

**GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
January 22, 1996**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jayne Standley, Chair  
Alan Mabe  
Elizabeth Platt  
Ike Eberstein  
Gary Heald  
Gordon Waldo  
Bob Marshall  
John Kelsay  
Eric Walker  
Tom Roberts  
Martin Schwartz  
Tonya Harris  
Steve Edwards  
Janet Kodras  
Ken Brewer  
Elizabeth Goldsmith

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Ann Durham  
John Deal  
Todd Curlew  
Walt Dick  
Bob Reiser  
Marcia Driscoll  
Don Ealy

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 by Jayne Standley. The committee first reviewed the revision of short course specifications submitted by the ad hoc subcommittee (Addendum 1) of the Faculty Senate. It had been felt by the Faculty Senate that the current catalog copy did not address the area of distance learning. After a brief discussion, it was **moved** that the revision be approved. The motion was **seconded** and **unanimously passed**.

Alan Mabe addressed the committee on the problem of graduate students registering for too many hours of supervised teaching/research. The university does not receive funding should a student take more than 5 hours credit total in these courses; up to 13-15 FTEs may be lost per year. This problem could be alleviated by having students who have reached their 5-hour limit register for alternative credit; e.g., a DIS rather than supervised research. Another concern is that some courses (such as preliminary exam prep courses) are classified as supervised research courses; it may be possible to examine and reclassify these. The Curriculum Committee is working with the departments to clarify the classification of these courses.

Since it would be logistically impossible to review the record of each graduate student each term to verify whether or not more than 5 hours of supervised teaching/research had been taken, Mr. Mabe asked the committee to consider the possibility of asking the Registrar's office to put a registration block on these courses for students who have reached the 5-hour limit. It was generally felt by the committee that this would not be appropriate until the Curriculum Committee had finished reviewing the courses with the supervised teaching/research classification. There was also concern expressed that

programs exist that require students to take supervised research each term they are in the program, and a registration block would prevent them from meeting this requirement. On the other hand it was felt that the University should not be losing FTE.

As this matter was presented only for discussion, no vote was taken.

The committee then considered the report of the ad hoc subcommittee for the review of the doctoral program in Instructional Systems. Mr. Eberstein presented a summary of the subcommittee's report on the degree program in Industrial Systems, expressing praise for the achievements of the program and noting that it ranks among the top five or higher such programs in the country. Mr. Mabe asked about the allocation of OPS funds for Instructional Design. OPS funds are allocated to the Department of Education Research, the majority of which is used to hire teaching assistants in Educational Psychology. OPS funds are not allocated specifically to the program in Instructional Systems. This makes it quite difficult for the program to recruit top doctoral students.

A question was raised concerning departmental criteria for doctoral directive status. On page 4 of the report, third paragraph, it was stated that one of the criteria for receiving doctoral directive status was prior experience in directing doctoral students. However, it is not possible for a faculty member to direct a doctoral student unless he/she has doctoral directive status. This requirement will be re-written to indicate that one of the criteria is prior experience in co-directing doctoral students.

There were comments made on the student survey, in that it would be more representative if the standard/mean deviation were known. It was also suggested that a formal teaching training program be developed.

Mr. Mabe questioned an item on page 21, under "written indication of student progress." This item did not state that an annual report is written on each doctoral student. This is currently not the practice with Instructional Systems. However, this annual written report is a university requirement.

#### Recommendations:

The following recommendations were **unanimously passed** with minimal discussion:

- A. That the doctoral program in Instructional Systems be continued.
- B. That doctoral directive status be renewed for the following faculty: Branson, Dick, Kaufman, Keller, Morgan, Reiser, and Wager.
- D. That the program, department, and college anticipate retirements among those program faculty with lines in LSI and plan accordingly. Coordination with LSI will be essential to assess whether there is

commitment to replace any Instructional Systems faculty retiring from LSI. It will be necessary to gain financial support from the administration in order to remedy this fast approaching problem. If this does not happen the program will soon be in jeopardy. This is a very close second priority.

E. That the program implement a data system for maintaining records that would enable a tracking of applicants through the student admission process and a record of student progress/attrition by year of entry.

F. That the program consider how to involve the Student Advisory Council in administration in more than a social capacity. This may be an effective vehicle for students to air problems and concerns.

G. That the program minimize scheduling conflicts among core courses and work to balance offerings across semesters.

H. That the program review core doctoral requirements in light of faculty interests and expertise and student needs, with special attention to the role of nontraditional research methodologies and electives.

I. That the program review the continuity across courses in the statistics sequence taken by doctoral students.

J. That the program review procedures for student orientation and advising. Some students may not benefit from a decentralized advising system.

It was moved that Item C, that the program be allowed to replace faculty losses, be amended with the phrase "in keeping with the mission and priorities of the College." Some committee members felt that needs the College as a whole should be considered and desired the amendment; others felt that the program in Instructional Systems should be given special consideration. The motion was seconded, and passed by a vote of 9 yea, 5 nay. It was then moved that item C be passed as amended. This recommendations now reads:

That the College of Education in keeping with the mission and priorities of the College allow the program to replace faculty losses --not just with junior faculty, but also with sufficient senior level staff that the national prominence of the program can be maintained and, perhaps, enhanced.

The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously. [Note: It was reported at the meeting that the dean of the College had approved the request to hire a new faculty member at the associate level]

Item K, that the program be allocated space for graduate students, was amended with the word "College" replacing the word "program" and the phrase "in keeping with the mission and priorities of the College" added. It

was then **moved** that item K be **passed as amended**. This recommendation now reads:

That the **college** be allocated space for graduate students for: a) graduate student offices; b) teaching assistants offices; and c) research assistants offices, **in keeping with the mission and priorities of the college**.

The **motion** was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

Item L, that renovation funds be allocated to the department, was questioned, as the department has no control over these funds. The committee requested that Max Carraway, Registrar, be informed of this recommendation to indicate that the Registrar's Office allocate renovation funds to the department. This recommendation reads as follows:

That funds be allocated to the department to renovate classrooms in order to accommodate media capabilities.

This item was then **moved, seconded, and unanimously passed**.

Recommendation M: It was **moved, seconded, and unanimously passed** that the program should follow University policy regarding the provision of a written annual evaluation of doctoral students

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55.