

## MINUTES

### GRADUATE FACULTY MEETING

Monday, January 8, 2007

1:00pm

United Spirit Arena, City Bank Room

Attendees: Zenaida Aguirre-Munoz, Mary Frances Agnello, Amma Akrofi, Connie Anderson, Judy Atcheson, Devender Banda, Alfredo Benavides, Loretta Bradley, Katie Button, Joe Claudet, Sandi Cooper, Roseanna Davidson, Lee Duemer, Page Furgerson, Heriberto Godina, Nora Griffin-Shirley, Douglas Hamman, Fred Hartmeister, Bret Hendricks, Carole Janisch, Peggy Johnson, JoAnn Klinker, Effie Laman, Carol Layton, Jay Leist, Mellinee Lesley, Robin Lock, Aretha Marbley, Sally McMillan, Sylvia Mendez-Morse, Susan Myers, Eva Midobuche, Barbara Morgan-Fleming, John Murray, Ratna Narayan, Arturo Olivarez Jr., Diane Oliver, Gerald Parr, Valerie Paton, Peggie Price, Rona Pogrud, Colleen Reutebuch, Roy Rodriquez, Rene Saldana, Dora Salazar, Rosa Hernandez Sheets, Jean Shen, Doug Simpson, Kamau Siwatu, Walter Smith, Karen Spears, Tara Stevens, Mary Tallent-Runnels, Julie Thomas, Reese Todd, Patricia Watson, Shannon Sanderson, Eugene Wang, David White, Jennifer Wilhelm.

Recorder: Esther Lucey, Patsy Mountz

Meeting called to order at 1:30pm by Dr. Joe Claudet. Everyone received Agenda and handouts. Dr. Claudet welcomed all to this Monday afternoon meeting. Dr. Claudet will be the moderator and ruled that speakers will be in order of recognition without interruptions.

*Motion* moved by Dr. Griffin-Shirley to approve November 2006 Minutes as amended.

*Seconded* by Dr. Bradley.

No opposition, motion carries to amend the November 2006 Minutes as follows:

1. Add EPSY 5349 to Research and Statistics Requirement on handout "Minimum Core Requirements".
2. Correct Agenda Item 1 Open Discussion to change course number from EDSP 7000 to EPSY 7000.
3. Clarify and discuss again today Agenda Item 3 – Graduate Assistantships: are limits 3 years or 4 years?

*Additions to the agenda?*

1. Dr. Bradley questions what agenda (faculty or program) does she address, i.e., what each program is responsible for as to graduate objectives in the future – is this a program assessment or a department assessment? Graduate data is involved per a meeting with Gil Reeve. Where are the objectives, assessments, and how do we gather grad data?

*Open Discussion*

- Annual assessment reports for each degree program discussed at departmental meetings. COE has a strategic plan which equals documentation required of the whole college. This is an important issue including the vision of the graduate programs within the COE. So it becomes a report of departmental data.

- Dr. Claudet states the COE has a six year review, so this is a college issue with a synthesis of departmental challenges into one. He recommends this issue be added to today's agenda and added to the departmental meetings' agendas.
- Dr. Mendez-Morse recommends that the COE dissertations to be submitted in APA 5<sup>th</sup> edition format/style (note: This will become an agenda item on the February, 2007 Graduate Faculty Meeting agenda.).

2. Dr. Griffin-Shirley requests the addition of an agenda item to accept international students without the usual entrance exams. Certain students will be accepted by the grad school into the ESL program (not COE's) without a TOEFL (without the usual entrance exams) and accepted at the same time into a COE graduate program. Once satisfactory completion of the ESL courses occurs, the student is eligible to enroll into COE grad courses. This is a recruitment issue. Does COE want this?

#### *Open Discussion*

- Is there a pre-screening?
- Is this without the GRE?
- Are we accepting selected students using their native country's standards for evaluation?

3. Dr. Claudet continues with the meeting requesting faculty to address the broad-based Agenda items here and then continue with further discussion within the departmental and program meetings.

