

**GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 10, 2007**

The following members were present: George Bates, GPC Chair, Biology; Nancy Marcus, Dean, Graduate Studies; Anne Rowe, Dean of the Faculties; Bettye Anne Case, Math; Flip Froelich, Oceanography; Frank Tomasulo, Film; Lois Shepard, Law; Peter Easton, Education; David Johnson, Humanities; Ken Apel, Communication; Darcy Siebert, Social Work; Michael Reisig, Criminology; Seth Beckman, Music; Eliza Dresang, Information; Colleen Muscha, Theatre; Randy Rill, Medicine; Rebecca Miles, Social Sciences; Amy Chan Hilton, Engineering; Ron Mullis, Human Sciences; Molly Wasko, Business

The following members were absent. Alternates present are listed in parentheses: Kathleen Erndl, Religion; Susan Lynn, Education; David MacPherson, Social Sciences; Lee Stepina, Business; Linda Sullivan, Nursing; Rodney Roberts, Engineering; Matthew Chandler, Graduate Student Representative

Also present: Jayne Standley, Faculty Senate President; Judith Devine, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies; Sarah Earley, GPC Staff Assistant, Graduate Studies; Melanie Booker, Admissions; Hege Fergeson, Admission; Kristin Hagen, International Center; Fritz Davis, History and Philosophy of Science; Michael Ruse, History and Philosophy of Science

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Jayne Standley, Faculty Senate President. **A quorum was present.** She thanked the members of the Graduate Policy Committee (GPC) on behalf of the Faculty Senate for their service on the committee. She said she wanted to convey the importance of the role of the GPC as a faculty group giving input on graduate policy and how critical this was to Florida State University. She explained the GPC had been convening for over 30 years and the process of reviewing graduate programs had been occurring for over 20 years. She said the Faculty Senate implemented the process of the GPC reviewing graduate programs from the perspective that there was great diversity among the academic programs. The Faculty Senate believed this provided an overview function that was not administrative which allowed faculty to make decisions regarding curriculum, criteria, and standards and provide input about the status of the university. She stated the Quality Enhancement Review (QER) process implemented by the Provost was phenomenally successful. She said the arduous task of reviewing programs was extremely beneficial to the university. She added that external groups evaluating the university recognized Florida State University as the role model for the nation for the structured ongoing reviews given to the doctoral programs which provided valuable feedback to the various academic units. She explained the Faculty Senate would be implementing a similar process at the undergraduate level to improve the quality of any undergraduate programs in need of attention. She said that the GPC not only reviewed the graduate programs, but also formulated ideas, identified problems, and solved graduate policy issues for the university, and the Faculty Senate was most appreciative for the effort and time spent by the graduate faculty and graduate students.

Election of Graduate Policy Committee Chairperson – Jayne Standley announced the first order of business, the election of the Chairperson of the Graduate Policy Committee. She pointed to the importance of the GPC by stating this was the only election of a committee chairperson the Faculty Senate President attended in order to assist and oversee the process. She opened the floor for nominations.

Professor Bettye Anne Case nominated Professor George Bates and the nomination was seconded by Professor Frank Tomasulo.

Professor Flip Froelich nominated Professor David Johnson and the nomination was seconded by Professor Rebecca Miles.

The votes were recorded by paper ballot at the recommendation of Jayne Standley. **After tallying the ballots, Jayne Standley congratulated Professor George Bates as the Chairperson of the Graduate Policy Committee for 2007-08, and thanked him for his years of service.**

Approval of GPC Meeting Minutes – March 26, 2007, April 2, 2007, April 16, 2007, and April 23, 2007 – A **motion** was made by Professor Frank Tomasulo and **seconded** by Professor Seth Beckman to approve the minutes from the GPC meetings on March 26, 2007, April 2, 2007, April 16, 2007, and April 23, 2007.

The motion passed unanimously.

