

2016-17 FACULTY SENATE
GRADUATES STUDIES POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES

October 4, 2016

Approved: October 18, 2016

Members Present: Bogazianos, Cowan, Pinch, Topping, Wassmer

Members Absent: Bradley, Hembree, La Rocco, Lindsay, Newsome, Shimabukuro, Vargas

Guests Present: Michaud, Endriga, McKeough

- a. **Call to order:** Called to order at approximately 8:30 a.m.
- b. **Open Forum:** Nothing for open forum
- c. **Minutes of September 20, 2016:** No voting actions could take place because there was no quorum.
- d. **Approval of Agenda:** No voting actions could take place because there was no quorum.
- e. **Information Items**
 - a. Report from Chair
Bogazianos reported that the Blended Programs Policy had been amended and split during Senate debate in second reading, and that one portion had been referred back to Executive Committee, revised, and would be debated again in second reading.
 - b. Report from Graduate Dean
Endriga, temporarily reporting for Newsome, reported that the Graduate Education Task Force was now in process. She also reiterated that CSU Mentor is expiring, and that a new one would be in place for the Spring 2018 cycle.
 - c. Report from Statewide Senate
Nothing to report at this time.
- f. **Discussion Items**
 - a. New Business: Discussion of Undergraduate/Graduate Degrees Policy
Because there was no quorum at the meeting, neither past minutes nor current agenda could be officially approved. Therefore, the Committee discussed the issue at hand, but only informally, and will bring the discussion back to GSPC for next meeting.

A consensus emerged among the members present that language used in official policy references to Sacramento State's EdD program should describe it as a "professional doctorate" instead of a "research doctorate" in order to stay consistent with SB 724 language as well as the program's own self-descriptive language. The members present also suggested that future actions taken concerning overlapping policies (both descriptive and processual) governing graduate programs should take place in consultation with Senate Chair Heather as well as Senator Sheppard (who had originally suggested the issue be referred back to GSPC), since both are involved with efforts to rationalize, simplify, correct, and update the current University Policy Manual.

b. New Business: Grad Program Review Discussion with Dr. Jeffrey Brodd, APROC

Dr. Brodd was invited to speak with GSPC regarding current APROC perspectives concerning the reviews of graduate programs in regular department review cycles. During this discussion, concern was registered that currently, graduate programs seem to be treated as “add ons” at the end of department reviews, and that there should be more specific language concerning grad program reviews. Brodd agreed that the current place of grad programs in dept reviews isn’t perfect, but noted that policy requires that all programs in a dept be included in the review. Brodd also noted that there are a number of alternative possibilities currently being discussed regarding the state of grad program reviews in dept reviews. Brodd noted that some of those possibilities include (in no particular order and with no specific advocacy for them) the following: maybe a College-based vs dept-based structure, since resource allocation is based in the Colleges; a more prominent role for the Graduate Dean before and during reviews; changing the current review structure to a more conventional University committee structure with College-based representation. In all, members of the Committee agreed with Brodd that current practices aren’t ideal, and that moving towards some of the possibilities suggested would be a positive change going forward. GSPC thanks Dr. Brodd for speaking with us.

c. Other Business

There was no other business.

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:25 a.m.

Dimitri Bogazianos, Chair, GSPC