#### **Agenda Item 1: What kind of Graduate Education Culture do we want to have in the College? (Joe Claudet and Hansel Burley)**

1. Dr. Claudet's opinion is for faculty to have conversations here and in departmental meetings as "we" are the college. We have a responsibility for a legacy. We have 13 different graduate programs. Each has unique challenges and ways to success. Each belongs to ALL of us. Programs are unique as to content, research, and pedagogy. We (the COE) need your program. There are issues that cut across programs and this is a reason for departments. Issues will include a community-wide involvement. One point is that a culture includes different kinds of unique challenges we address and the successes we can share, so we embrace each program's challenges and successes as a COE culture. This is a win-win proposition. The focus is to always do what is best for our students – the graduates of COE and TTU. We need ongoing conversation as grad faculty and tackle the graduate challenges creating realistic and insightful solutions - sharing what's best for all
2. Dr. Burley's opinion is that he cannot disagree with Dr. Claudet's vision. Talking needs to stop and we need to start doing something. How doctoral students get degrees, complete their dissertations, take qualifying exams are areas of disagreement among faculty. Many don't know how it occurs. He states two points: One is to get really organized by cataloging, categorizing, and writing down processes and policies. Point Two is to organize research. Reorganize the graduate assistants' time into research projects versus time given to individual faculty. He used a quote paraphrased from "*The University: An Owner's Manual*" by Henry Rosovsky, "Democracy is not all it's cracked up to be . . .country versus organizations." We are to reach goals and there is a responsibility by those in charge. There is a hierarchy throughout higher education. Please don't let the conversations prevent work

and accountability. Some things are easy such as the lay out of principles and directions for faculty and students as an implementation issue

*Open Discussion*

- Should we limit discussion to what exists here?
- Purview of programs = those who confer the degrees?
- Other faculty should not tell others about what courses, research, coursework a program should have.
- We are all experienced faculty, each one of you make decisions.
- There should be no college requirements such as core requirements because not everybody's college has COE's culture.
- Change it.
- Trust issue of other program's colleagues.
- Example of English/Philosophy compared to Arts/Sciences: Are we a college/a division/a program?
- We had an odd structure in the COE which is difficult.
- We are a hybrid – the state of Texas approved our departments but fiscally we operate as a unit. COE holds the money. Department chairs have leadership.
- It is not the philosophy of the COE to be a unit, so TTU wants us to assess “unit” to create a common language.
- Culture is useful for the mechanical aspects to be outlined. But for new faculty, advisement process is difficult to access. Different answers from each person. Difficult to get through the Tech system to view criteria, certification office, graduate information, etc...
- Some professors feel responsibility to their program's students only, not other grad students taking a program's course.
- Yes, it is important to have a conversation about what the requirements are to meet certain minimums across the table.
- In favor of fewer students in the advanced courses.

3. Dr. Claudet summarized the open discussion with these statements:

- a. Who owns research and research apprenticeships in field of interest?
- b. Who owns minimum standards as to what constitutes research in COE?

They dovetail, so what belongs? How do we come at these two points and meet the rigorous standards of higher education?

*Open Discussion continues*

- We are not just a college, but also TTU. Address the course requirements in other colleges, need guidelines, broad enough from out points of view.
- We need a way to organize students/faculty around research. Example given: Five graduate assistants work as a group around topics of research. The students “just took off” on topic of “factor analysis of his created instrument”. The point is not a top down meeting of the minds with minimums and to organize as a Goal to drive students to do MORE as a success – not to meet minimums.
- This discussion is on target with full-time students, but one program is 95% part-time, employed students who want their degrees as an opportunity to move up in their profession and don't want to be professors.

- Some agreement, students want to be practitioners, not researchers. Hearing at this meeting we are doing a bad job regarding files to students, dissertations, other programs, good vs. bad dissertations and we know the difference.
- Wants evidence of what is wrong.
- Important points have been presented. Issues are the infrastructure versus content. The analogy is one of building a house. A house has walls, windows, doors to serve the purpose of a family dwelling unit with a bureau for safe guidelines. What are the processes or steps for M.Ed. vs. Ed.D./Ph.D.? How the content of each program is analogous to the kind of door (hollow or solid core), what the program needs, expertise for the style, one feeds and sustains others.
- Research is new knowledge, graduate program, found in the fringes. Don't get bogged down, don't re-invent the wheel. Is that doing too much to push knowledge forward? Paradigms change.
- Two issues – Dissertation vs. COE dissertations. The issue is communication. A new person who doesn't know the communication style – how does COE do it and what is the process? How, when, where to go?
- Do we need common processes to codify?
- Issue is not clear enough regarding the COE versus the programs.
- At curriculum studies' meetings, we talk about how others do it and ways how to look at quality through outcomes, not how they did it. Is it strong research? Are the doctoral dissertations a result to help us with program assessment?

4. Dr. Claudet reiterates that his goal today is to open discussion. It is a complex, real issue to focus on how we want to define ourselves. COE needs to continue to be vital and move forward. Please continue this discussion in the department and program meetings.

