix, then the committee will discuss those at that time.

Christine Finnan called for a motion to approve the proposal. Sandy Slater moved to approve. Kate Keeney seconded. All approved.

D. Old business

Christine Finnan discussed the approval process in Curriculog. At the next meeting (March 5), the committee may see proposals from Communications, History, Environmental Studies, Historic Preservation, English, and maybe Arts Management.

E. For the good of the order

F. Adjournment. Sandy Slater motioned to adjourn. Lindsay Drager seconded. All approved. Meeting adjourned at 10:40. Next meeting March 5, 2018 – 9:00 – 10:30 AM – Jewish Studies Center #319
2017-18 Committee on Graduate Education

MEETING MINUTES

Monday, March 5, 2018

Committee members: Christine Finnan (Chair; TEDU & Anthropology), Lindsey Drager (English), Kate Keeney (Arts Management), Sandy Slater (History)

Ex-Officio: Jon Hakkila (Graduate School), Robyn Olejniczak (Graduate School), 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), Julie Dahl (Registrar’s Office), Franklin Czwazka (Registrar’s Office), Jerry Mackeldon (Registrar’s Office),

Invited: Mike Duvall (English), Carter Hudgins (Historic Preservation), Amanda Ruth-McSwain (Communication), Rachel Donaldson (History), Jason Coy (History), Phyllis Jestice (History)

A. Call to order. 9:02 AM. Christine asked for introductions from invited attendees.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the February 26, 2018 meeting.
Sandy motioned to approve the minutes. Lindsey seconded. All approved.

C. New Business
a. English
Mike Duvall talked about proposal, including a program requirement change from a comprehensive exam to an eportfolio. With an eportfolio, students would submit three significant pieces of writing that are tied to outcomes of the program. As a joint program, the Citadel has reviewed and approved this change as well. Sandy Slater asked about the equivalency of a thesis and three pieces of writing. Mike Duvall responded that the eportfolio is better than a thesis, in his opinion, because the students are working on three pieces. It is being offered as an equivalent to the exams, not the thesis. The program has few traditional thesis writers anyway. The thesis will still be an option. Sandy Slater asked about the standards for adequate revision to the eportfolio pieces. Mike Duvall said that the standards will need to evolve. There is a joint committee between CofC and the Citadel that would decide; this will be part of the assessment cycle. Lindsey Drager motioned to approve. Kate Keeney seconded. All approved.

b. Special Education Renumbering and Cross-listing
There was not a representative from Special Education at the meeting. Christine Finnan offered to respond to questions. Sandy Slater asked if the content of the courses was changing. Christine Finnan responded no. Brian McGee mentioned that many courses have been numbered in a way without reason. This proposal is bringing institutional logic/policy to the numbering scheme. Robyn Olejniczak asked about the continuation of the program. Christine Finnan responded that if/when the program is reinstated, it would be reinstated with these numbers. Kate Keeney motioned to approved. Sandy Slater seconded. All approved.
c. History
The committee discussed how to proceed because not all of the documents had been reviewed by the committee in advance of the meeting. Brian McGee asked for clarification of History’s timeline. Rachel Donaldson responded that the hope was to start the approval process this Spring. Mary Bergstrom commented that the Registrar had not yet had an opportunity to review the proposal. Christine Finnan suggested that the committee discuss the proposal via OAKS. History faculty gave some background on the program change including the addition of a concentration in public history. Rachel Donaldson completed a study of best practices in public history. The concentration proposal includes more courses in developing skills (590 courses). This includes a theories and methods course in public history and a mandatory internship course for credit. History has been working with Historic Preservation to offer electives that would be of interest to students in both programs. Faculty members stated that there are ample resources on campus and in the community to support the program. The program was losing high-quality students to other programs that offered public history.

Mary Bergstrom asked about the credit hour requirements. Concentrations need to be 18 credit hours and the proposal reflects 15. This needs to be amended in the proposal. Kate Keeney asked about the choice of a concentration versus a certificate. Rachel Donaldson responded that the program already has a history of concentrations This was a question that came up in the peer program review. Brian McGee asked about the ⅓ rule. Does the proposal meet this requirement? Lynn Cherry clarified that one of the Citadel courses is a 700-level course. This might present a problem in meeting the requirement. Brian McGee noted that the Master’s degree (not the concentration) has to meet the rule. Christine Finnan noted that the committee will return to this proposal at the April meeting.

d. Historic Preservation
Carter Hudgins explained the proposal as part of the joint program with Clemson. The first piece corrects the language/course description for an independent study course; this will bring language in-line with the Clemson description. The second piece of the proposal is a new course for Digital Tools in Historic Preservation.

