

Meeting of the Graduate Council

May 2, 2005

Minutes

Present

Councilors: Arts and Sciences—Kristine Anthis, Jon Bloch, Charles Wieder, Ken Florey, Alan Friedlander, Ross Gingrich, Gerry Lesley, Patricia Olney, Lorrie Verplaetse; **Business**—James Thorson; **CLIS**—Yan Liu, Jane McGinn, Gwendolyn Nowlan, Hrvoje Podnar; **Education**—Beena Achhpal, Robert Axtell, Nancy Boyles, William Diffley, Bernard Hayford, Norris Haynes, Lystra Richardson, Beth Taylor; **HHS**—Mary Bellandese, Jean Breny Bontempi, Elayne Haymes, Susan Killion, Joe Panza, Mary Purdy, Barbara Worden.

Guests/Observers: Dean Sandra Holley, Dean Edward Harris, Dean James M. Granfield, Associate Dean Roseann Diana, John Jean, Patricia Major, Cathryn Magno, Marianne Kennedy.

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Susan Killion called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.

2. Disposition of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of April 4, 2005 with two minor corrections. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Announcements

a. Office of the Academic Vice-President

Ellen Beatty

The interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Beatty, was not able to attend the meeting and asked Dr. Edward Harris, Dean of Library Science and Instructional Technology to give a report in her place. Dean Harris extended greetings to the Council on behalf of interim Vice President Beatty, and indicated that she was extremely pleased with and supportive of the Graduate Student Graduate Assistantship (GSGA) and Graduate Research Fellowship (GRF) programs, the winners of which for next year had recently been determined.

b. Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies

Sandra Holley

The Dean of Graduate Studies addressed the Council concerning the following matters:

- Our Graduate School Open House was a successful event. Over 300 prospective students attended. We thank the faculty, staff, and students who represented their academic departments and provided the information that the attendees sought. We will host an Open House in the fall on Thursday, November 17th and we look forward to the sustained support from all.
- The 7th Annual Graduate Research Symposium will be held this Thursday, May 5 from 1:30 – 4:p.m. in EN 120A. Please come to support the Graduate

Research Fellows who will be presenting their research. We also will introduce the Graduate Research Fellows Class of 2006 and the Graduate School Graduate Assistants Class of 2006 during the symposium.

- Our 7th annual Graduate Commencement will be held on Thursday, May 26, 2005. The speaker for the 2:00 p.m. afternoon commencement for graduates in the schools of Arts & Sciences, Business, and Health and Human Service is Mr. Sean Maloney, Executive Vice President for Communications of the Intel Corporation. The speaker for the 7:00 p.m. evening commencement for graduates in the School of Communication, Information and Library Science and the School of Education is Dr. Betty Lentz Siegel, President of Kennesaw State University in Georgia.

This week, we are sending commencement participation lists to each graduate program chairperson with the request that the chair or chair's designee verify the eligibility of each student listed and provide the name of the member of the graduate faculty who will hood each candidate. We ask that the list be returned to us by Wednesday, May 11.

Commencement rehearsals will be held on Wednesday, May 25 in the morning. Notice will be sent out to graduate program chairpersons and coordinators. Attendance at the rehearsal is important for the smooth coordination of a successful event. There is a rationale for the organization that has evolved over the past five years, and we greatly appreciate the cooperation and support of the members of the graduate faculty.

Due to asbestos removal scheduled for Earl Hall beginning May 23, we will not be able to use Earl to line up students and faculty for the processional. Depending on the weather, the procession lines will be formed either outside Lyman or inside Lyman using the Drama Lab and the side hallway. The weather will be the determining factor. In either case, we are confident that all will proceed successfully. We are relying upon faculty to assist the commencement marshals in ensuring that their students are in line, properly attired, and comport themselves with appropriate decorum for a graduate commencement.

