

**GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE
MINUTES
March 30, 2015**

The following members were present: Lee Stepina, Chair; Nancy Marcus, Dean, The Graduate School; Karla Schmitt, Nursing; Steven Webber, Interior Design; Fred Huffer, Statistics; Sudhir Aggarwal, Computer Science; Jamila Horabin, Biomedical Science; Diana Rice, School of Teacher Education; William Fredrickson, Music; Elwood Carlson, Sociology; Tomi Gomory, Social Work; Peter Hoeflich, Physics; Ron Doel, History; Anne Barrett, Sociology; Linda DeBrunner, Engineering; Jeannine Turner, Education; Stanley Gontarski, English.

The following members were absent: Brian Gaber, Film/Music; Gary Burnett, Communication & Information; Jasminka Ilich-Ernst, Human Sciences; Tahirih Lee, Law; Patricia Born, Business.

Also present: James Beck, The Graduate School; Judy Devine, The Graduate School; Jennifer Buchanan, Assistant Vice President, Faculty Development and Advancement; Jay Rayburn II, Communication; Michael Brady, Department Chair, Marketing; David Paradise, Associate Dean, College of Business; Caryn Beck-Dudley, Dean, College of Business; Sherry Southerland, Department Chair, School of Teacher Education; Ruby Lee, Program Director of Marketing, College of Business.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 P.M. by Lee Stepina, Chair.

Previous Meeting Minutes –With no revisions or additions in mind, the meeting minutes for March 23, 2015 were approved.

QER- Marketing – Dr. Rayburn gave a brief overview of the GPC subcommittee report for the Marketing program. He explained that the program is unique in terms of composition and focus and stated that the Department of Marketing’s ability to leverage the synergies among a variety of academic areas is a key competitive advantage and strength for the department.

Currently, the Department has 21 faculty members; 16 occupy tenured or tenure-earning lines, and the remainders are teaching professors, professionals in residence or visiting professors. The graduate student body is comprised of 11 doctoral students and approximately 20 Master of Science in Marketing (MSM) students. For the doctoral program, the student retention rate is high (i.e., 89.5% since 2008). Dr. Rayburn and the review subcommittee were “very pleased with this retention rate.”

In terms of placement, all doctoral students who have graduated have obtained academic appointments, and approximately 30% of graduates (5/17) have been placed at the equivalent of peer or aspirant institutions (i.e., Auburn, Cornell, Kentucky, Northeastern, and Texas Tech). The doctoral students appear to be quite satisfied with most aspects of the program, including access to faculty, opportunities to get involved in research projects targeted at top-tier journals, and the stipends they receive. PhD enrollment is the standard low number--about

three to four per year--that is common today in the College of Business. Multiple faculty advisors are assigned to each new student and serve as contact points for questions regarding the program as well as mentors when selecting topics to research and write on. Gender balance varies by year and does not seem to be a problem. Enrollments in the master's program in marketing could be higher, according to the external review of the department. In response, the department is in the process of improving its area offerings by focusing more on supply chain topics and so-called data analytics that are currently in high demand in the private sector.

Dr. Rayburn stated that many doctoral students expressed considerable interest in the possibility of some sort of supervised teaching or a teaching seminar, even a brown bag session held as a teaching orientation before students take full control of a class (some for the first time). He added that many doctoral students also expressed interest in some sort of "Handbook of Expectations" or a specific code of conduct that would cover such issues as whether or not "suggestions" to attend lectures by visiting speakers were actually veiled requirements.

Dr. Rayburn explained that one of the main issues facing the department is the teaching load for faculty who are active in research and publishing. To address this issue, the department has begun hiring non-tenure track faculty who teach a heavier load and run the programs that bring the department financial and corporate resources. He added that there was also some concern expressed amongst the committee regarding the number of prep-courses doctoral students were required to teach. He approximated 8 courses and stated that "this is above the norm and may not be appropriate."