Christine Finnan noted that the syllabus reflects Clemon’s grading policy. She asked that the syllabus reflect CofC as well. Sandy Slater motioned to approve the independent study. Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved. Kate Keeney asked about the 800-level numbering for the new course. Brian McGee explained that the joint programs cannot necessarily fall into our new scheme. Sandy Slater motioned to approve the course. Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved.

e. Communications
Amanda Ruth-McSwain explained the proposal, including an online program with a 12-month completion option (this timeline is not required), and a move from a 33 to a 30 credit-hour program. Curriculum changes include combining two methods courses into a single course, and clean-up of courses that have not been taught recently. Comprehensive exams are being eliminated and instead, students would complete a six hour capstone. Courses are moving from semester to express courses only. The face-to-face degree option will no longer be offered. The new program takes existing courses and packages them in a way that will be more appealing to professional audiences.

Christine Finnan asked about the enrollment module/ introductory experience. Amanda Ruth-McSwain commented that this is similar to the MBA program; we want to be sure that all students are starting on the same page. The enrollment module is required for everyone, and it includes program expectations as well. This will be a 12 hour commitment (not credit hours) that must be completed between the time of acceptance until enrollment in Module 1. Jon Hakkila asked about documenting completion of the
enrollment module, as it is non-credit. Amanda Ruth-McSwain explained that it will be a check-off requirement, like Founding Documents or comprehensive exams. Robyn Olejniczak explained that the enrollment module is similar to the MBA program. This is a program requirement, not a degree requirement. As such, it can be managed through a department hold. Students would not be able to enroll in Module 1 without completion of the enrollment module. Robyn Olejniczak asked if the thesis option will still exist. Amanda Ruth-McSwain said yes, but that not many students complete the thesis currently. Christine Finnan asked about the capstone experience. Jon Hakkila asked about continuous enrollment with the capstone. Kate Keeney asked about the 12 month vs 24 month cycle pedagogically. Amanda Ruth-McSwain explained that the content does not necessarily depend on the two foundational courses. Brian McGee asked if all Communication faculty are DE trained? Amanda Ruth-McSwain said all but three are trained. The bigger problem is getting faculty used to more experiential teaching. Mary Bergstrom asked about this as a concentration change versus a program change in Curriculog. Amanda Ruth-McSwain responded that this did not appear as an option to her in Curriculog. Lynn Cherry will follow-up on this software issue.

Amanda Ruth-McSwain then walked through the course changes. Christine Finnan suggested that the committee consider the courses all together. Kate Keeney motioned to approve. Sandy Slater seconded. All approved.

f. Environmental Studies
There was no representative from EVSS. Mary Bergstrom commented that the Registrar’s Office had not yet seen the proposal. Lindsey Drager motioned to table this proposal to the April meeting. All approved.

g. Public Administration
The proposal includes new course renumbering that was not considered at the 2/26 committee meeting. Kate Keeney motioned to approve. Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved. Brian McGee noted that we will see many course renumbering proposals in the future. If there is an error or oversight in number changes, we will address this managerially.

D. Old business
Sandy Slater asked about joint programs. The Citadel has created a new program in military history without consulting the CofC History Department. Brian McGee noted that this will need CHE approval. He asked if the Citadel is planning to use any CofC courses to meet the requirements of the program? He noted that just because we have a joint program with someone, that does not prevent us from creating new programs.

E. For the good of the order.
Christine Finnan explained that we need a new chair for next year. Brian McGee suggested that tenured faculty consider the work of chairing the committee. Sandy Slater noted that she would be happy to serve as chair.

F. Adjournment.
Next meeting April 2, 2018 – 9:00 – 10:30 AM -- Jewish Studies Center #319
A. Call to order. 9:05 a.m.

B. Review and approval of the minutes from the March 6, 2018 meeting. Sandy Slater moved to approve, Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved.

C. New Business
   A. Welcome new committee members and election of chair for 2018-19
      Christine Finnan noted that voting on the incoming chair would have to be delayed since we are still waiting on a vote to determine the committee members for next year. She reminded everyone to please vote when the call goes out over the faculty listserv.

   B. History
      Jason Coy gave a summary of the proposal for a program in Public History. He explained that there is demand from the program given Charleston’s historical significance. He also noted that Rachel Donaldson was hired specifically in preparation for this program, and established a need by underscoring that this work is already taking place in the joint program with CofC and the Citadel, but there is currently no formal recognition of or credentialing for these students. He explained that as a result, the History department is losing applicants. Brian McGee asked if this proposal would need to be approved by CHE. Lynn Cherry said it shouldn’t need to be. Rachel Donaldson wondered if SACSCOC would need to be made aware, to which Lynn Cherry said they do. Sandy Slater asked if there was enough faculty to implement the program. Rachel responded that there are committed faculty through the oral history program at the Citadel, and added that they would like someone with public history experience to run the internships. She made it clear
that faculty would be split between the Citadel and CofC for both classes and internships. Sandy Slater asked if the internship would be a formal course available each fall. It was made clear that the fall of the first year would be an introduction, fall of second year would be the internship, and both courses would lead toward thesis. Christine noted that this could be a powerful recruiting tool for the department as a whole. Sandy Slater moved to approve the proposal as a package. Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved.