Professor Bates asked for introductions from the meeting's attendees. He thanked all the GPC members for their service and welcomed the new members. He summarized that the GPC activities fell into three categories which were to conduct program reviews, consider graduate policy issues, and review proposals for new graduate degree programs. He explained committee service was for a three year term and members should expect to serve on program review subcommittees. He stated the meeting dates were scheduled on Mondays at 3:35pm in 201 Westcott throughout the fall semester. He announced the tentative meeting schedule, which he said was subject to change, which was September 10, September 17, October 1, October 15, October 29, November 5, November 19, November 26, and December 3.

Professor Frank Tomasulo inquired about course schedule conflicts in future semesters. Professor Bates answered that members with extended temporary conflicts would need to be replaced with a temporary substitute. He explained the importance of attendance and being prepared because the committee operated with a quorum. He stated the supporting materials for the meetings would be emailed and posted on the GPC Blackboard website.

Professor Bettye Anne Case pointed out the importance of starting the GPC meeting at 3:35pm or later so that members could arrive on time from when their classes ended across campus. She said 3:35pm was the official registrar's class start time for that time slot. Professor Bates said the meeting time was established taking that into account and that time constraints were part of the nature of conducting business with such a wide variety of members.

International Student Full-Time Enrollment Requirements – Professor George Bates introduced Kristen Hagen, Assistant Director for Immigration, from the International Center; Melanie Booker, Assistant Director of Admissions; and Hege Ferguson, Associate Director of Admissions. He explained the issue of International Student Full-Time Enrollment Requirements had come before the GPC on March 31, 2003 when the Admissions Office requested a change in policy due to the fact that the federal government had instituted strict record keeping requirements and tracking of international students as a result of the 9/11 attacks. He said the GPC had considered the issue in order to ensure compliance with federal law, which requires that international students be enrolled full-time.

Kristin Hagen, from the International Center, stated the federal regulations did not specify for graduate students but did for undergraduate students. She explained they needed a formalized definition for what was acceptable for immigration purposes because they had to submit a report each semester to certify enrollment for all F-1 students.

Professor Bates explained the motion passed on March 31, 2003, and needed to be taken to the Steering Committee and then the Faculty Senate for approval to finalize and formalize the policy. He explained the policy had been followed appropriately since then because the wording of the motion had been correctly put into the bulletin at the time which read:

Graduate student enrollment in at least nine (9) credit hours per semester constitutes full-time registration for purposes of satisfying federal reporting requirements for F-1 and J-1 international students. This definition of enrollment for federal reporting purposes does not alter enrollment requirements set by colleges, departments, or other special programs for their academic or program purposes.

Melanie Booker, from Admissions, explained they had a request for a related issue to be considered. Hege Fergeson, from Admissions, stated they listed the tuition cost for graduate students based on 12 credit hours, and if they listed the tuition cost for international students to be based on 9 credit hours, they were concerned people would object to the higher requirements and cost for domestic students.

Kristin Hagen said they used 9 credit hours as the requirement for the I-20. She explained that domestic students could establish residency after one year which brought the cost down substantially.

Professor Bates stated that Dean Marcus and he had considered possible improvements to the wording of the motion. Dean Nancy Marcus said she looked at what other institutions in the state of Florida were doing with regard to policy regarding full-time enrollment requirements. She said the language other universities used for their definition of a full-time student ranged from 9 to 12 credit hours. She gave the example that the University of Florida used 9 to 12 credit hours, depending on the discipline and the student, for the wording of their policy. She said she was not comfortable with the current policy of differentiating between international and domestic students even though she understood the rationale for it. She recommended doing what was common practice in the state by defining full-time enrollment as 9 to 12 hours and not distinguishing between international and domestic students. She believed 9 to 12 credit hours should be updated throughout the bulletin wherever it was applicable for full-time enrollment. She added that 9 credit hours also applied to teaching and research assistants.

Professor Case said another factor to consider was it would allow federally funded programs that paid student tuition and fees to pay the full 12 credit hours per term. She said it would also allow for the cost consideration to be based on 12 hours for financial aid.