Dr. Rayburn noted that the MSM program is relatively new, but there are potential areas for improvement. First, the program already has had three different directors. This discontinuity has made it challenging to adopt and carryout plans and evaluate progress. Second, there is no or limited recruiting of potential students, nor is there funding for students admitted into the program (e.g., graduate assistantships). Third, the external reviewer identified some possible issues with courses that are not currently offered (e.g., business law), or that are offered only online (e.g., within the Sales track), as well as a somewhat limited number of elective courses in some tracks. Finally, the program appears to lack specific learning outcomes and does not track student placements. Such criteria would seem important for the future evaluation of the MSM program.

Dr. Rayburn honestly admitted that the review subcommittee "did not take a close look at the MSM program."

Dr. Gomory was very concerned with the fact that the MSM program was not thoroughly assessed. He stated that it is unacceptable that the master's students were not interviewed properly, especially considering the fact that some master's students raised concerns in the external reviewer's report. Dr. Rayburn explained that no master's students were present at any of their meetings and the subcommittee was informed, by an undisclosed entity, that no such interviews were necessary. Dr. Stepina stated that the guidelines he distributes to all of

the review subcommittees during their introductory orientation sessions emphasize a focus on the doctoral program. He added that in many past program reviews, no master's students were interviewed because it "eats up too much time for subcommittee members." Dr. Gomory disagreed and stated that "master's students are as valuable as the doctoral students and should not be underrepresented or, for lack of a better word, discriminated against during the review process." Dr. Gontarski, GPC representative on the review subcommittee, noted that he was also surprised that no MSM students were interviewed. He explained that he raised this concern during the faculty meeting and the graduate student meeting, but it was not addressed.

Dr. Gontarski stated that a little over 10% of the Marketing faculty showed up during the subcommittee's review meetings, which equals out to approximately 2 of 16 faculty members. He emphasized that there "needs to be greater efforts in the future to make sure the Department of Marketing's faculty are available to the GPC so that voices other than the Department Chair are heard." He noted that "multiple voices need to be heard during these program reviews and not just one in order to gather several perspectives of the department." Dr. Brady stated that he was unaware that he needed to invite all faculty members from the department, but instead was under the impression that he could just invite the program directors. Dr. Stepina explained that the rules and guidelines pertaining to the review subcommittees are explicitly clear in the template/handout. He stated that he clarified everything to the Department of Marketing at the multiple orientation sessions he held throughout the semester.

Dr. Hoeflich stated that he was pleased to see the funding levels were significantly higher than other departments (e.g., living wage is \$30,000).

Dr. Horabin asked for more information on the distribution of master's students in the MSM program. Dr. Lee, Program Director of the MSM program, explained that of the 22 currently enrolled master's students, 2 are international students and 20 are domestic students. She added that all students in the program are self-funded. Dr. Horabin was concerned that no metrics were provided in the subcommittee report on GMAT scores, placement percentages, etc. Dr. Rayburn explained that the review subcommittee followed the template given to them and no such metrics were mentioned. Dr. DeBrunner concurred that the template does not call for specific numbers.

Dr. DeBrunner requested that the GPC program review template be revised to include more obligatory information and clarity regarding the expectations and operation of the review subcommittees (e.g., metrics, interviewing of master's students, etc.). Dr. Gomory and Dr. Schmitt agreed. Dr. Stepina stated that this can be one of the first items the GPC addresses in fall 2015.

Dr. Aggarwal asked why non-tenure track faculty members are being hired to teach heavier loads and run the programs that bring the program financial and corporate resources. Dr. Brady explained that the non-tenure track faculty run the centers and have a yearly revenue gross of

around \$500,000. He stated that there are a lot of expenses, but whatever the department nets from this amount goes into the support of faculty, doctoral students, and undergraduates.

Dr. Brady and Dean Beck-Dudley did not have anything further to add.

Dr. Stepina asked for discussion on recommendation 1:

The Department should consider developing a handbook that clearly states expectations for doctoral students.

Dr. Rayburn explained that this recommendation is a request directly from doctoral students for a “Handbook of Expectations” that is separate from the Doctoral Handbook housed at the college level. Dr. Stepina agreed that the College of Business’s Doctoral Handbook is lacking sufficient information from specific departments and is missing key material that some doctoral students would look for. Dr. Stepina explained that he spoke to the Graduate Office for the College of Business and the representative stated that the departments are greatly encouraged to add additional information for their department in the handbook.