- The Institutional Review Board has had a very active year, and a second IRB Newsletter for this semester is being sent to all full-time and part-time faculty this week. Dean Holley expressed her desire to recognize the members of the IRB:
 1. Mr. Vincent Avallone, Esquire
 2. Dr. Robert Axtell, EXS
 3. Mr. David Denino, Counseling

4. Dr. Shirley Girouard, NUR
5. Dr. Marianne Kennedy, CMD
6. Dr. James Mazur, PSY
7. Dr. Michael Perlin, PCH
8. Dr. Jaak Rakfeldt, SWK
9. Dr. Frank Sansone, CMD, Chair
10. Dr. Cynthia McDaniels, EDF (Alternate)
11. Dr. Mary Purdy, CMD (Alternate)
12. Dr. Karl Rinehardt, EXS (Alternate)

- Finally, Dean Holley expressed her sincerest appreciation to the members of the Graduate Council “who worked diligently to conduct the business of the Graduate Council throughout the year. Your work has been exemplary and I am grateful to you all.”
- Dean Holley continued: “Special acknowledgement and commendation must be given to the members of the Graduate Council Executive Committee who generously donated many hours serving as chairpersons of the Council committees and in other leadership roles. They along with the members of the Council have worked with the School of Graduate Studies to *Advance our Agenda for Excellence* in Graduate Studies at Southern Connecticut State University. Thank you all.”

4. Reports

a. Academic Standards

Gerald Lesley

Gerald Lesley, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), announced that his committee had reviewed the interim report of the Political Science Department and that it would be submitting its recommendation to the Council later in the meeting. The ASC had also revised the guidelines for the “Minimum Elements of a Graduate School Syllabus” that had originally been prepared and disseminated by Dr. Rodney Lane on 10/3/1990, revised from Council procedures adopted 4/4/1988. A copy of those revisions was passed out to the Council for discussion. There was some concern that “methods of evaluation” as listed on a syllabus should be directly and specifically tied into “outcomes” for the course, the listing of which is also mandated. The conclusion of the Council was that the existing language in the revised document did make that connection. There were one or two minor changes regarding wording and the spelling out of “ASC” on the document that were accepted by Dr. Lesley. The document with minor corrections was passed unanimously by the Council (document attached to minutes).

Dr. Lesley then passed out the second document that the ASC had revised, that of “Procedures for Graduate Program Evaluations.” The need for these revisions is twofold: (1) the document should reflect more closely what the current process of program review

actually consists of; and (2) departments should know more clearly what is expected of them when their programs are up for review. Discussion on the document then followed. There was some confusion as to what happened to a program once it had failed to meet the Council's standards after it had been given "conditional approval" instead of "continuing approval" the previous year. If the program were revised after having twice been rejected by the Council, did the revision of the program necessarily have to go to the Curriculum Committee or could it go back to the Academic Standards Committee? Some Council members also felt that a department should not be punished for the fact that they had fewer than three instructors in a graduate program. Dr. Lesley pointed out that there were procedures in place to take care of that eventuality. It was suggested by some members that the entire report be sent back to committee for clarification. Dr. Gingrich, however, felt that the questions that were raised only dealt with items 11 and 13 on the report and that the remainder of the revisions could be voted upon at today's meeting. The document was then passed unanimously by the Council with the understanding that items 11 and 13 would be brought back next year after the language had been clarified by the ASC (document attached).

b. Procedures

Alan Friedlander

Alan Friedlander, Chair of the Procedures Committee, announced the Committee had approved the nominations to the Graduate Faculty of Dr. I. Roy Hunter of Recreation and Leisure Studies, Dr. Leon Yacher of Geography, and Dr. Scott Graves of Science Education / Environmental Science. Their nominations were approved unanimously by the Council.