A **motion** was made by Professor Eliza Dresang and **seconded** by Professor Peter Easton to accept the recommendation to change the full-time enrollment requirement to 9 to 12 credit hours per semester across campus with no difference between international and domestic students.

Professor Bates asked if the motion should specify 9 to 12 hours but leave the wording up to the administration in order to incorporate the language into the bulletin in the appropriate sections.

Professor Seth Beckman asked if the wording of the new motion would include the portion from the previous approved motion which stated the definition of full-time enrollment did not alter enrollment

requirements set by colleges, departments, and programs. He said he believed it was important to include that part of the motion.

Dean Marcus recommended using the following language for the policy and the motion:

Full time enrollment is 9 to 12 credit hours per semester as is appropriate for the discipline and the student.

Hege Ferguson asked if Admissions should base their tuition cost on 9 hours. Professor Bates suggested listing it as a range that varied. Hege Ferguson said it was currently on the Admissions website for prospective students as 12 hours per semester built on an academic year, and she believed it would be too much to list it for both. Professor Case suggested listing a range of 9 to 12 with an asterisk indicating a footnote that explained it may be up to 12 hours, since saying 9 hours could be inaccurate in some cases and so could 12. She gave an example where an international student was required to take and pay for 10 credit hours. Professor Easton suggested saying it was "up to 12". Dean Marcus said it was a financial issue for Admissions to determine.

Professor Bates confirmed the acceptance of the amended motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Professor Bates stated he would bring the issue to the Steering Committee.

Dean Marcus explained this related to another issue which needed to be addressed in the future, which was the policy that stated once a student passed their preliminary exam or completed all coursework for their degree, they must still be enrolled as a full-time student. She stated policy allowed students to seek and be granted under load permission, which meant they would not be a full-time student. She said domestic students could seek the under load permission, but international students were precluded from under load permission because the federal guidelines stated they must be a full-time student.

Kristin Hagen said Florida State University was the only university in the state of Florida that required more than 2 or 3 credit hours after completion of coursework for master's or doctoral students. She explained the currently policy was that international doctoral students took 9 hours until the semester they completed their dissertation hours, then they took the number that brought them up to 24 hours, and then they went to 3 hours. She said the policy existed for immigration purposes and needed clarification to alleviate confusion that existed throughout the university.

Graduate Faculty and Directive Status Guidelines – College of Business, College of Music, and College of Visual Arts, Theatre & Dance – Professor Bates explained the colleges which had programs under review for the 2007-2008 academic year, College of Business, College of Music, and College of Visual Arts, Theatre & Dance, submitted their Graduate Faculty and Directive Status guidelines to the GPC for review and approval. He said the Fall 2007 program reviews would be Accounting, College of Business; Management Information Systems, College of Business; Finance, College of Business; and Theatre, College of Visual Arts, Theatre & Dance, and the Spring 2008 program reviews would be Management, College of Business; MBA Program, College of Business, and Music, College of Music. He said Doctoral Directive Status (DDS) had been a difficult and contentious issue over the years, and the GPC voted to consider suggestions for revising Graduate Faculty and Directive Status policies and procedures in the Spring semester of 2007, and planned to revisit the issue this Fall semester of 2007. He explained the GPC had to work under the current policies as they existed, which required colleges to submit specific

guidelines for the GPC to use when reviewing graduate programs and making recommendations about whether or not to continue the status of the faculty members. He believed it raised consciousness about the differences among the colleges and suggested looking at the DDS sections only.

Dean Nancy Marcus summarized that none of the documents provided any more detail than the university guidelines with respect to how to evaluate the quality and productivity of the faculty. Professor Johnson agreed there were no references to faculty productivity in any of the submitted guidelines. Professor Tomasulo added that none of the documents referred to requirements for ongoing work and maintaining productivity. Professor Beckman believed the colleges had to be careful not to create language that differed from university policy. Dean Marcus replied that the guidelines could be stricter or more specific without being different. Professor Easton added that colleges could have more rigorous standards than the university.