Dr. Gontarski stated that many doctoral students expressed interest in this separate handbook because they were looking for a “departmental survival guide.” The students felt vital information was missing from the official college handbook.

Dr. DeBrunner requested that the “Handbook of Expectations” be readily available to all graduate students and not restricted to just doctoral students. Dr. Gomory agreed.

Dr. Schmitt proposed a friendly amendment for the language to read:

The Department should consider developing a process that clearly communicates the expectations for graduate students.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. All were in favor.

PASSED

Dr. Stepina asked for discussion on recommendation 2:

While junior faculty have had teaching loads reduced by specialized faculty hires, similar steps should be taken to reduce teaching loads for senior faculty who are active in research and in the doctoral program to the extent that it is consistent with the mission and priorities of the College Business, the Department of Marketing, and the University.

Dr. Brady explained that the senior faculty teaching load is 2-2 and the junior faculty teaching load is 2-1. Dr. Gomory felt these numbers were reasonable and did not feel this

recommendation was needed. Dr. Hoeflich agreed with Dr. Gomory and stated that “this sanction may not be helpful to the program.”

Dean Marcus asked how this recommendation will impact the graduate program if the goal is to reduce teaching loads for senior faculty. Dr. Brady expressed concern with this recommendation as the majority of senior faculty members are teaching all of the courses in the graduate programs, especially the doctoral program.

Dr. Schmitt proposed a friendly amendment for the language to read:

The department should explore ways to provide opportunities for senior faculty to promote their opportunity to engage in research.

Dr. Brady stated that this recommendation rose from a concern raised by senior faculty to the review subcommittee. Dean Marcus asked how many senior faculty members attended the committee meeting. Dr. Gontarski confirmed that one senior faculty member attended the meeting and expressed this concern.

Dr. Gomory requested a motion to strike this recommendation.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. None were in favor. All were opposed.

FAILED

Dr. Stepina asked for discussion on recommendation 3:

The Department should consider developing a teaching workshop for doctoral students before they teach their first course.

Dean Marcus asked for further clarification on the instructional training the graduate students receive prior to their teaching assignments if they do not attend the PIE training workshop. Dr. Stepina and Dr. Brady explained that all of the doctoral students in the Marketing program in fact attend the PIE training workshop, but were simply “unaware of the abbreviation.” Dr. Gontarski and Dr. Rayburn disagreed and stated that many of the doctoral students they interviewed were unaware of the PIE program. As an alternative to the PIE training, Dr. Brady explained that every new doctoral student has to be his TA for 2 semesters for the “Introduction to Marketing” course. Each doctoral student’s first teaching assignment depends on his materials and syllabus. Dr. Brady stated that this “applied learning technique” can be considered an alternative to the PIE training. Dr. Gomory disagreed and explained that this is a “personal procedure for teaching that may not be an appropriate substitute.” Dean Marcus was concerned that some doctoral students could be missing important information on foundational policies related to FERPA, Sexual Harassment, etc. especially in regards to instructors of record.

Dr. Stepina interpreted this recommendation as graduate students requesting to pursue an alternative to PIE as it is seen as a “one size fits all approach.”

Dr. Schmitt proposed a friendly amendment for the language to read:

The department should consider developing a teaching workshop for doctoral students that would complement and augment what they receive in PIE.

The committee was open to this amendment.

Dr. Horabin explained that she felt after reading the subcommittee report that the doctoral students were requesting more than just an alternative teaching workshop as some students reported receiving “nothing [in regards to guidance and instructional training]” from their mentors. Dr. Rice agreed that it can be problematic if doctoral students feel they are not receiving sufficient training from their mentors/supervisors.

Dean Marcus proposed a friendly amendment for the language to read:

The department should ensure that all doctoral students receive the required and appropriate training necessary to serve as a teaching assistant.

Dr. Schmitt agreed to withdraw her friendly amendment in lieu of Dean Marcus’s language.

Dr. Horabin requested that “teaching assistant” be removed as the doctoral students are considered teaching assistants and are teaching courses. Dr. Brady agreed.