*Question:* Action needed, are Agenda items action items?

5. Dr. Claudet posed the question of how often to meet as a convened graduate faculty?

*Question:* Is there technology to facilitate future meetings such as threaded discussions? Meetings to be held when they are needed?

## **Agenda Item 2. Distinguishing between Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs of study in the College.**

1. Dr. Claudet presented this agenda item as a general discussion issue stating there was no Ph.D. in the past and now we have several Ed.D./Ph.D. programs.

Some questions to consider:

- Only one page of core requirements, is that the way we want it?
- How do we distinguish our Ed.D. from the Ph.D. programs?

A 5-page handout is available with general information about this issue and page 4 of the handout is the EPCE program. The last page is a copy of page 74 of the TTU graduate handbook. A dissertation is required by all doctoral students except Music Arts.

These are a few information points to take to your program meetings. This Agenda item is now open for open discussion – Programs do it but what does the COE want?

*Open Discussion*

- EDHE is the only program that has both an Ed.D. and a Ph.D.
- From a Special Education perspective, it is bothersome to think that an Ed.D. degree “is cheapened”. Don’t diminish the Ed.D. - make the Ph.D. an increase from the Ed.D..
- Does the Ed.D. take out of the Ph.D.? No the Ed.D. was built around what TTU was allowed to do which covers requirements and content. Do not lessen it. It is a recognized terminal degree with a different purpose.
- Ed.D./Ph.D. in Higher Ed are rigorously different. We asked for the COE faculty to lower requirements from 18 credit hours to 12. At the time Brent Cjeda called the Coordinating Board and was informed that we could change the requirements once the program was approved. Then a fiscal crisis in Texas occurred, so TTU did not support COE and other Ph.D. programs. Suggestion is to take the Ed.D. and change the letters to Ph.D. and review the research requirements. That’s why they are so similar. Also, introductory courses do not count.
- Ed Psych requirements equal competition with the Big 10 (versus hours of other universities). Full-time students and recruitment issues. Prefers full-time student which allows time for research, etc... to do these things for a Ph.D..
- Where are we going with the Ph.D. and how does it relate to student goals. It is competitive out there – so they hire the Ph.D.s and not Ed.D.s. So what does it look like centered around research? What action do we need to take now?
- A proposal by Dr. Johnson to change the letters from Ed.D. to Ph.D., not do both programs – with permission from the Coordinating Board.
- The Coordinating Board said NOT to do that as “Ph.D. is masquerading as an Ed.D.”. Now EPSY is re-built as a different program and it has quadrupled since it is under EPSY.
- This is a good example of rules of the COE holding back a program – serves the state through distance education – but it is Ed.D. – a practitioner’s degree which is recognized by various organizations. We need flexibility to work with programs, research, options of core requirements, other college courses instead of COE courses such as marketing, communication, and engineering. This will not work for growth of a program. Please distinguish between Ed.D./Ph.D. to be Ph.D. as research based with Ed.D. as practitioner based.

2. Dr. Claudet suggested we add an Action section to the Agenda for future meetings per discussion comments.

*Open Discussion continued*

- Agree with the suggestion for future Agendas to have Discussion/Action sections. The EPCE program wrote their Ed.D. to a Ph.D. as a distinct change. The changes involve a new configuration of the core, minor and research requirements. They did this “reconfiguration within existing resources” so they eliminated the Ed.D. and moved to the Ph.D. Eighty-five percent of degrees awarded in this field are Ph.D.s.

*A motion made by Dr. Sylvia Mendez-Morse to move to form an ad-hoc committee to explore these differences and report the findings at the next meeting.*

*Seconded by Dr. Roy Rodriguez.*

*Open Discussion continued*

- Issue of how do we handle the quality of full-time and part-time students. Part-time students have a huge handicap, the coursework demands 40 hours a week.

*Amendment to Motion of Dr. Mendez-Morse by Dr. Arturo Oliverez to add the issue of part-time/full-time students and resolve the program aspects so these students are equipped.*

*Amendment not accepted by Dr. Mendez-Morse.*

*Open Discussion continued*

- Clarification? COE is not a program issue for 2007?
- Please add the issue of Distance Ed students accepted into the MEd. at TTU. Program proposals are in consideration for distance education in Ed.D./Ph.D. EPSY is on-line. The challenge is how many are running programs that can be cut because 51% of the program courses are taught on-line? Valerie Paton asked to comment, but discussion continues.
- The approach to this issue may not be a subcommittee. Suggests students do the research into this issue.