Professor Bates stated the university policy for awarding Doctoral Directive Status from the Faculty Handbook which read:

Subject to consideration of special circumstances, the minimum qualifications for appointment are: (1) attainment of recognized professional stature in the discipline by virtue of substantial post-doctoral or equivalent scholarly or creative work and (2) experience in the supervision of graduate students.

Professor Tomasulo argued the policy addressed the minimum requirements for the initial approval for DDS but not for continuation.

Dean Nancy Marcus said there was university policy for continuation of DDS. She stated the policy from the Faculty Handbook which read:

GPC approval for continuation of DDS will be made only if the faculty member's teaching and research have continued to be of at least the quality that justified the original appointment.

Dean Marcus believed the policy provided substantial guidance to the GPC for reviewing faculty members in the absence of any other guidelines by requiring the current productivity to be compared with the justification of the original appointment. She said if there was not productivity at least at the level of the initial approval, then the status should be sunset. Professor Tomasulo suggested requesting the colleges incorporate language to that affect into their documents so everyone could become aware of the policy.

Professor Easton said the program reviews occurred every 7 years and covered a 5 year time period, so the productivity and scholarship being reviewed was only looked at for that period of time. He explained a faculty member may have been very productive in the beginning of their career, but if not in the last 5 years, they tended to receive a negative judgment.

Professor Beckman asked Dean Marcus if there was anything in the documents that was in conflict with university guidelines. Dean Marcus replied there was nothing in conflict, but she had hoped for more guidance from the colleges, but since they had not done so, it was left up to the GPC to decide what constituted productivity. She pointed to the university policy referring to continuation of DDS to use as substantial guidance by stating that in order to maintain DDS faculty should be of at least the quality that justified the original appointment. She said it was incumbent upon the Chair of the Department and the Dean of the College at the program review to make an effective

argument for continuing DDS for a faculty member who had inadequate productivity during the time period being considered.

Professor Tomasulo stated his belief that it would be helpful to request the colleges incorporate the language of the university policy for continuation of DDS into their guidelines.

Professor Beckman asked if the directive to the colleges from the Office of Graduate Studies asked for policy pertaining to continuation of status. Dean Marcus answered that it requested policy for maintenance of the status.

Professor Bates suggested that he would submit a memo to the Department Chairs of the programs being reviewed this academic year, indicating the GPC would be reviewing DDS of their faculty members, and that the criteria used would be based on productivity at least at the level that justified the original appointment. He added this would allow the Department Chairs to take the necessary actions at the time for faculty members to avoid difficult situations at the program review.

Professor Easton said he believed it was important to articulate an alternative viewpoint. He described an argument which stated DDS required excess specificity and violated subsidiary principles. He said some people believed that since what the GPC wanted to control was the quality of scholarship and production at the program or departmental level, then the program or department should decide the consequences for whether or not faculty measured up to their standards. He explained some people would argue that for the GPC to weigh individual faculty members as to whether or not they were worthy of DDS, was more problematic than it was worth and went against the larger task of ensuring productivity and scholarship at the program level. He added that some people felt the programs should judge how to employ faculty in order to achieve the goals of productivity. Professor Bates said that argument addressed the future agenda item for revising DDS policies and procedures and they had to follow the policy now as it currently existed.

Professor Case said she did not believe the GPC had a history of using the same standards for the continuation of the status as was used for the initial appointment of the status. She said the initial nomination required considerable and immediate productivity where the GPC only looked for productivity of any kind. Professor Bates agreed and said that was one of the problems that needed to be addressed since there were no guidelines for what constituted significant productivity.

Professor Randy Rill said that in reviewing the GPC meeting minutes, he noted an issue where the GPC discussed whether to consider \$300,000 or \$450,000 toward the amount of grants awarded, and whether to consider 3 publications or 4 because of where they had been published, which indicated that the committee did consider specific details about what constituted productivity.