Dr. Horabin proposed a friendly amendment for the language to read:

The department should ensure that all doctoral students receive the required and appropriate instructional training before teaching.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. All were in favor.

PASSED

Dr. Stepina asked for discussion on recommendation 4:

The Department should continue to take steps to increase the quality and acceptance rates of students admitted into the masters’ program, but the department should heed the warnings of the external examiner that reliance on self-pay foreign students to support the MSM degree could seriously reduce placement percentages.

Dr. Rayburn stated that the reference to “acceptance rates” in the language above should be listed as “enrollment rates.” Dr. Brady explained that due to the competitive marketplace, and the fact that MSM degrees are competing with MBA degrees, the enrollment rate for the MSM program is low.

Dr. Gontarski explained that the review subcommittee did not evaluate the MSM program and as such, the recommendation above is word-for-word from the external examiner. Dr. Hoeflich asked how “placement percentages” could affect the quality of the MSM program. Dean Beck-Dudley explained that in many business schools nationwide, some of them have about 50-70% of international students in their graduate programs. She stated that this is done for financial reasons (i.e. to raise revenue), but few of those students can be placed in the United States because they cannot obtain work visas. Business schools are generally valued and ranked based on their “U.S. placement statistics.” She elaborated that one fear is that the admittance of too many international students into the program could hurt these “placement statistics” for the school.

Dr. Schmitt proposed that the recommendation be split into two separate recommendations. Dr. Hoeflich disagreed and felt that the second-part of the recommendation could be removed as it is contradictory and unrelated to the first-part. Dr. Aggarwal stated that this should be left in the department’s hands.

Dr. Stepina proposed a friendly amendment for the language to read:

The Department should continue to take steps to increase the quality and recruitment rates of students.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. All were in favor.

PASSED

Dr. Stepina asked for discussion on recommendation 5:

The Department should continue efforts to reduce teaching loads for doctoral students.

Dr. Brady explained that the department is already reducing the teaching loads for doctoral students. He reported that starting this upcoming fall, the teaching loads for the marketing doctoral students have been reduced to 2 prep-courses and 6 regular-courses across 4 years (4 undergraduate courses in the summer, 1 undergraduate course in the fall, and 1 undergraduate course in the spring). Dr. Carlson was happy to see that this recommendation is helpful to Dr. Brady.

Dr. Aggarwal did not feel this recommendation was necessary as the Marketing program already seems to be reducing the teaching loads of doctoral students.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. 16 were in favor. 1 abstained.

PASSED

Dr. Stepina asked for discussion on recommendation 6:

Both the doctoral and master's programs should be continued.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. All were in favor.

PASSED

Proposal- Online Version of a Face-to-Face Master's Degree Program in Curriculum and

Instruction - Dr. Southerland provided a brief overview of the proposal. She explained that the proposed online MS in C&I will offer an alternative for working educators from the largely residential program currently offered. The work of teachers in the 21st century has greatly expanded, and the ability for even local teachers to come to campus for evening classes has diminished. Yet, the drive for rigorous avenues for professional development and recertification remains for many practitioners. While many avenues for online graduate work in C&I are available, the online Master's Degree in C&I is designed to support educators in their work by engaging them with the wide range of theoretical and research based tools available to enhance their practice and support them in determining the effectiveness of such approaches in their own instruction. Focus groups conducted with two groups of local teachers determined that there is a strong interest in such online classes. The online MS in C&I will target already certified, currently practicing PK-12 educators, and will require that the participants have currently participated in some form of education of children/adults. The existing admission standards will be maintained for the online program. There will be no difference in the minimum admissions criteria for the online program as compared to the traditional version of the degree. Dr. Southerland explained that the department anticipates enrolling a minimum of 15 students in their first cohort. To distinguish the online degree from the other C&I degrees found online, the program will limit their cohort to 25 students, to allow for optimal interaction with course instructors. The online MS in C&I can be completed in 6 semesters/2 years. After three years, the program anticipates graduating at least 15 students per year. As in the face-to-face program, students pursuing the complete online format of the degree must complete a minimum of 33 credit hours spanning the following five areas: curriculum, teaching & learning, instructional technology, research and scholarship, and major field of study. However, in the online format, the courses for the first four areas will be fixed.