Dr. Friedlander also announced that Dr. Karl Rinehardt of the Faculty Senate was attempting to bring to the floor of the Senate this year the changes in Rules of Procedure of the Council that the Council had approved at its last meeting.

c. Curriculum

Mary Purdy

Mary Purdy, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, announced that her committee had reviewed thirteen new course proposals and one new program; They recommended that the following five courses be approved as written: EDL 800—Dissertation Research and Writing: Dissertation Seminar, CSC 533—Real-Time Systems, CSC 563—Distributed Applications Development, CSC 576—Data Mining, and SED 512—Curriculum Methods and Materials for Students With Autism Spectrum Disorders and Other Developmental Disabilities. The Committee also approved the following four courses with minor revisions: EDL 725—Using Computers to Facilitate Data-Based Decision Making, EDL 801—Independent Study, CSC 531—Computer Graphics, and PSC 527—Seminar in Public Policy. The Committee tabled the following three courses: ILS 683—The Dramatics of Story Telling, ILS 686—Sacred Storytelling, and ILS 694—Storytelling and Character Education. It did not review CHE 560—Advanced Environmental Chemistry. It also approved with minor revisions the dual degree program in Master of Social Work and Women's Studies.

A motion was made to accept the committee's recommendations with regard to the nine approved programs and the dual degree program. The motion was passed unanimously.

5. Old Business

Dr. Lesley introduced Dr. Patricia Olney of the Political Science Department to present that department's interim report. Dr. Olney acknowledged the problems that had existed in the department's previous report and indicated that Political Science had worked hard to eliminate or alleviate the difficulties. She indicated that last year the ASC felt that the department relied too much on cross listed courses, those courses that had been combined with undergraduate equivalents. What the department has done was to cut down on the number of courses that it offers and to develop graduate student only courses that are required in the program. The department was also working on methods to track its students better. She showed the Council surveys that demonstrated that students were very pleased with the intellectual content and overall quality of the classes.

Dr. Marianne Kennedy indicated that she was very impressed with what the department had done in the past year to address the Council's concerns. Dr. Lesley noted that the Academic Standards Committee agreed, and that its feelings were reflected in his report to the Council. He also said that the ASC believed strongly that the graduate coordinator in the Political Science Department should be granted 2 credits of release time during the year instead of 1 ½ credits as is the situation at present.

The Council then approved unanimously the recommendation of the ASC that the Political Science Program be granted the status of "continuing approval" for the next five years.

6. New Business

Dr. Killion then asked the chairs of the three standing committees of the Council to distribute their annual reports to Council members and take approximately five minutes each to review them.

Dr. Lesley of the Academic Standards Committee pointed out that his committee, consisting of 12 members plus himself, had reviewed 7 programs during the course of the year and had recommended "continuing approval" for each of them. The committee also reviewed and revised documents pertaining to the "Minimum Requirements for a Graduate Course Syllabus," "Procedures for Graduate Program Evaluations," and "Guidelines for Preparing the Graduate Program Report." His committee will pilot an information session for the participants involved in the preparation of program reports for the coming academic year. The inaugural presentation is scheduled for May 9, 2005 from 1-3 p.m. in MO11.

Dr. Purdy of the Curriculum Committee noted that her committee did not prepare a written report for the meeting but that one would be forthcoming. Her committee did recommend passage of the first joint degree program under the new guidelines. They also

reviewed 33 new course proposals, most of which they approved. They were currently working on guidelines for interdisciplinary programs.

Dr. Friedlander of the Procedures Committee indicated that his committee consisted of 11 members. This year the committee considered and reviewed 29 nominations to the graduate faculty, approved of 26 and disapproved 2. One was withdrawn. The Procedures Committee anticipates continuing to review nominations under the newly revised Rules of Order.

The next item of business under “New Business” was that of election of officers. Dr. Friedlander presented the slate of officers that had been recommended by the Procedures Committee. These were Dr. Gerald Lesley as Chair, Dr. Kenneth Florey as Vice Chair, and Dr. Patricia Olney as Secretary. There were no further nominations from the floor. This slate of officers for next year was then approved unanimously by the Council.

Dr. Killion then indicated that it was now the time for councilors to raise any issues they felt needed expression. There were no new issues raised.

