

Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee

October 3rd, 2018

KC 401

12:30PM

Minutes

Voting Members Present: Humayun Zafar, Doug Moodie, Paola Spoletini (Proxy), Mingon Kang, Stacy Delacruz, Chinasa Elue, M.A. Karim, Bill Bailey, Rene McClatchey, Cherilyn McLester, Charity Butcher, LeeAnn Lands, Scott Nowak, Marina Koether, Debbie Smith, Heather Scott

Voting Members Absent: Ameen Farooq, Pavan Meadati

Meeting started 12:30PM. Quorum was established (16/18).

Agenda – Business Meeting

- 1) Approval of Agenda – 1st Moodie, McLatchey 2nd - approved
- 2) Review and Approval of GPCC Minutes (9/5/18) – 1st Moodie, 2nd Smith – approved.
- 3) Review of Executive Committee Minutes (9/19/18)
- 4) Tentative items of discussion:
 - a. IRB and program of study form – presented by Nowak. Unresolved issue from last meeting. Motion was approved but no timeline for that action. Do we want to formally request from programs, or informally? Karim: will this be done by The Graduate College? Nowak: the discussion was what we approved didn't state if we were going to do the reach out. Who should do it? Dishman: my recollection that the programs handle how they are going to address the systemic noncompliance without The Graduate College crafting the solution. We have had many forms coming in (especially BCoE). We prefer this not to be an annual non-compliance issue. The Graduate College will only get involved if needed. Bailey: for on-going compliance, we need a mechanism. Perhaps the Registrar's office? McLester: have there been any adjustments to the forms for those MS programs with capstones? Palamiotis: nothing yet. Dishman: we're looking at a draft explicitly for dissertation. Moodie: I agree with Bill (Bailey). Needs to be a semi-automatic process so if the programs don't do it correctly, it doesn't have to come back up in GPCC. We want some permanent process. **Motion by Moodie: The Graduate College and Registrar come up with a continuous process that will work from now on so that students can't start writing their dissertations until the forms are submitted.** Butcher: having The Graduate College work with the programs that everyone can follow will be more efficient. **Motion modified by Moodie to include programs in the development of this process.** Dishman: this is why we delayed. Students are being hurt, so ideally we'd like to have the forms on the front end. Also ties in with Financial Aid. Bailey: it seems like one way is to incorporate it into the curriculum for each program. Palamiotis: during my presentation, there were a lot of forms. I offered to talk with the programs and I met with BCoE.

Within two days, I had tons of them from BCoE. Petition to Graduate forms need to get in ASAP. **Moodie re-amend motion: I think we need a draft policy and then it can go out to everyone.** Too many people at the beginning won't lead to progress. Butcher: it won't hurt to get input at the outset. Might be good to have a meeting for initial thoughts. Bailey: I wonder if this is a policy issue, or we need a mechanism. Moodie: if there was some automatic process that would prevent them from making progress. If it's just the Registrar, it may cause problems. Dishman: The Graduate College requests that GPCC give another 30 days to come up with solutions. If not, TGC can come up with the solution. Moodie: people just forget about doing the forms. Some may be filling them in and not sending them in.

Motion withdrawn. Motion by Moodie: propose if within 30 days the directors of the programs haven't resolved the issue with TGC, then TGC will draw up a draft policy that will be brought to GPCC. Hayes: point of clarification. Who initiates this? This is the same as last time. Nowak: if it comes back, I would appoint a sub-committee. Hayes: sometimes the most appropriate bodies would be the curriculum committees. Dishman: this is an administrative matter. We're asking for input. We would love to have participation from the programs. **2nd Koether. – Approved.** Dishman: TGC appreciates everyone's help.

- b. Scientific journal subscriptions – presented by David Evans. Need support on a decision about the Elsevier subscription. Previously negotiated to \$80K/year. The price went to \$287K/year. 85 institution in Sweden cancelled, 75% of Taiwanese, etc... Elsevier will likely come back with a piecemeal subscription. We have talked to the Deans Council, Humanities and CSM use them. Karim: if we need them, what can we do. Evans: I've set about \$10K to help pay. Karim: do you know why the increase? Evans: they're predators. UCF paid \$1M. Nowak: after 5 requests, we get a copyright issue. It's easy to see 5 requests. What's the recourse? Evans: I've set aside money. Soon, we'll run out of money. Nowak: we just moved to R3 and research is key. We need to have a model going forward. If we have limits, that can get us into trouble. What's to keep us [faculty] from going to illegal sites? Evans: there's no solution here. Nowak: how much faculty input did you get? Evans: zero. Nowak: the new president? Evans: no – there was a time issue. I only learned about it mid-September. Moodie: are other publishers doing the same thing? Evans: we've been watching others and they're doing the same thing. Lands: this DB affects our colleges. What did the deans say – did they have problems with it? Evans: no. Butcher: can you publish a list of journals they don't have access to anymore. Evans: good idea. Zafar: isn't there a library committee? Evans: yes, they're meeting next week. Zafar: when it comes to the USG, we don't see collaborative things for the libraries like we do other things. Evans: they [Elsevier] want to maximize the profits. McLester: How is this going to get rolled out to faculty, and what kind of increase should we see with inter-library loans? Evans: 2-3 days. The rollout is in talking with the deans. Bailey: this was discussed at some meetings last year. Koether: when is this effective? Evans: January 1st. Forehand: have you already set aside the money? Evans: yes, \$10K. Koether: there was originally \$80K. Where did that go? Evans: money had to be used for other things. Dishman: This would equate to 18% of the University's total indirects.

