2015-16 FACULTY SENATE
GRADUATES STUDIES POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES
February 2, 2016
Approved February 16, 2016

Members Present: Bogazianos, Cowan, Hamilton, Heather, Kaplan, La Rocco, Meidinger, Newsome, Pinch, Topping, Wassmer

Members Absent: Hembree, Vargas

a. **Call to order:** Called to order at approximately 8:34 a.m.

b. **Open Forum**: There were no items for Open Forum.

c. **Minutes of December 1, 2015:** Approved.

d. **Approval of Agenda:** Approved.

e. **Information Items**

   a. Report from Chair

   The President's address focused on maximizing graduation rates for undergraduate students did not mention graduate education explicitly. Members noted that the downtown education center, which was mentioned, is currently only for graduate education; that the President's focus on developing blended programs will benefit graduate education; and that students who complete their undergraduate education faster will maintain eligibility for financial aid to support their graduate education.

   The duplicative degree policy will receive its first reading on February 4th, 2016. Members discussed questions about the policy raised by faculty from Recreation Parks and Tourism Administration.

   Heather will be soliciting feedback on the proposed GWAR revisions from graduate coordinators when they meet on February 12, 2016.

   b. Report from Graduate Dean

   OGS has collected samples of graduate writing which will be assessed using the proposed graduate writing rubric, tentatively in April.

   Two items at the federal level will affect graduate education. The first is related to student-loan payment assistance and will allow students to exclude $10,000 of assistance from income. The second is from a ranking member of the Senate Health, Education, and Labor Committee who is asking for feedback on affordability and debt.

   Graduate and Professional Student Appreciation Week will be held April 11-15, 2016. Dean Newsome encouraged members to work with their departments and colleges to identify events that could be held during this week.

   Departments must submit their goals and objectives, curriculum maps and action plans by May 30, 2016.

   c. Report from Statewide Senate

   Nothing to report.

f. Action Items

  a. Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy

  Members revised this policy to incorporate feedback from graduate coordinators and voted to forward it to the Senate Executive Committee (see Appendix A for full text).

 g. Discussion Items

  a. Old Business: Summit on Graduate Education

  Members discussed a draft report on the summit's outcomes and suggested revisions. A working group consisting of Heather, Bogazianos, Hamilton, and Wassmer was formed to work on revising the report before the next GSPC meeting.

  b. Old Business: Blended Programs Policy

  There was no time for discussion.

  c. Other Business

  There was no other business.

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:10 a.m.

_____

Julian Heather, Chair, GSPC

Appendix A

FS 15-16-XX/GSPC/   Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy, Amendment of

The Faculty Senate recommends revision of the Graduate Learning Goals/Objectives Policy (FS 14-15-166-GSPC-EX), with effect from approval of this policy.

Graduate Learning Goals/~~Objectives~~ Policy

The Faculty Senate recommends that departments/interdisciplinary groups with graduate programs in their purview shall be required to establish Graduate Goals/~~Objectives~~, Program Learning Outcomes with an associated curriculum map, and an assessment plan with an associated action plan, to be submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies ~~within one full academic year of approval of this policy~~ by May 30 of each academic year.

The Institutional Graduate Learning Goals listed in section A express a shared, campus-wide articulation of minimum requirements for recipients of graduate degrees. Each graduate program may set Program Learning Goals in addition to the required Institutional Graduate Learning Goals.

A. Institutional Graduate Learning Goals/~~Objectives~~

~~The Faculty Senate further recommends that in developing graduate learning goals/objectives, faculty consult resources such as the information submitted in the Instructional Program Priorities (IPP) process, the Graduate Learning Goals recommended by the Graduate Studies Policies Committee (see attachment), and/or the Lumina Foundation Degree Qualifications Profile in framing their learning goals/objectives and assessment components.~~

For each Institutional Graduate Learning Goal, students are expected to achieve a level of competency associated with an advanced degree, as appropriate to the discipline.