Professor Johnson argued it was never satisfactory because not everyone knew how to read the numbers from the QE5 from each departmental culture, which he believed meant more specific guidelines were needed from the colleges.

Dean Marcus drew attention to the sentence in the existing university guidelines about continuation of DDS pointing out that you could only work with what you had for guidance on how to evaluate the information during the program reviews. She believed the only alternative was to suspend the evaluation of DDS in order to determine the criteria and address the issue of what it meant to have DDS. She said the policy discussions were important for the committee to deliberate on and that it was essential that they take advantage of the time before the program reviews to really get at the

heart of the issues. She believed at times the committee followed common practices without considering which existing policies needed changing because they were no longer effective.

Professor Bates said at the heart of the DDS issue was whether faculty members were capable of directing graduate students successfully to a doctorate and being competitive in the job market. Dean Marcus said the GPC should take a stance before the program review process began about what the decisions would be based on in order to maintain standards and continuity during the meetings. Professor Rebecca Miles asked if there was time on the meeting schedule to address the issue. Professor Bates said there was adequate time to consider the subject and that Professor David Johnson and Professor Flip Froelich had the report ready regarding DDS.

Proposal for Exploration of a New Doctoral Degree Program in History and Philosophy of Science – Professor Bates introduced Michael Ruse, Program Director and Professor of History and Philosophy of Science, and Fritz Davis, Professor of History and Philosophy of Science. Professor Ruse presented a summary of the Proposal for Exploration of a New Doctoral Degree Program in History and Philosophy of Science. He said History and Philosophy of Science had proposed and implemented a master's degree program a few years before and now they wanted to propose a doctoral degree program.

Professor Michael Ruse provided a summary of the Proposal for Exploration of a New Doctoral Degree Program in History and Philosophy of Science. He explained the program of History and Philosophy of Science had begun seven years before when he was hired by Florida State University and the master's program was implemented 3 years before. He said an undergraduate minor had been added and that Urban and Regional Planning was another program which had an undergraduate minor without a doctoral program. He explained the next step was to add a doctoral program. He stated Joseph Travis, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, did some of the team teaching with him in the program and said he was very enthusiastic about the proposal. He said the program had focused and involved faculty members, including himself from Philosophy, Fritz Davis from History, and Matt Day from Religion, along with other less involved faculty members as well. He stated that Dean Travis had added two designated faculty appointments in Philosophy and Religion, despite their budget constraints, which gave them a total of five designated faculty who were tied to their own separate home departments. He explained that other universities referred to the discipline as Science Studies or History of Science which were more based in the Social Sciences and Sociology, but they had chosen the traditional name of History and Philosophy of Science so that it was clear to people in the field that they believed in a real world and were not continental social constructivists. He said their program consisted of History, Philosophy, and Religion involved with Science. He said it was a hot topic in America becoming more popular in Europe and particularly in Germany. He stated they had 12 master's students, and there were 8-10 doctoral students from various departments who would have joined the program if it had been available. He added that 4 doctoral students who had taken part in the program had attained academic positions, 3 of which were tenure track, which pointed to the fact that there were interested students and available jobs for them. He explained that History and Philosophy of Science had received a course prefix through the proper channels and they were developing both graduate and undergraduate courses. He added their students were beginning to publish and they were putting increased emphasis on research. He said they were presenting the proposal and were eager to gain feedback in order to accomplish their goals. Professor Johnson said the proposal was very thorough.

Professor Easton inquired about the negative reference to Sociology. Professor Ruse answered that their proposal was more biologically oriented because they were concentrating on making the program more attractive and marketable to students throughout the country. He said it was not a

prejudice against Sociology, but they did not want to attract students from Social Sciences who were not of the caliber they were looking for and who believed scientists were constructing figments of their imagination. He said they were a moderate, middle of the road program deeply committed to the virtues of science and a liberal enlightenment view of science. He said they did team teaching with scientists and just received their first large grant of \$500,000 from NSF. He added that he was currently collaborating with an economist. He said they were not solely based in the biological sciences and were trying to do something of real value. He said they may have students who did intensely theoretical thesis and some who could teach concrete courses such as Environmental Ethics. He said the scientific aspect of the program made students attractive in the job market.

