October 2nd, 2019

KC-300 (Kennesaw Campus)

12:30PM

Minutes

Voting Members Present: Doug Moodie, Tridib Bandy, Reza Parizi, Meng Han, Yi Jin, Stacy Delacruz, M.A. Karim, Bill Bailey, Cherilyn McLester, Rene McClatchey, LeeAnn Lands, Charity Butcher, Susan Smith, Marina Koether, Heather Scott, Debbie Smith

Voting Members Absent: Ameen Farooq, Pavan Meadati

Meeting called to order at 12:33.

Agenda:

3. Review of Executive Committee Minutes (9/18/19)
1. INED 7980
5. Agenda items:
   ○ The Graduate Certification in Leadership and Ethics, and ILEC courses. Presented by Mark Forehand. This institute has been around for 10 years. Started by Seigel. Offers a 5-course certificate and serves as part of three masters programs. At first, 19 programs were associated with this. The MBA provided the majority of students, but no longer wishes to use this program. Only a handful of students are enrolled. This semester we offer three courses with enrollments of 3, 6 and 8. Several are on TAP (Tuition Assistance Program). Tridib – these are just for this program? Forehand – they’re not offered anywhere else. D. Smith – motion to discontinue the 10 ILEC courses and the ILEC certificate and waive 2nd. Second by McClatchey. Approved. 1 abstain.
   ○ Engineering Management, MSEM. Presented by Bailey. There are three programs in our department. We’ve run into problems of squeezing students into these programs. It’s a 30-hour program. We need to add 6 other electives to the program. Smith – there’s a body that certifies these kinds of programs. Bailey: There aren’t any in ABET. Our Quality Assurance would go through another body. Smith – my question is whether these courses would normally be certified by an outside body. Bandy – you’re talking about the MSEM program, right? If these are the new courses, they are mostly QA. In the set of electives, should everything be from QA? Bailey – we selected QA because there’s a lot of quality management. Bandy – Did you look in Coles? I have not been privy to any of this. Bailey – I’m sure there are courses in the business school we could use. At the time the collaboration was being done, Coles didn’t seem to be interested. Bandy – this is an opportunity for MSIS. Bailey – that’s a valid question. These are listed as QA and that discipline has a lot of management in it. Bandy – I only saw this about 3 minutes ago. Bailey. We have room in our courses and they’re appropriate. Bandy – did you look up our courses? Bailey – I’ll follow up. Motion to accept and waive second to add these courses as electives. 2nd Karim. Discussion. Karim – Tridib, what do you want? To work with Bailey? Bandy – no, just wanted to know the thought process. I’m not against it. Approved.
      i. EDSM 8701
      ii. EDSM 8901
iii. EDSM 8902

- Start with EdS. Our secondary and middle grades program is collaborative, math, English, chemistry, science, history departments. In 2015, we did a survey with current students and alumni for improvement. They said they wanted more content courses in their field. Also, they want more project-based activities. Talked with stakeholders. Not reducing any hours, but replacing courses to the education core. Many of those are shared with other departments in Bagwell. We proposed this to reduce the core from 15 to 9 hours, and then moved 6 hours into content hours. We created Capstone courses, so we will be able to work with candidates to do capstone courses. For EdS in Secondary, the only difference is their concentration. They are in the same courses. The revision is same.

- The EdS is embedded in the EdD, which is why we had to change it. Going from 27 -> 15 hours for core, so 9 goes into content. For Secondary EdD, it’s identical. The difference is if they are coming as a middle school or high school certificate.

- EDSM 8701 – this used to be a Social Justice course. Was taught by a teacher who retired. Want to make this course broader so more faculty can teach the course. This will replace previous course. Bandy – this was created to get more depth? Chang – this is to broaden the course. The Social Justice was very specific. Gwaltney – question about the appropriateness of majors to teach course. Chang – yes, these are all appropriate. Usually only faculty with strength in this are scheduled to teach this course. Gwaltney – this says that all of these majors are appropriate at the time of graduation. Chang – many of our faculty have this degree, so we put that there so they can teach it. Dishman: if a faculty has that degree and went to the chair, they could claim they had the appropriate degree. Chastine – the “or closely related degree” can’t be encoded. Smith – general question. What is the mechanism for justification. Gwaltney – the ones listed here are automatics. After that, there’s graduate faculty status and SACSCOC visits and justifications are written. Smith – there’s nothing here in this procedure that happens later. Moodie – Can we separate this course from the rest of the package?

- EDSM 8901/8902 – these are the capstone courses for our EdS and EdD. Students want more project-related coursework. Students are introduced to seminal readings. Taking a lot of content courses outside the department. Students take this course in the beginning of the program and begin to design their capstone project. Related is EDSM 8902 – they work on their capstone paper and present it to their peers. Karim – questions about CIP codes. Edwards – all three of these courses need to be updated to Fall 2020. Karim – we can probably strike out 13.0301 and get rid of closely-related. Moodie – part of the package… Chang – it is part of the package. McClester – should send feedback to peers. Karim – there was one CIP code (42). McClester – where are we (the group) with regard to this? Bailey – motion to approve package of first reading, look for changes on second reading. Gregory – can we have the suggestion as part of the package now? 2nd - Delacruz. Smith – for consideration. We are approving something that we know has a defect. Moodie – it’s not approval, it just a first reading. Smith – restate the motion? Bailey restates. Smith – what’s the purpose if we’re not approving it. [Discussion of rules]. 9 approved. 2 opposed. 0 abstain. Approved.

6. Old Business: none

** Summary of CIP discussion

EDSM 8701 – Remove 13.0301. Add 30.2301,

EDSM 8901/8902 - 42.2608 does not exist, so needs to be removed or modified.