7. Adjournment

Chairperson Killion adjourned the meeting at 2:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ken Florey, Secretary

Appendix to Minutes

Minimum Elements of a Graduate School Syllabus

- 1. Course Number and Title**
- 2. Instructor** (Who as well as where, when and how to contact. Office hours should be convenient for students enrolled in the course. Electronic mail addresses should be included whenever possible)
- 3. Prerequisite Requirements** (List courses, experience, skills, permission, level, etc.)
- 4. Course Description** (Copy from the current Graduate Catalog or the course approval form if it is a new course)
- 5. Course Objectives/Learner Outcomes and Assessment** (This section should indicate to students what they can expect to know and/or be able to do as a result of successfully completing the course requirements. Outcomes should be written in terms of the knowledge or skills students will attain rather than material covered in the course. Methods for the assessment and/or evaluation of the completion of learner outcomes should be included as per the requirements for new course proposals. Outcomes where appropriate should be correlated with the program outcomes as described in the department report)

- to the Graduate Council Academic Standards Committee. A diversity statement should be included when it is appropriate to a specific discipline.)
6. **Modes of Instruction** (Students should know what they will be doing in order to attain the objectives/outcomes listed above, i.e. listening to lectures, participating in discussions, discussing cases, doing research, reading assignments, completing laboratory work, field work, receiving critiques of individual and/or group projects, etc.)
 7. **Course Outline** (Typically by class session including appropriate correlation to text chapters, journal articles, case studies, etc.)
 8. **Course Requirements** (Students should know what is required of them including: text, attendance, class participation, readings, papers, projects, reports, lab work, technological competencies, and any other performance expectations. Information presented here should relate directly to the achievement of the objectives/learner outcomes described in item 5.)
 9. **Evaluation** (Students should know how they are going to be evaluated including the frequency and types of examinations and other elements that will form the basis of their grade. The weight given to each element should be included.)
 10. **Current Bibliography**
 11. **Accommodation Statement** (A statement dealing with the policy for accommodating students with a disability incorporating the language suggested by the DRC)
 12. **Academic Honesty Statement** (A statement addressing the instructor/department policy regarding pertinent issues such as plagiarism, cheating on examinations etc. and the consequences.)

Revised 5/2/2005

Examples of course syllabi can be found in the appendices of the program reports submitted to the ASC. These documents and examples of new course proposals that include many of the components of the syllabus requirements are stored for consultation at Buley library. New course proposals can be viewed online by the department representative(s) to the Graduate Council by accessing the WebCT account for the School of Graduate Studies.

These guidelines were approved by the Graduate Council (4/4/1988) and are amended from a memorandum prepared and disseminated by Dr. Rod Lane (10/3/1990).

Comment [TU1]: This document will be posted online and can be distributed if necessary.

PROCEDURES FOR GRADUATE PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

In so far as the Graduate Council must approve all new graduate programs before they can be offered on an ongoing basis at SCSU, there is a need for a regular and systematic graduate program evaluation process to promote the quality and maintain the integrity of existing graduate programs as well as to assure program viability.

The "Standards for Graduate Programs," adopted by the Graduate Council, will serve as the standard against which program evaluations will be conducted. A major role of the Academic Standards Committee is to advise programs in meeting those standards as well as to offer technical preparation advice.

The Academic Standards Committee will review existing programs according to the duties described in the "Rules of Order." Given the diverse nature of the certification programs offered at this institution, the objective of the Academic Standards Committee will be to review only the graduate level components of programs. Data pertaining to students evaluated in undergraduate level courses may be incorporated into the program report but should be clearly differentiated from data pertaining to students evaluated in graduate level courses.

Procedures

1. Each existing graduate program will be evaluated by the Graduate Council once every five years on a rotating schedule presented in writing by the Chair of the Academic Standards Committee. Each year, the Graduate Dean will publish and disseminate the Graduate Program Review Schedule to the school deans, department chairpersons, graduate program coordinators/directors, and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.
2. The department, which conducts the graduate program to be evaluated, will prepare a written report of the program based upon the Standards for Graduate Programs and submit it to the Academic Standards Committee at the meeting of the Graduate Council prior to the scheduled meeting of the oral presentation before the Graduate Council.
3. The Academic Standards Committee will evaluate the program based upon the written report submitted by the respective department using the Evaluation Form appended to these procedures. The Academic Standards Committee will meet with the representatives of the department one week after the receipt of the report to discuss the standards that have been judged as "met" or "not met" and any additional recommendations which the Academic Standards Committee deems important to program integrity and quality. Within three weeks of receipt of the report, the Chairperson of the Academic Standards Committee will submit a narrative report and summary findings based on the rating scale to the respective department.
4. The department, which submitted the written program report, shall address the concerns of the Academic Standards Committee at the time of the scheduled oral presentation before the Graduate Council and in the subsequent report generated for distribution to the Graduate Council members.

