

Doctoral Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes  
February 6, 2008 – 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.  
Conference Room 210 A/B  
Dial in Information (866) 744-8809  
Access Code: 9542628478

Attendance: Linda Simunek, Tom Thompson, Linda Howard, Alan Cohen, Fred Ricci, Shelley Victor, Ron Parlett, Mike Simonson, Jacqueline Brown (conference call), Gretchen Donlinger (conference call), Don Gainey, and Michele Christian – recording of minutes.

### **Call to Order**

### **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The meeting began with approval of the minutes of the last meeting of the Doctoral Curriculum Committee.

Motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting called by Mike Simonson

Second – approved.

### **Old Business**

- A. Doctoral Grading Policy – Dr Mike Simonson. Dr. Don Gainey thought that all the steps for the new grading policy had been taken, but Dr. Karen Bowser indicated that the grading policy has been placed on hold. Drs. Mary Ellen Maher and Nelson Diaz have stopped the grading change for now, and asked if the change had gone through a policy board since it would appear in the FSEHS Catalog. Dr. Bowser assured them that it had gone through the proper channels, and had been approved. She was told that it was okay to make the change and double checked with Drs. Dana Mills and Jennifer Nottingham.

The committee then sought clarification from Dr. Mills. The committee did not believe that the grades should be a policy. However grades are based on a scale and not really a policy. Dr. Mills has said that it was a faculty driven decision and should not be a policy issue. Grading is based on a grading scale according to the catalog – which is under review – and the catalog does not have it listed as a policy.

### **New Business**

- A. Two Syllabi up for consideration.
1. Biology of Human Aging – Dr. Jacqueline Brown, and have addressed minor changes brought up in last meeting. Dr. Gainey asked everyone to please review the revised syllabus and ask any questions. Dr. Marcello Castro was concerned about whether or not the assignments and the objectives were aligned.
- Dr. Castro asked about how information is attained for the syllabus, whether faculty lifts the information and additional references from another source or gets the information first hand. Dr. Gainey spent a lot of time with Jackie Brown designing syllabi, and checking the journals so he will ask her this question.
- Dr. Alan Cohen asked if the only journal sources should be juried sources. Dr. Linda Howard felt that it was not necessarily so. HRD has some great stuff and newsletters that is practitioner oriented. They should be minimal and in some syllabus but not allowed

in dissertations, unless used to illustrate a point. In some technology or scientific based disciplines there are a fair number of 'tech memos', which are allowed, but that is for specialized majors.

Dr. Brown called in and Dr. Gainey asked her about the sources that were listed as additional if she excerpted from another source or found them herself. Dr. Brown said that she found them and used other sources as well. Dr. Castro pointed out that the additional references list was posted twice on the syllabus on page 6 and page 27.

Dr. Castro asked that the scope be either removed or added to additional references. Dr. Gainey asked Jackie if the scope could be removed from the additional references in the syllabi. Dr. Cohen felt as if the syllabus could be approved if the scope was removed. Dr. Howard commented on how nice a fit with the Psychology of Aging course the Biology of Aging course was.

Dr. Gainey asked for a motion to approve the syllabi for EDD 7612 – The Biology of Aging, with the recommended adjustments; the motion was made and seconded. The committee voted and then approved.

2. The EDD XXXX – High School Reform Initiatives - Dr Judy Stein and Michael are not here today, but we had a go-around about this and whether or not it had been approved as a minor and we discovered that it had not been. The syllabus has a lot of problems starting with the 36 objectives, and there needs to be 36 different meanings by which you can assess the effectiveness of it. It was reduced down to what you have in front of you now. Drs. Cohen, Charlie Farris, and Denise Kelly reviewed the syllabus and Dr. Gainey compiled all of the comments into one syllabus with the feedback. The response to the feedback was not well received.

After considerable discussion, Dr. Bowser suggested that a motion to table this issue for the present time to give Drs. Bowser and Gainey the opportunity to review the secondary school renewal minor with Dr. Stein. Dr. Castro asked to review the process for approval of concentrations and minors. Dr. Bowser reviewed the process that includes peer review prior to sending it forward to DiPiano's office.

3. Dr. Simonson has been asked to ask the group about the new Master's degree in Instructional Design and Diversity Education. And how that got approved and what is the relationship between that degree and the Master's degree in Instructional Technology and Distance Education. Dr. Howard is on the board with Dr. Delores Smiley and she understands that this was approved before and she has never been to the Master's curriculum meetings so she doesn't know what goes on there. But she was lead to believe that this was something that was seen that was helpful to enrollment. Linda has seen a list of courses that are focused on diversity issues. Mike says he hopes that there is one on instructional design.