C. Environmental Studies

Annette Watson represented Environmental Studies. Christine Finnan explained that a new renumbering system is in place and Environmental Studies has taken a first step toward changing the numbers of the courses. Sandy Slater moved to approve, Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved. Annette Watson summarized the new course proposal (EVSS 679) which has been offered every other year for last eight years. As the curriculum did not reflect this, Environmental Studies is asking that it be added to the sequence to better reflect the realities of the curriculum. Sandy Slater moved to approve, Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved.

D. Early Childhood MAT & Elementary MAT admissions changes

Christine Finnan noted that now it is officially the Graduate Education Committee’s work to review and pass admission changes. Bob Perkins discussed the proposal to substitute the Praxis test for the GRE for admissions purposes. He explained that this change is initiated because the Praxis is used as the undergraduate level and the state has put in place required scores that all candidates for teacher certification have to meet. Bob Perkins also explained that the program wants to take out self-assessment and technology requirements from admission criteria, as these are now part of the curriculum for students enrolled in the program.

Sandy Slater moved to approve MAT changes, Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved.

E. Marine Biology admissions changes

Brian McGee reminded everyone that part of the process of reviewing admissions guidelines is to create flexibility in admissions standards that reflects admissions practices. If the program’s published admission criteria does not have language to create exceptions, then the program needs to revise its language and get that revision approved through the Grad Ed committee should they want to grant exceptions at any time. Programs need to recognize that there needs to be transparency and consistency with the admission criteria as well as the language of admissions that accurately reflects how exceptions to those admissions will be handled. If language is not reflected in admission guidelines, exceptions cannot be granted. The Graduate Education Committee will review such language in order to begin a larger initiative within the graduate college to more closely align practice with formal procedure.
Sandy Slater moved to approve Marine Biology admission changes, Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved.

F. Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy admissions changes

Christine Finnan explained that an increasing number of applicants to the MTLA program have a passion for this work but don’t have the teacher licensure and/or education major or minor to be admitted into the program. She made it clear that the department is asking that the applicants meet the admission requirement by either undergrad GPA of 2.5 OR the GRE OR teacher certification (which requires Praxis 2).

Brian McGee reminded us that this is the ultimate back door, as there are essentially three ways to get into the program. There was some discussion about the fact that this was needed only to apply, not necessarily criteria for acceptance.

Sandy Slater moved to approve MTLA admission changes, Lindsey Drager seconded. All approved.

D. Old business

Brian McGee provided an update on the successor plan for the Graduate Education dean. He noted that some find searching for a permanent dean outside of the university problematic given that we are at a transition time with the president. The conversation is ongoing and we’ll be updated as new information surfaces.

Brian McGee explained that there is an effort to try to secure financial funding earlier in the academic year with the goal of recruiting. He is currently in the process of evaluating the allocation of funds for graduate assistantships. Too, it should be made clear to graduate programs that the Graduate School should send the official offer of admission first, and only then should the program take over specifics about the offer. This is because it’s important that students receive all offers of admission at the same time and with the same language to create centralization and to achieve the goal of earlier admission and financial decisions. This process is beginning now for the 2018–19 academic year. Sandy Slater asked if there was formalized language given to graduate directors about standardizing the acceptance language. Brian McGee explained that a lot of material has gone out to ensure program directors know about what they can say. Part of this is for the quality assurance issue of making sure the work done by graduate students make sense. Assistantships are not merely paychecks, as there is a work/product expectation, and if programs do not abide by this, there will be an effort to reallocate. Sandy Slater asked how this would work with joint programs with the Citadel. Brian responded that in these cases, admissions should come through the “lead institution” or the school the student applied to initially. There doesn’t need to be a formal letter from both schools. There was some discussion about how each institution is notifying each other of acceptances. Brian McGee explained that this is a management issue at the program level, so if letters are significantly different, that is a program level continuity issue and programs should address this one-on-one. This does
not apply to the MBA program or the joint Clemson-CofC Historic Preservation program.

Christine asked if there are any major areas of work that Brian would like this committee to be contemplating over the summer. Brian noted that there are two high priorities for next year: monitoring graduate enrollment and monitoring graduate programs that need to go to CHE, given the competition for graduate programs in the state. Monitoring graduate enrollment should happen not just through council, but also through ongoing work in this committee. The cost structure is high for some programs, and there are not enough students to operate efficiently. The discussion of the decline of student enrollments is a source of great anxiety and we need to have ongoing conversations about this issue. Second, internally, we need to operate with a great deal of scrutiny with regard to graduate programs that need to go to CHE, since there is a competitive mindset in SC given many programs don’t have enough students. Program are aggressive to protect their turf and thus if/when proposals leave campus, they must have been under the highest level of scrutiny, given that research institutions claim they cover the needs of the state. Program duplication across the state is an issue, and education gets much of the focus. We need to strengthen processes and oversight and to work with the dean to create consistency in funding decisions, meeting deadlines, and graduate policy concerns.

Brian McGee thanked the committee for its work this year.

It was decided that the committee would meet on Monday, April 16th at 9 a.m. to bring new committee members up to speed.

E. For the good of the order.

F. Adjournment at 10:12 a.m.

Next meeting: Monday, April 16th at 9 a.m.