College of Education Graduate Programs Committee Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2022
12:30 pm – Student Petition Subcommittee; No Curriculum Subcommittee
1 PM GPC Convenes

Call to order:
The COE-GPC meeting was called to order via Zoom Video-conferencing at 1:01 pm on March 2, 2022.

Attendance:
Drs. Paul Peluso (chair), Eileen Ariza-Zoeller, Maysaa Barakat, Victoria Brown, Ali Danesh, Sharon Darling, Kelly Emelianchik-Key, Lisa Finnegan, Jarrett Warshaw, Caitlin Imgrund, Sabrina Sembiante, Bianca Nightengale-Lee, Deborah Shepherd

Recorder: Sabrina Sembiante

1. **Review of prior meeting minutes**
    - Minutes approved unanimously without objection.

2. **Curriculum Committee Report and Recommendations**
    - There was no curriculum subcommittee meeting

3. **Student Petitions Committee Report and Recommendations**
    - Two departments submitted a total of three petitions. CE submitted two petitions (i.e., leave of absence, waive of application process and fee to complete program); SE submitted one petition (i.e., waive the GRE writing score and use a master's thesis in its place. Subcommittee recommended approval on all seven petitions. It came to the GPC with a motion (& second) and was unanimously approved.

4. **Proposed draft policy language on chairing dissertations and incentives for faculty**
    - The university policy committee met around Feb 15th and there was a lot of discussion about the proposed policy language and the suggested edits that came from the colleges and departments. The dissertation policy emerged from the Graduate Programs Committee and the Graduate Counsel. There was a recommendation for a senate policy subcommittee to meet and discuss the policy. Meredith Mountford from College of Education, Bill Trapani from College of Arts and Sciences, Fred Hoffman from College of Science, and Paul Peluso met. They made some edits and recommendations which included that dissertation work should be added to faculty annual assignments and be specified within their instructional load. Incentives should be negotiated at the college level. The incentive idea came from the provost in 2021. The edited policy is currently in the hands of the provost's office. Michelle Hawkins will report back to the policy committee about the provost's which

should occur relatively soon. The policy as stipulated makes sure that faculty are being compensated and being recognized for their dissertation chairing work through their academic assignment. This would leave additional work to be compensated through teaching additional courses. Many faculty members were bothered by the incentive section of the policy and so it seems that section may not move forward.

5. **Research Committee Report – Using APA JARS as template for checking COE Dissertations**
    a. The Research committee is reviewing the JARS with some faculty using these guidelines as a pilot study for the next year. The Department of C&I is discussing this and will provide feedback to Paul. The Department of ELRM is reluctant and concerned that the JARS will be used as a checklist and have questions including: who will be the implementer? what are the obligations of the faculty? ELRM does not see the nature of their work with dissertating students reducible into a checklist. They feel the JARS are a good resource to have, but are fearful of the manner in which it may be used: What is intended to be a framework for guidelines could be conflated with evaluating and adjudicating faculty. A suggestion is to use the JARS as a resource, rather than a required element. One of the pieces that has been missing in the JARS documents is its purpose explicitly written in the document, and whether it is a policy or just the principles by which this should be utilized. This needs to be clarified. Other necessary clarifications include: Who is supposed to review what content at what level? How does this tool fit in with an evaluation scheme where it is evaluated and signed by a committee chair, department chair, etc.? For example, if the committee and chair have all agreed that there shouldn't be a control group, then there shouldn't be a process where a higher-level review would make an evaluation of those determinations. More clarity and specificity needed on the following questions: What does the JARS measure? How is the JARS going to be used at the different levels of review throughout the college? Is it or is it not a quality checklist? The JARS as currently formulated does not solve the issue of redundancy between the professor's review, chair's review and dean's review.

6. **Provost's Search**
    - The provost reported that he had a conversation with the president and it was along the lines that faculty are not comfortable with the timeline for the search occurring during the summer because of the concern that candidates are likely to be brought in when faculty are off contract. The president stated that the search committee would start their work now, but candidates would not be brought in until the fall. This means that the university is likely going to have an interim provost beginning July 1st 2022. It could be Russ Ivy, or one of the deans. With regard to the dissertation policy and the upcoming change in leadership, if the policy isn't settled now, then it may be likely that nothing will be settled until

January, 2023, or at the latest July 2023.

7. **Alternative Dissertation Formats**
    - Graduate dean and Univ. Graduate council will give feedback in the next few days regarding alternative dissertation formats. Departments need additional time to consider and discuss this. Special Education (SE) discussed this idea in their department during Fall 2021 and brought in a colleague from FIU whose department uses a 3-article format for alternative dissertations. The FIU faculty member discussed their process and protocol for the alternative dissertation format. SE had a motion that alternative dissertation formats could be used: two papers or three papers. There are currently no university policies that explicitly prohibit alternative dissertation formats. Alternative dissertation formats are meant to be an option not a replacement of the current traditional dissertation format. A recommendation from the GPC is for professional development to be provided to faculty around the alternative format. Some faculty are excited about the potential of alternate formats, that may be more in line with the field. Faculty are interested in having more conversations around what a dissertation proposal might look like for alternate formats, its timeline, etc. It was clarified that alternative dissertation is a COE initiative.

8. **Master List of Electives**
    - GPC representatives should send a list of electives from their respective departments of electives that are eligible for any graduate student in the COE to take.

9. **5000-level Course Restrictions Feedback**
    - Discussion of this policy, not restricting registration for 5000-level courses to graduate students only, will take place at the next GPC meeting.

Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn made by Maysaa Barakat and seconded by Sharon Darling. Meeting ended at 1:59pm