The committee looked over the curriculum that is in the addendum and there are no elements of instructional design in the curriculum. Mike thinks the broader issue is the relationship and the doctoral programs in ITDE, where there is a gray area. The Master's courses in ITDE are comprised of 90% EDD courses and that is a fifth floor mandate. Several adjuncts have come to me and asked who was involved from the ITDE

department and Mike fears that sooner or later, there may be a potential problem as we may step on each other's toes.

Dr. Gainey mentioned at one time there was a school-wide curriculum committee, but as time went on, doctoral and master's separated because most of the doctoral committee didn't want to get caught up in the GTEP quagmire. The ITDE students are confused because they see themselves taking doctorate courses, and there could be overlap. Linda has always been surprised because of the demarcation of the doctorate and the master's here. At other schools there is just undergraduate and graduate. The other thing is that in terms of how this group may be affected by the diversity master's is that there may be diversity minor at some time for the doctorate. Don says that we have to make sure that folks don't go off in a bunch of different directions and there are not a lot of different minors out there. We also have to look at it from a cost-effective point of view, and the impact on student learning. We have to track the number of students in the various minors right now. Who wants an independent study course, it is much richer with student interaction along the way. If you don't have the numbers you don't have the interactions with students.

Karen said that there were three things that she wanted to say along those lines. First we are all worried about retention and we all know that it costs a whole lot less money to keep the people you have instead of recruiting new ones. She spoke to Dr. Jamie Manburg about the need to look at undergraduate programs that feed smoothly into the master's programs that feed smoothly into the doctoral programs. And she doesn't necessarily see a real smooth sequence for that, so that at the undergraduate level, the last couple of years they could be suggesting master's courses. Particularly that there are faculty that teach at all three levels. The minors are, as mentioned, being monitored and you will hear Dr. Bowser come back with courses that have been adopted but there are no students. So we can't see continuing to offer these courses and being spread so thin that nobody is doing anything and nobody is being affected by them. The third thing is the whole idea of the PhD program. Who is working on this and who knows anything about that. This is a whole program that may seriously compete with the one EdD. Why do we have a separate ARC if it's one-third of our doctoral classes as well? Linda said that the introduction of the PhD will be the single most dampening effect of the one EdD, and our enrollment will drop substantially.

4. Dr. Gainey said that there were a couple of things to mention about the minors, and that is there is really not a lot of marketing in the catalog about them. Some people don't know they are out there. The other thing is the scheduling; five courses were offered in the education minor. But Don has only offered two in the fall and two different ones in the winter and one in the spring/summer semester and enrollment has gone up in those classes. Mike pointed out that enrollment management is not something that is done very well. Shelley asked if that was the responsibility of the Lead Faculty to look at what has occurred over the past year and make determinations as to how frequently a course should be offered. Linda asked who is deciding when a course should be offered. Don said that you really want to make available all of the minor courses to be offered in one year.

5. Tom asked if would have made sense if (for example) Delores Smiley presented her ideas about this new master's degree to our committee not only to make a presentation and a pitch for it, but also to get some suggestions from faculty, ideas and ways to get other resources. Linda said Delores will be presenting at the school-wide curriculum committee in March. She (Delores) wanted to have approval from the main campus first before she presented to us. The courses are not written yet, but she invites all of us to participate, although she has identified people that are writing these courses. Karen said unless we put some sort of succinct process in place, that makes sense, and people know about it; it is not about being a control freak, but about doing business the right way. Don said that the reality is that most people follow the rules, and sometimes it is called politics and we have to go adjust to it. Tom thinks that a multi-cultural focus is a good idea and it will be a popular academic program. But the instructional design wording for the courses can be a problem, and we will check into that.
6. Denise Kelly wasn't present but promises that she will develop those brainsmart courses are out there and she will be getting back to us about it.
7. Marcello asked about the EDD XXXX courses, and asked if he could make a suggestion. The first was to table the course and then that the lead faculty looks at this and the documentation. Marcello made a motion that if Karen could explain, or put into a simple graphic, how this committee is to suppose to interact and interface with that approval process you previously described. One is administration and the other is curricular as well, if we vouch for educational quality we need to look at these materials beforehand. So he at least knows what his job is here. Don asked if anyone seconded the motion and it was so. All voted in favor.
8. Linda asked if the students in the brainsmart minor that at least one or perhaps two have been approved and the last three haven't been approved for months and months. This is the first semester that students are enrolled in these courses. But we don't know how many are enrolled and Don will check.
9. Tom asked about educational psychology courses and if there are any in the doctoral curriculum and Alan said that it is one of the curriculum minor courses. Normally, according to Alan, most schools of education have more than one course in ed psych.

Dr. Gainey asked if there was any other business and then asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned.

The next Doctoral Curriculum Committee meeting is scheduled for April 2, 2008 at 1:30 pm in room 210A/B.