- c. Exceptions for working in Curriculog during moratorium – presented by Nowak. This is just a notice that there are some exceptions that are being allowed. Any issue that harms students or accreditation-related issues. Hopefully, you do not have any items in your Curriculog to-do list. Any questions, please refer them to The Graduate College.
- d. Differential in online vs F2F fees while students are in dissertation/thesis – presented by Nowak. Dishman: this body and the Grad Council, we have a challenge when students are in dissertation with the fees. When they took less than 3 hours, fees exceeded the tuition, which led students to sign up for more hours and take out more loans. We are looking at a solution. A series of placeholders of online courses with variable hours. Our thinking is it would make it more economical for students, and help them in the writing phase. There are challenges – communication needs to be in online format. However, gives a powerful tool for students. Butcher: this implies that you aren't allowed to meet with online students F2F. Edwards: these sections would have to be approved by distance learning. If a course is online, they can't come on campus. Palamiotis: online students don't have to submit immunization. [General discussion]. Dishman: they come to campus as a member of the general public... if they are evading, that would be different. [General discussion]. Dishman: this is a solution that we could implement almost immediately, and students not incurring debt. Grad students don't do a lot of things activities with the fee money. [General discussion]. Dishman: the important thing is not to appear to be defrauding the system. McCloud: this is just an additional offering? Dishman: it's just an additional tool. Bailey: it's possible to have a program that wants to set up both. We need to make sure it's legitimate with SACS. Delacruz: does financial aid still cover? Dishman: could be a substitute. Could be a GRAD 9900 that could be used for all programs. [General discussion]. Dishman: if you don't want us to explore this, that's OK. McCloud: is there a disadvantage to leaving it as optional? Nowak: do we want TGC to explore this? **Motion by Bailey: we ask TGC to further explore this matter. Koether – 2nd. Approved.**
- e. Advance previous GPCC items to next agenda. Nowak: want to push (h) from last [9/5/18] agenda (resources). One issue that comes up that whenever a new program is proposed or a new course load, that there are resources for deploying that program. Here we say “we're going to use existing resources”. When the curriculum pause is removed, we need to understand resourcing, including library, faculty time, classroom. The curriculum working group is trying to come up with a model for this. We need to think about resources to deploy that model. Example: program proposal for 300 students into a cohort class, but we don't have a lecture hall. Moodie: if the resources are coming because you're canceling something, that should be explained. Every new program has to have resources that come from somewhere. Karim: it's a kind of current practice but may fall through. Nowak: we see course proposals that say no new resources are needed.

Two other items (f) – the GRE as an admission requirement – we need to develop an idea/sense of the group, thoughts about GRE as a requirement. We've had several programs come through wanting to do this. The successful ones have an additional metric to waive the GRE. Dishman: if you waive the GRE, not more than

½ the students can come in with the waiver. In 2015, we said programs should have alternative paths. The additional proxy can't be under the control of the faculty (external). Forehand: we had a program that has three paths. Important to use the word "alternative". From an admission's standpoint. Students don't want to take GRE. McClatchey – how many outside metrics? Forehand: we'd prefer three. Dishman: the faculty can make the argument that the metric can predict the success. Forehand: in Bailey's programs, they use licensure. Hayes: if the GPCC rejects it, it's because they don't explain why it's an adequate substitute. You may only use part of the GRE (e.g. writing portion) and then have alternates for the other parts of the exam. Nowak: when this happens in the future, we need a working standard for what's acceptable. Hayes: GRE is important for some, but not all, programs. Dishman: average age is 34 years old, so testing more recall than anything else. McCloud: is there any follow up to see how GRE correlates to success. Dishman: there was a negative correlation between GPA (in the accounting program) and success. Promotions were more important. **Nowak: Motion: save discussion of (g) – relative class sizes – till next meeting. Bailey, 2nd – approved.**

- f. Recording GPCC minutes – Nowak: we need a better method of recording minutes. If a member of GPCC is willing, we need to designate another member to record minutes. We looked into recording to prevent "he said, she said". The important thing is to have an accurate reflection of what happens here. If you're willing, please notify me.

5) New Business - none

6) Motion to Adjourn – Koether, 1st, Karim 2nd.

Meeting ended at 1:31PM.