

**2013-14 FACULTY SENATE**  
**GRADUATE STUDIES POLICIES COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES**  
**01 October 2013**  
*Approved 5 Nov 2013*

Members Present: Barakatt, Blanton, Cowen, Hamilton (Chair), Heather, Hembree, Kaplan, Miller, Reddick, Steinwert, May, Newsome

Members Absent: Sprott, Wassmer

Guests: Pia Wong, Dennis Geyer

**1. Call to order:** Called to order at approximately 8:30 a.m.

**2. Minutes of 03 September 2013:** Approved

**3. Information Items:**

1. This item to which GSPC will respond is the Faculty Senate request to re-examine the credit hours definitions/categories. The Senate does not accept the proposed definition and policy for the credit hour as it relates to the credential programs.

Guest speaker Pia Wong, Teaching Credential Chair, spoke to the committee regarding the credit hour and the credit hour definition. Dr. Wong felt the course type that most approximates student teaching would be the practicum internship. However, the problem is that excess petition units would result from using the practicum internship because student teachers spend so much more time in their classroom placements along with additional prep time. It's possible that service learning might be a more accurate category. This would mean that the actual teaching hours in the classroom plus the prep time would be included. The number of units students take in the credential program changes as they advance in the program, taking fewer academic classes and doing more student teaching as they move along.

Issues under discussion:

- A. A student in the Master's Program for Speech-Language Pathology is roughly 45-46 hours for 4 units in practicum/internships. Credential

students/student teachers have roughly 6-hour days 5 days a week (minimum 30 hrs/wk.) by the time they get to practicum.

- B. Dr. Wong's department is looking at and working on the table in the proposed policy, specifically the number of hours and how they correspond to the number of units. At issue is the current policy that defines 45 hrs. of coursework per one unit.
  - C. Through discussion, it was agreed upon by GSPC that the point of the policy is to establish/meet minimums. Current policy leaves an opening for legal challenge. As it is currently defined, there is inequity in hours per unit of credit across programs:
    - a. The possibility of using outcomes might be the solution. Similar to a thesis, there are a large number of hours for a small number of units.
  - D. But the credential program also has traditional classes for traditional units. Perhaps separating the classroom from the practicum experiences is the way. Dr. Wong says the program is also looking at this.
  - E. Perhaps the solution is being more descriptive in the policy rather than a table. An experiential description piece may be more applicable.
  - F. Accreditation requirements do force some limitations, however.
2. The amendment to modification of existing policy on program discontinuation had its first reading in the Senate. No real issues were raised at the time, but there is some confusion about whether any department was being forced to delete a program (defunding). The point of the amended program discontinuation policy is that if a department feels their program is being de-funded, the amended policy allows a specific course of action to be pursued. The first reading didn't seem to cause a big stir.
3. Dan Melzer wishes to examine section B2 of the GVAR policy with GSPC as he has some questions. He would like to attend the 10/15/2013 meeting for discussion. GSPC needs to take a look at this section before that meeting. Graduate writing intensive classes are perhaps at issue.
- A. During this discussion, Senator Miller noted that the proposed declaration of a program as a graduate writing intensive major goes around the purpose of the GWI, which is to be sure that students can write as befits a Master's-level student by the time s/he gets to the culminating experience. It is part of the advancement to candidacy. If the GWI is part of a program, then a major just advances its students forward without certifying they can write.
  - B. There are two issues at play: The first is the remedial issue; and second, the majors are supposed to teach people to write in the discipline. The remedial issue shouldn't be part of the graduate program. Students should come into the majors writing well. A remedial course offered through CCE was considered but what was dropped from the discussion was that the class should be a grammatical, technical class.

- a. This class would be a requirement to avoid remediation. Grad coordinators suggested that the class happen in the January intercession, but the discussion was stuck at whether the class should be taken before the semester a grad student begins a program or after the student has begun taking classes.
  - i. One option is to make the class a condition of acceptance into a grad program., but there are consequences: If you require it before they start, the possibility is that enrollment plummets. If, after they're accepted, then students enter a program are then remediated. This discussion should be framed within the fact that GSPC writes policy, and that Mr. Melzer is advisory.
  - b. It was GSPC agreed that Dr. Melzer should be invited for a discussion with the proviso that he understands GSPC writes the policy and he is advisory.
- C. On this topic, it was further discussed that the Curriculum Policy Committee (CPC) was keeping the policy from reaching GSPC or the Senate. It was agreed that the charge of GSPC needs to be asserted. Perhaps a liason from GSPC need to sit on the Reading and Writing subcommittee of the CPC. At the least, CPC needs to send the issues that affect graduate study to GSPC for review.
- D. Chris Miller made a motion to respectfully request that the portions of the Comprehensive Writing Proposal document related to graduate students (GWAR) be removed from the Curriculum Policies Committee (CPC) Reading and Writing Subcommittee, noting that the portion related to graduate students is under the charge of the Graduate Studies Policies Committee (GSPC).
  - a. Second - Julian Heather
  - b. Passed unanimously.

#### **4. Report from Dean of Graduate Studies:**

- a. A department in the university has raised the issue of the paired course policy.
  - i. This is a CPC policy that allowed departments to pair undergrad and grad courses together with the proviso that grads were supposed to have additional work above and beyond that of the undergrads. The behavior the policy was designed to contain was that core courses would not be paired, which would potentially have the effect of watering down the grad courses. Only elective courses were supposed to be offered this way. This was not the case in practice, however.
  - ii. Grad studies asked that programs cease and desist these offerings as paired courses were being offered in core classes with the grad work component being no greater than the

undergrad. However, programs could still use this in cases where grad program enrollment is low.

- iii. The department in question wishes to re-open the possibility of paired courses. CPC was supposed to have reviewed it, but this has not been done to date.
- iv. GSPC did not exist when the policy was initially created, there were no doctoral programs, and the university had a different graduate culture.
- v. This is both undergrad and grad issue. Undergrads may be intimidated in a grad course; grad students may get a lesser experience.
- vi. Dr. Newsome recommended that GSPC view the policy and determine further action. Request to put on future agenda.

#### **5. Report from Statewide Senator Chris Miller:**

- A. It has been discovered that the Chancellor of the junior colleges convened a meeting, without consultation, inviting members of the legislature and others, to look at offering baccalaureate degrees.
  - a. The reasoning behind this meeting was that as the CSUs now offer doctorates, the junior colleges should be able to offer baccalaureate degrees.
  - b. However, the legislation that allowed CSUs to offer doctorates did so with full knowledge of the UCs. The UCs didn't want to offer doctorates in the same fields that the CSUs did, so the UCs went silent and offered no opposition.
  - c. The argument being made at this point is that the CSUs don't want the junior colleges to offer baccalaureates. There has been no change to the master plan.
  - d. The junior colleges primarily want to offer technical degrees that the CSUs don't necessarily want to offer. However, the big issue in subtext here is that the junior colleges want to offer baccalaureates in nursing.
- B. Another issue raised in the Statewide Senate is primarily one of numbers regarding the residency requirement.
  - a. This requirement states that 21 semester units in a program shall be completed in residence.
  - b. The new language states that 70% of a program's units shall be completed in residency.
  - c. The reason for this is that there's more variability in programs now and in the units they require.
    - i. Original policy: no less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the units shall be organized for graduate students.
    - ii. New language: No less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the units shall be designed for graduate study.

d. Rigor is the issue. This change is meant to be more rigorous, but GSPC thought the language was less rigorous.

a. **Other Business:** There was no other business.

4. **Adjourn:** Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:15

---

Ann Blanton, Vice-Chair, GSPC