Dr. Southerland stated the "program is down 21% in graduate student credit hours." She feels that this new fully-online version will not only help practitioners from around the state but also support the program in their graduate admissions.

Dr. Horabin asked if the traditional program is planning on phasing out of face-to-face. Dr. Southerland denied this and stated that it will remain face-to-face. She noted that the Visual Disabilities and Foreign Language Teaching face-to-face master's programs are doing very well. She added that some of the majors that fall under the umbrella of the degree program of Curriculum and Instruction do better as face-to-face programs than others. It merely depends.

Dean Marcus asked what majors will be offered in this fully-online format under the degree program of Curriculum and Instruction. Dr. Southerland confirmed that the following majors will be available in the online format: Elementary Education, English Education, Foreign & Second Language Education, Mathematics Education, Science Education, Special Education and Social Science Education. Dean Marcus advised Dr. Southerland that this be clearly articulated on their departmental website.

Dr. DeBrunner asked if non-degree seeking students can pursue this option. Dr. Southerland agreed as long as the student has access to some form of instructional capacity available.

In terms of marketing, Dr. Southerland stated that the program's primary focus will be on in-state students. The program will be looking for undergraduate students who completed a 4-year state-degree, but don't have the option to complete a master's degree at their current institution.

Dr. Schmitt proposed a motion to accept this proposal. It was seconded by Dr. Gomory.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. All were in favor.

PASSED

Online Course Development/GPC Approval Statement in Faculty Handbook- At the last GPC meeting, Dr. Tyson and Dr. Fiorito, representatives of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, requested that an additional single-statement be added somewhere affirming that the development of fully-online courses/programs will require GPC approval. A subcommittee consisting of Dr. Schmitt, Dr. Horabin, Dr. Carlson, and Dean Marcus proposed the following statement be added under the "Distance Learning" section of the Faculty Handbook, Section 7: Teaching and Student/Faculty Interactions:

Recommendation # 4:

Faculty Handbook, Section 7: Teaching and Student/Faculty Interactions Distance Learning

Florida State University offers a wide array of courses through distance learning, some of which are part of entire degree programs available online. Any new, or existing doctoral program that will offer more than 50% of its curriculum utilizing some form of technology where student and faculty are not engaged in traditional face-to-face instruction must be approved by the GPC.

Instructors developing or teaching distance learning courses can find resources at:
<http://distance.fsu.edu/>.

Dr. Schmitt reviewed the previously approved residency recommendations (1-3). Dr. Schmitt confirmed that the federal and university policy for receiving Financial Aid is 6 credit hours. For emphasis purposes, and to appease the concerns of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Dr. Schmitt proposed this additional statement to clarify that GPC approval is needed for any new or existing doctoral program with more than 50% of its curriculum in online-format.

Dr. Gomory was concerned about adding the word “traditional” in the recommendation. Dr. Schmitt preferred to respect the federal and national definition of distance learning.

Dr. Horabin stated that she felt an additional question should be incorporated into the curriculum section of the Template for GPC Program Review Reports. She felt this one additional question would provide sufficient oversight and a “checks and balance system” when the GPC reviews the program every 7-year cycle. All GPC members unanimously agreed.

Dean Marcus requested replacing the word “doctoral” with “graduate.” Dr. Buchanan requested moving the comma after “new” to after “existing” and spelling out the abbreviation GPC. Dr. Hoeflich requested replacing the word “curriculum” with “graduate credit hours.”

Dr. Schmitt proposed a friendly amendment for the language to read:

Recommendation # 4:

**Faculty Handbook, Section 7: Teaching and Student/Faculty Interactions
Distance Learning**

Florida State University offers a wide array of courses through distance learning, some of which are part of entire degree programs available online. Any new or existing, graduate program that will offer more than 50% of its graduate credit hours using distance learning must be approved by the Graduate Policy Committee. Instructors developing or teaching distance learning courses can find resources at: <http://distance.fsu.edu/>.

With no further discussion a vote was placed. All were in favor.

PASSED

With no further business to be presented, Dr. Stepina adjourned the meeting at 5:37 P.M.