

**GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES**  
**April 20, 1998**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Karen Laughlin, Chair, English  
Alan Mabe, Graduate Studies  
Ken Brewer, Education  
Bob Zmud, Business  
Stuart Baker, Theatre  
Steve Edwards, Dean of the Faculties  
Elizabeth Goldsmith, Human Sciences  
Bill Landing, Oceanography  
George Bates, Biology  
Patty Phillips, Dance  
Elizabeth Platt, Curr. & Instr.  
Gloria Grizzle, Pub. Admn.  
Tonya Harris, Nursing

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Donna Wieckowicz  
Ann Durham  
Raymond Fielding  
Peter Stowell  
Meryl Warren

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 P.M. Ms. Laughlin informed the committee that next week the GPC meeting will begin at 2:30 P.M. to allow enough time to cover the review of the Ph.D. program in Marriage and Family, and to review the proposed new degree in Open and Distance Learning.

Ms. Laughlin then presented to the GPC the requested changes to the Graduate Film Conservatory curriculum. Ms. Laughlin informed the committee that Ms. Kathryn Anderson, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee requested, by memorandum of March 31, 1998, that the concept needed GPC approval prior to the Curriculum Committee proceeding with their review. All necessary materials, including Ms. Anderson's memorandum, were distributed to the GPC with the agenda notice.

The floor was opened to questions. Questions regarding the impact on other disciplines that interact with Film; efficiency of block courses; and the proposed S/U grading system were raised. Mr. Stowell responded that Film sees no impact problem with the other disciplines. He feels that this new structure could produce more, not less, cooperation between programs because of the built-in flexibility that allows for more short workshops and seminars. The block course method is more efficient for the kinds of training the Film School wished to give their students. Mr. Stowell informed the committee that for years Film has struggled with the three-credit-per-course model. The conservatory approach brings together a collaborative teaching and learning environment that combines a number of complex technical and aesthetic disciplines, which is essential for the creation of short films. Mr. Stowell advised that the Film School plans to offer the screen writing courses, as well as the new Film Conservatory I, II, III and IV, on a letter-grade basis. However, it is very difficult to assign

individual qualitative judgments to individual areas of responsibility on a finished film, and Film expressed interest in having the entire program graded S/U as are their two existing large credit courses, MFA Thesis Production Support and MFA Thesis Production. Mr. Stowell added that this is a professional program, not an academic one, that has been very successful. The Film School is now requesting through this proposal to be permitted to officially structure their program to be the finest Graduate Film Conservatory in the country.

It was **moved** by Mr. Baker and **seconded** by Ms. Harris that the GPC endorse the concept of a Graduate Film Conservatory curriculum as proposed by the Film School. **Passed**

The committee then discussed at length the grading issue. The committee felt several questions were left unanswered regarding S/U vs. grade. These included concerns about how to determine probation and retention policies, the rigor of S/U grading in the conservatory atmosphere; and the established University policy requiring a minimum of 21 graded hours in a masters program. The GPC felt that the Film School needs a more detailed plan addressing how students will be evaluated and recommended the Film School present such a plan to the GPC in the Fall.

Ms. Laughlin then reported to the GPC the Faculty Senate Steering Committee's reaction to the proposed new format for program reviews. In general there were several areas they felt needed more work by the subcommittee. They did not think faculty should be involved in the rating and priority setting contained in part two; statistical section needed more information from graduate programs to see what would be useful; felt external reviewers not as qualified as FSU to judge programs, but gave permission to set up a pilot group to see how it goes; also approved the forming of pilot group for outside reviewers to read dissertations. Ms. Laughlin advised that the subcommittee will proceed to reevaluate the proposal and address those issues of concern by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and present a revised draft of the program review format to the GPC in the Fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 P.M.