

Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee

September 5th, 2018

KC 401

12:30PM

Minutes

Voting Members Present: Humayun Zafar (Proxy), 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 12:31. Quorum was established (16/18).

Agenda - Business Meeting

- 1) Approval of Agenda, **Motion to approve: 1st Moodie, 2nd Karim, Approved.**
- 2) Review and Approval of GPCC Minutes (8/22/18), Correction: Koether was at a conference and is (E)xcused. **Motion to approved modified minutes. 1st Moodie, 2nd Karim. Approved.**
- 3) Review of Executive Committee Minutes (8/29/18).
- 4) Tentative items of discussion:
 - a. curriculum pause – presented by Nowak. Curriculum pause for foreseeable future. Nowak/Wade-Berg/Whitlesey/Dishman named for working group. Going to be looking at curricular process. Will be looking at comparable R3 institutions to see how we can improve the process. We have a failure of review by predicate committees. Anything in the queue has been administratively rejected. If there is a case where 1) a student is adversely affected or 2) external accreditation requires changes, then it will be considered. The group needs input from faculty. McClatchey – what is the timeline for lifting the pause? Nowak: ASAP, but want to do it right. At other universities, proposals can take two years to pass. The tentative timeline is January. Process hasn't changed in 20 years. Dishman: any proposal must pass through shared governance bodies. Nowak: Faculty Senate will be briefed later this month. Koether: why the pause? Nowak: we are failing at levels of shared governance – predicate bodies; proposals not being reviewed as they should be. We're now in a unique year. We haven't had a chance to look at Policy in a long time.
 - b. thesis and dissertation forms – presented by Palamiotis. Charged with looking at issues with doctoral students, including number of dissertation hours. Forms are listed on the website. What are peer institutions doing? Setting deadlines for forms. At KSU, student forms are put into NoliWeb. Program of Study should be turned in from the beginning semester. Only 10% of these were turned in. Students are coming in under a specific catalog, but catalog changes – causing confusion. The Committee Approval form – about 8% of these have turned them in. Doug – how can they graduate? Pal: not checked by Registrar's office. Moodie: has anyone asked the directors? Dishman: we did in 2014, 2015, and 2017. Process still not working. Karim: is there any follow up discussion from The Graduate College? Dishman: same dates. Proposal Approvals: 9% of these turned in. Candidacy Approval: 10%. Defense: 9%. Some of these people aren't done, so we have time.

- c. IRB compliance – presented by Palamiotis. For students in dissertation 9% turned in. Dishman: in 2017, we did an analysis, and approximate 90% would have required IRB approval. Purcell: with IRB, there's an exemption policy. We should agree (as a university) to go through the process. Butcher: we should be clear about who gets exemptions (e.g. those who work exclusively with numbers). Nowak: how many of those people were hooded? Palamiotis: not sure. Karim: not all people need IRB approval. Dishman: 90% of the dissertations needed IRB approval. Bailey: doctoral training should include IRB and exemption is IRB's decision. Rutherford: for DBA program, it's the faculty member who runs that through, not the student. Never had a student not do IRB. Palamiotis: only looked at students. Dishman: there was some of that, but doesn't explain the variance. Students said "I was told I didn't have to do IRB." Smith: question about dissertation approval. Is a proposal required? Baugher: are these oral proposals? Smith: they are done informally. Dishman: is there a formal meeting of the minds where it is approved? Smith: no, but it sounds like there should be. Edwards: when this form is submitted, is the title locked in? Unknown person: the title can change. Dishman: cases where title evolved over time. On the Defense Outcome form, the title is listed again (in case it changes). Palamiotis: sometimes the committee members leave KSU, but they should contact us. McCloud: can we make a video for the students that explains all of this? Palamiotis: most schools have a handbook. Once we have that, we can have some video. McCloud: I think the IRB has online training. Dishman: one of the requirements is that they have to take responsibility for the investigation. Thus far, students claim faculty told them not to get IRB. Unknown: is this database populated by advisors? Palamiotis: it's in their NoliWeb record, and we have an Excel file. They currently go to Dean Chastine. Dishman: it would be difficult for Dean Chastine – you've suggested a committee that is inadequate. Nowak: what do you want from us? Palamiotis: we have students who are scheduled to graduate who have not submitted their forms. We will be sending out/contacting these students. Dishman: we had this problem in 2014. We were assured in 2014 by the colleges that it would be taken care of. The same thing in 2015 and 2017. We may be asked to create an administrative structure for this. Moodie: you can't rely on voluntary efforts. Dishman: this can impact our R3 status as well as our status with federal funding agencies. It can become a reportable problem. Karim: is there any punishment from the dean and/or department chair? Hayes: the issue is sometimes the way the program is designed. There aren't necessarily curricular markers for where these occur. Some students sign up for dissertation hours to develop their proposals, so they may not have that form. Palamiotis: this should be seen in the program of study. Hayes: there's no way to explain that on the form. McClester: have the IRB # be part of the document. Dishman: it's a question of non-presence (missing forms). Jones: part of this is not that you have forms. Who is responsible for putting the hold? Moodie: someone has to sit down and write a detailed policy. Jones: wording is loose. Hill: a body that is representative of graduate should take up this process. Could be that schools have internal forms. Tried to send them in and Grad College doesn't want them. Baugher: not correct. All of these forms are required. Hill: Sometimes there are difference messages for doctoral and masters students. Dishman: some colleges have several more forms than The Graduate College requires. Those forms removed signatures. The core forms are the minimum. Hill: program of study form is required? Palamiotis: yes. Bailey: we're including non-thesis? Dishman: yes. Students bring in hours from other institutions, and not filling out this form causes confusion. Nowak: we have one more item. Butcher: if we don't know which courses are offered in a particular semester, do we put placeholders? Palamiotis: No. We receive updated ones all the time.