*Clarification question on the motion in question – are we exploring Texas or COE distinctions? Dr. Mendez-Morse' motion wants a comparison, a fact-finding committee to scrutinize the differences.*

3. Dr. Claudet re-stated the Motion is discussion: To form an ad-hoc committee to explore facts of how Ed.D./Ph.D. programs are constructed within the COE.

*Open Discussion continued*

- What will that accomplish? National standards versus COE standards and what are the differences?
- Asked by Dr. Claudet to amend the motion?
- Reply – No.
- Would the amendment state – What is different for COE/State/National?
- Yes

*Amendment to Motion: What are normative Ed.D./Ph.D. differences statewide and nationally and report the comparison with COE standards.*

*Open Discussion continued*

- How do we see it? Program differences? How does the COE unit distinguish it? Yes, there should be a difference.
- Before the vote, what is the problem? Is there one? Program/field distinctions per program? Is this what we need to be spending our time on?
- What are the issues? Is the Ed Specialist degree equal to a Ph.D. with the exception of this or that? If so, is this an additional issue?
- The issue, per one opinion, is we should be research-based programs; others may think otherwise. So is it practitioners or researchers, we cannot do both.
- The challenge is do we need an ad-hoc committee?

- To answer the question about the Ed Specialist, it is a degree not offered in Texas. It is 2 years less coursework – offered as consolation instead of a Ph.D. dissertation. There is no market for it.
- Yes, do both degrees (Ed.D. and Ph.D.) in one institution. What to offer, how to offer, meeting criteria set by the program/college/university. It is up to the program.
- There are money and resource issues.
- There is a real danger of never meeting practitioner or researcher standards.

*Call the Question:* In favor: 20  
 Opposed: 23  
 Abstentions: 4

*Motion does not carry.*

### **Agenda Item 3. Foundation core course requirements in the College.**

1. Dr. Claudet provided a one-page handout listing the core requirements.

#### *Open Discussion*

- I have been here 3 ½ years and still don't know how were these requirements created as required by all programs?
  - Dr. Claudet answered they were created through convened meetings by the COE graduate faculty. These requirements cut across the two departments and the programs.
  - When was the last time they were revised?
  - Three years ago.
  - Action on the research requirements – Yes. Action on the foundation requirements – No.
  - Where is a handout for the Ph.D.? Are they exactly the same?
  - We've never had differences.
  - Single subject design research – EPSY 5349 not listed on handout.
  - SPSS not listed, but issues with “choose” of those listed. Wants flexibility of 12 semester hours.
  - Not true – the graduate committee is the arbiter of requirements.
  - Comment made that “she could not substitute a course if it was not on this list”.
  - If a student can choose, why have the list?
  - Two years ago, in the Grad Academic Affairs this subject was addressed with the result being that the student's committee is the final arbiter. It is stated and yes there is flexibility.
  - Yes, it is the committee's decision, if it is not listed.
  - Yes, it has to be on the list – if equivalent – yes to be added to be above and beyond the 12 hours required.
2. Dr. Claudet stated that in previous conversations with Dr. Burley it is his sense that the doctoral committee is the final arbiter of the courses. This handout is to be used as a recommendation resource.

#### *Open Discussion continued*

- Grad school treats this handout as a recommendation.

- EPSY 5379 and EPSY 5380 are leveling courses due to the prerequisites. They do not count towards the degree. Take EPSY 5381 to start counting towards a higher ed degree. The basic courses used as an audit. Doctoral students should take more 6300 courses.
- Dr. Bradley stated the EPCE met in the Provost office for support to move from an Ed.D. to a Ph.D. Liz Hall was consulted. They divided courses into four areas with a selection of 9 hours. EPSY 5379/5380 on the doctorate and requires 15 hours of research.
- Dr. Claudet asked if these handout pages are unreflective with the answer yes, they are not accurate.
- Don't count EPSY 5379/5380. Keep 12 hours of research.

*Motion by Dr. John Murray* for the committee to decide the 12 credit hours of research for all doctoral programs.

*Seconded by Alfredo Benavides.*

3. Dr. Claudet clarified the discussion/motion to be to get rid of the information on the handout, keep 12 hours of research, with sign off by the advisor, department chair, and dean.

*Amendment by Dr. Marbley to the Motion* because she is uncomfortable by the wording of committee versus program – so please amend the motion.

*Dr. Murray accepted the amendment* because it is the professional judgment of 3/5 committee members.