5. At the meeting of the Graduate Council, when the oral presentation is made, or at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Graduate Council, the Academic Standards Committee will make a recommendation to the Graduate Council to:
 - (a) Grant continuing approval of the program
 - or
 - (b) Grant conditional approval of the program

These are the only recommendations within the authority of the ASC.

6. If a department does not submit the appropriate written report according to the timeline described in number 2 above, the Academic Standards Committee will so advise the Graduate Council, which will then grant conditional approval of the program. The Chairperson of the Academic Standards Committee will provide written notification to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies to request a meeting with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, Dean of the Academic School, chairperson of the department, and coordinator(s)/director(s) of the program(s) to outline a schedule for, and aid in, the successful completion of the review process.
7. By a majority vote, the Graduate Council will accept, reject or table the recommendation of the Academic Standards Committee. The factors leading to continuing approval, or the conditions leading to conditional approval, and the action of the Graduate Council shall be communicated in writing by the Academic Standards Committee to the respective department chairpersons, program coordinator(s)/director(s), appropriate academic dean and academic vice president. The minutes of the Graduate Council meeting shall serve as a written record of the vote of the Graduate Council.
8. Any graduate program granted conditional approval by a majority vote of the Graduate Council will have up to eleven months from the published date in the **Graduate Program Review Schedule** to address the conditions cited and provide the Academic Standards Committee with a written interim report.
9. The interim report addressing the cited conditions will be evaluated by the Academic Standards Committee. The department submitting the report will have an opportunity to meet with the Academic Standards Committee one week subsequent to the submission of the interim report before the evaluation is completed. No later than one calendar year after previous action by the Graduate Council, the Academic Standards Committee will recommend that:

- (a) The Graduate Council grant continuing approval of the program or
- (b) The Graduate Council deny continuing approval of the program. In this eventuality, a representative of the affected department will be present at the meeting of the Graduate Council to present an alternative perspective on the Academic Standards Committee's recommendation.

(At this point in the process, these are the only recommendations within the authority of the ASC.)

10. If continuing approval of the graduate program is granted by a majority vote of the Graduate Council, the graduate program will be deemed to be in full compliance with the SCSU "Standards for Graduate Programs" and will continue to be published in the subsequent graduate catalog.
11. If continuing approval of the graduate program is denied by a majority vote of the Graduate Council, the Graduate Council will forward to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the Dean of the Academic School, and to the Academic Vice President, the action of the Graduate Council to deny continuing approval of that program with the following recommendations:
 - (a) That the program be removed from the subsequent graduate catalog;
 - (b) That, if the program is not in compliance with the "Standards for Graduate Programs" within one year of the recommendation to deny continuing approval, no new students will be allowed to enroll in the program after one year from the date of the recommendation to deny continuing approval.
12. The Dean of Graduate Studies and the Academic Vice President will be requested to report their actions regarding the affected department to the full Graduate Council within four academic weeks or at the next Graduate Council meeting.
13. For those programs that have been denied continuing approval, the Academic Standards Committee shall serve in a consultative capacity if requested in writing by the Academic Vice President, the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, or the affected department or program. During this period:
 - (a) The affected program, with the approval of the school dean, may be resubmitted as a revised program following the established procedures of the Graduate Council.

- (b) New students will be allowed to enroll in the program pending approval of the revised program (by the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee and a majority vote of the Graduate Council) within one calendar year of being denied continuing approval.

- 14. After a program which has been denied continuing approval is reinstated, it shall be evaluated by the Graduate Council according to the following schedule:
 - (a) one year after reinstatement;
 - (b) on the 5 year published Graduate Program Review Schedule thereafter.