- d. dissertation hours and financial aid – presented by Palamiotis. We have issues with students registering for well over the number of hours they need. Those requiring 9 hours took 12. Those requiring 12, 15.6. For 15, 19.3. As an example: a student has taken 30 hours, we have no forms, and they are getting financial aid. Unknown person: Do they need to submit some kind of syllabus? Palamiotis: it's part of advising. Baugher: financial aid is getting tighter – and they will only pay for courses that satisfy degree requirements. What happened in the past is that students would register for 3 hours, but needs 5 hours for aid.
- e. dissertation credit hours and the amount of work they represent – Baugher: no discussion at the end of the semester. Should consider changing curriculum. Hayes: why is minimum dissertation hours (in catalog) considered as maximum? We need to see what we can do to challenge IP problem. There are students we don't hear from that should receive a 'U', but receive an IP. Dishman: the IP and the U are not the problem. The problem is when students take 30 hours which are all S. When questioned, that student hasn't even started. Edwards: there's a Continuous Enrollment Policy, where students must enroll in at least 1 hour, followed by Grading of Thesis/Dissertation credits policy. Dishman: as a faculty member, are you comfortable with a student telling you how many hours they will be taking. Moodie: with foreign students, they sign up for hours to keep their visa current. Forehand: this creates legal problems because of the I-20. If homeland security looks at it, that can cause problems for us. Unknown: what about students who start, take a break, and then restart? Palamiotis: there's a Leave of Absence form. Baugher: For Grading of Thesis/Dissertation credits: the BoR gave the option of establishing this policy. We should revisit this policy. Still, someone has to be responsible for the amount of work a student does relative to the credit hours. Dishman: merging those ideas, for the lingering dissertations, is it possible to tie into a program that, during the first semester of dissertation, they will have the following benchmarks, then the grade of 'S' will be giving because they have met that benchmark? Bailey: I agree, but we may also have individual contracts with the students. Moodie: having a clear project plan with milestones will be very helpful. Bailey: that could be the reason a lot of them linger. Palamiotis: clarification, the Leave of Absence form is for those who are gone for a year. McCloud: I like Dr. Moodie's proposal. Bailey: when students do their plan of study, one of the benchmarks could be the forms. Jones: for those semester hours, it could be similar to the undergraduate research forms. McLester: Are we looking for a motion? Nowak: group? We have been asked to consider these issues. We have options: 1) form subcommittees, 2) we've given our input to The Graduate College or 3) tell Graduate College "go ahead". This is an enforcement issue. Butcher: when we're talking about dissertations, it may be useful to list the ways the forms are not being followed. Perhaps leave the process development to the individual programs. Nowak: two issues – compliance (is the form submitted) and compliance (academic). This group can be involved. **McLester: motion. The Graduate College will make some revisions to the things we've talked about today and come back to this body for further review/discussion.** Dishman: that's what this was. We will take it to the deans and Provost. In 30 days, we'll know what we're doing. Hayes: let's give them a deadline before GPCC meeting to have enough time to review. We're going to solicit the program and then bring back to this body. **Motion withdrawn.** Moodie: if you just go out and ask for ideas, you won't get much back. Dishman: what goes to the deans will have a jarring degree of specificity. Butcher: accompanied with "if you don't come up with policies, we will." **McLester motion: programs will be asked to provide input on the process we discussed today, and those will be brought to the EC firsthand then this body afterwards. Bailey, 2nd. Approved.**
- f. the GRE as an admission requirement – not discussed

- g. relative class sizes for graduate courses – not discussed
 - h. the importance of understanding the resources needed to successfully support new programs
– not discussed
- 5) New Business: **Smith: Motion to carry over items above. Moodie, 2nd. Approved.**
- 6) **Motion to adjourn: Moodie, 2nd McLester.**

Adjourn: 1:57PM