Institutional Graduate Learning Goals for Masters Programs

1. *Disciplinary knowledge*: Master, integrate, and apply disciplinary knowledge and skills to current, practical, and important contexts and situations.
2. *Communication*: Communicate key knowledge with clarity and purpose both within the discipline and in broader contexts.
3. *Critical thinking/analysis*: Demonstrate the ability to be creative, analytical, and critical thinkers.
4. *Information literacy*: Demonstrate the ability to obtain, assess, and analyze information from a myriad of sources.
5. *Professionalism*: Demonstrate professional integrity.
6. *Intercultural/Global Perspectives*: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and application of intercultural and/or global perspectives.

Institutional Graduate Learning Goals for Doctoral Programs

All of the above Institutional Graduate Learning Goals for Masters Programs, with the addition of:
7. *Research*: Conduct independent research resulting in an original contribution to knowledge in the focused areas of their graduate program.

B. Program Learning Outcomes

Graduate programs shall develop Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) that represent their unique perspectives <u>and which demonstrate achievement of Graduate Learning Goals</u>. Each graduate program shall define its own set of learning outcomes, specific to the level of study and to the discipline, which are clearly more advanced in content than those defined for related undergraduate work. For some programs, these might already be defined, at least in part, by external accrediting agencies. Such defined outcomes shall also form the basis for assessment plans within graduate programs and offer foci for future academic program review teams.

Program Learning Outcomes are designed with the goal of placing graduated master's or doctoral students into post-degree positions in secondary education, non-profits, business and consulting, government and private agencies, and other fields that draw on the knowledge and skills of graduates in the focused areas of their degree preparation.

C. Curriculum Map

Each program shall create a curriculum map:
1. List all courses, both required and elective, as well as other required graduate education activities.
2. Indicate where in the curriculum each PLO is addressed through development of a curriculum map. The curriculum map may be presented in many formats, including tabular form as in the following example:

Coursework	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 5	PLO 6
GRAD 201 (core course)	X		X			
GRAD 202 (core course)				X		X
GRAD 203 (core course)		X		X		
GRAD 204 (core course)	X				X	
GRAD 205 (core course)			X			
GRAD 206 (core course)	X	X	X	X		
GRAD 252 (elective)	X				X	
GRAD 252 (elective)		X				X
GRAD 500 Culminating Experience	X	X	X	X	X	X

D. Assessment Plan
Each graduate program shall develop a plan for assessing student achievement of its Program Learning Outcomes:
1. Identify graduate program-specific direct and indirect lines of evidence for each of the PLOs. The table below summarizes the kinds of direct and indirect evaluative data programs might draw on to assess ~~progress towards and achievement of two example~~ PLOs <u>related to two of the Institutional Graduate Learning Goals</u>:
   ~~Core Knowledge: Demonstrate mastery of the skills, methods, and knowledge appropriate to the profession or field.~~
   ~~Scholarly and Professional Communication: Demonstrate effective written and oral communication skills appropriate to professional and public contexts.~~

		Example of Lines of Evidence for Assessing Graduate Program Learning Outcomes
		Lines of Evidence

PLO Institutional Graduate Goal	*PLO*	*Direct*	*Indirect*
~~Core~~ Disciplinary Knowledge	1. PLO1 2. PLO2 3. PLO3	1. Assignments in core courses 2. Completion of culminating experience	1. Mid-course assessments 2. Program exit interview 3. Alumni survey
~~Scholarly and Professional~~ Communication	1. PLO1 2. PLO2	1. Assignments in content courses 2. Early writing assessment 3. Pre-Candidacy project or examination 4. Presentation at scholarly meetings or in colloquia series 5. Papers/articles/books/grants 6. Thesis or Doctoral dissertation proposal 7. Culminating experience Doctoral dissertation	1. Mid-course assessments 2. Program exit interview 3. Alumni survey

2. Articulate evaluation parameters for measuring introductory and advanced levels of graduate student development for each PLO.
3. Evaluate each of the PLOs based on direct lines of evidence such as those identified above, collectively supporting the evaluation of introductory and advanced levels of development over the course of each student's program trajectory. Emphasis should be placed on early assessment of indicators that predict success in the graduate experience.

E. Action Plan Based on Assessment Data

Based on the assessment data collected, each graduate program shall provide detailed information about <u>ongoing</u> action steps to be taken to maintain <u>and improve</u> program quality and/or address identified deficiencies.