*Motion by Dr. Murray as amended* that all students be required to take 12 hours of research and the 12 hours are to be determined by each program area.

*Seconded by Dr. Benavides.*

*Clarification of the amendment by Dr. Claudet:* Doctoral students in COE be required to take 12 research hours to be determined by each individual program.

*Amendment by Dr. Maushak to the motion* because the problem is with the 12 hours determined by the program versus the needs of an individual student. Amendment to be: Doctoral students in COE to take 12 research hours are to be determined on an individual per student basis by the program.

*Amendment Seconded by Dr. Benavides.*

- Question for clarification – Does the Program make the decision?

Dr. Claudet re-stated the motion as amended to be: *Doctoral students in the COE complete 12 hours of research to be managed by individual programs.*

*Seconded by Dr. Benavides.*

*Open Discussion*

- Are we creating problems – go back to the handbook – are all levels recognized in the handbook?

- Dr. Sally McMillan states that due to language – we need an explicit segment – the issues are the foundations and research core courses.
- Dr. Duemer states the language is there. Resolved with the Grad School. COE makes rules, so we can enforce them. So where is the obstacle?
- Support of the motion, but not the statement because of misunderstanding of: A program is what? Allow the student’s committee to decide? What is a program – C&I or subdivision?
- Clarification: C&I is a department. Bilingual is a program area. Student gets through C&I department. Do we have control over our own programs? Please vote.

4. Dr. Burley states “We want your business”. Flexibility, keep credit hours here at home. Problem is a misunderstanding of the rules. The larger issue is “who do we want to be – a college, a program or individuals”. Need to know/decide if we have direction as a college. We have reduced committees to three which were incestuous within a program. They now allow one outside person. A principle by Rosovsky is “Accountability” which leads to the issue of reliability – we want the best product by the student.

- Dr. Hartmeister addressed the Motion on the floor as being monumental. This is a discussion item, not an action item – so not have a list of research classes. Are we heading to programs without students? Some “intersection” of this handout list needs to occur. This motion emasculates – department chairs and associate deans are taken out of the loop. Discussion to continue by the program faculty and the committee members.
- Doctoral students in the EPCE programs are different as to the Ed.D./Ph.D. of the 12 hours versus the Coordinating Board’s 15 hours. Who has the last word? Still distinguish a difference between Ed.D. and the Ph.D.? Is it a difference in the research courses?
- As to the Coordinating Board, do any changes go back to them, to Susan Hetzler? Is there a difference between the Ed.D./Ph.D.? Yes, we need a menu of courses which may result in students setting up competition between faculty members. An assessment team wants to know the difference between these two degrees. Are we talking around the issue? Are there accreditation issues?
- Dr. Claudet asked: Do we need more information to make a decision? He volunteered to call Susan Hetzler, as an accredited college.
- Valerie Paton asked about calling Susan, there is an issue within the Coordinating Board regarding the Ed.D./Ph.D. Where are the state level requirements?
- Clarification please – enough turmoil – this has been a good discussion bringing issues to the surface. We need to address this issue more carefully and more in-depth along with a host of other issues. We need to do something – motion not capricious, who, how, menu, clarify.

*Motion to Table* by Dr. Benavides.

*Motion* not withdrawn.

*Dr. Claudet Motions to Table* for the moment.

*Seconded* by Dr. Murray.

*Open Discussion*

- What is the current status? Does the committee decide from what is in the handbook? How to communicate them to the college?

- Dr. Claudet asked Dr. McMillan about her course with Peggy. It is not counted as a research course in the COE but is counted in other TTU colleges.

*Motion by Dr. Claudet to table with discussion.*

- If grad students do not take EPSY are they free to take outside courses?
- Current understanding is that ultimately it is the mentoring committee of the student using the handbook wording.
- If the Degree Plan is not approved do we use the Course Change Form? Yes, approved as a substitution.
- Clarification question – Dr. Burley is right and the pressure from outside reports (Levine being one) with teacher prep courses and administrative prep courses because the market is changing – we need to get our “Act together”.
- The question is: Make a motion to table Dr. Murray’s motion?
- Both motions are legal.

*Dr. Murray voluntarily Tabled his Motion for further discussion.*

**Call the Question** by raising hands: Favor: Majority  
Nay: None  
Abstain: None

*Motion Tabled.*

### **Closing remarks**

1. Dr. Claudet will gain more information on the items under discussion. Please email him your wishes as to the date for the next meeting and your items to be added to the Agenda as for discussion and/or action.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

Esther Lucey  
Recorder