Professor Tomasulo explained he had a background in both Chemistry and Philosophy. He asked if the courses listed were primarily general subjects or if they were more focused on Biology. Professor Ruse replied the courses were a combination of both. Professor Tomasulo suggested clarifying the course descriptions in the proposal. Professor Tomasulo also asked about employment opportunities and suggested they add data about student placement into the proposal. Professor Beckman pointed out it was a proposal for exploration not implementation. Professor Bates stated that kind of information was normally included in the proposals for implementation. Professor Tomasulo pointed to language in the proposal of "one mandatory minor" and said he did not know of any doctoral programs with minor requirements. Professor Fritz Davis said it was intended to be a recommendation which suggested a minor field in science, but it was not a requirement. Professor Bates said he read it as a requirement as well. Professor Tomasulo said they could have a program requirement that was not a university requirement and inquired about the rationale. Professor Ruse answered that they were enlightenment people who believed that science was a good thing. He believed if you were going to write and talk about science, you should have a background in science.

A **motion** to approve the Proposal for Exploration of a New Doctoral Degree Program in History and Philosophy of Science was made by Professor Seth Beckman and **seconded** by Professor David Johnson.

Professor Case said the proposal described a long time period before doctoral students could be admitted to candidacy. She pointed to the section titled Doctoral Residency from page 12 of the proposal which read:

After completing 30 semester hours of graduate course work (at Florida State University or elsewhere) doctoral students **MUST BE CONTINUOUSLY ENROLLED FOR A MINIMUM OF 24 GRADUATE SEMESTER HOURS DURING ANY PERIOD OF TWELVE CONSECUTIVE MONTHS before taking the doctoral comprehensive (preliminary) exams.** Absolutely **no** exceptions can be made to this regulation.

Professor Bates agreed this did not correspond with university policy and recommended they adjust the wording. Professor Davis said it was not intended to be interpreted that way and he would make the appropriate changes to the proposal.

Professor Bates stated his concern that programs with faculty from different departments often encountered problems because they had no control over their faculty or courses. He suggested they clarify in the proposal which faculty had formal commitments to the program and how the agreements would work and if they would teach courses that were real components of the program. Professor Ruse said he spoke with faculty members about the subject at the recommendation of Professor Bates and they planned to spell the agreements out on paper.

Professor Case asked if all science departments would be invited to have involvement. Professor Ruse replied that he had communicated with many department chairs and had gotten some responses that expressed a lack of interest or willingness to participate. Professor Bates explained that he believed they needed clear commitments from core faculty members. Professor Ruse said they would clarify these issues prior to submitting the Proposal for Implementation.

Dean Marcus explained that most proposals for exploration were 2-5 pages long, and that while their proposal was much longer, it did not address information necessary for proposals for implementation. She said there should be less attention to the rationale and justification and more attention to specifics about things such as the organization of the program, library resources, bylaws, and admissions committees.

Professor Randy Rill added that they needed to provide more detail about admissions standards for the types of students they wanted to attract. He said more specific information and clarification was needed. Professor Johnson agreed that real numbers were essential for proposals for implementation. Professor Ruse said he would make the changes and additions and that was the kind of feedback they were seeking for their proposal for exploration.

The motion passed unanimously.

A **motion** was made by Professor Eliza Dresang and **seconded** by Professor Frank Tomasulo to reduce the number of paper copies brought to the meeting to 8 in the interest of protecting the environment since the documents were sent electronically by email and posted on the GPC Blackboard website.

The motion passed unanimously.

Professor Bates thanked the committee and meeting participants for attending and for their contributions.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.

The next meeting will be held on Monday, September 17, 2007 at 3:35pm in 201 Wescott.