

APPROVED MINUTES

Graduate Faculty Meeting
Friday, February 2, 2007
12:00Noon - 3:00pm
College of Education, Room 001

(Note: These minutes were approved with amendment by the College of Education Graduate Faculty at their meeting on May 2, 2007.)

Attendees: Mary Frances Agnello, Zenaida Aguirre-Muñoz, Amma Akrofi, Judi Atcheson, Alfredo Benavides, Loretta Bradley, Hansel Burley, Katie Button, Joe Claudet, Steve Crooks, Roseanna Davidson, Lee Duemer, Kay Gleghorn, Heriberto Godina, Nora Griffin-Shirley, Doug Hamman, Shane Hammontree, Fred Hartmeister, Carole Janisch, Peggy Johnson, Joann Klinker, William Lan, Carol Layton, Deann Lechtenberger, Jay Leist, Robin Lock, Esther Lucey, Aretha Marbley, Nancy Maushak, Sally McMillan, Sylvia Mendez-Morse, Eva Midobuche, Barbara Morgan-Fleming, Patsy Mountz, John Murray, Susan Myers, Arturo Olivarez, Diane Oliver, Jerry Parr, Peggie Price, Loretta Rudd, Dora Salazar, René Saldaña Jr., Shannon Sanderson, Sheryl Santos, Jean Shen, Doug Simpson, Kamau Siwatu, Walter Smith, Karen Spears, Julie Thomas, Reese Todd, Eugene Wang, Patricia Watson, Jennifer Wilhelm.

Recorders: Esther Lucey and Kay Gleghorn

Meeting called to order by Dr. Claudet.

Dr. Claudet thanked faculty for attending and indicated that Graduate Faculty meetings are opportunities for faculty to have wide forum discussions on issues of interest. Dr. Claudet also encouraged faculty to review handout materials during lunch. The following handouts were distributed: draft of January 2007 meeting minutes; copy of today's meeting agenda; print out of graduate programs in the College of Education; and the latest enrollment figures (Fall, 2006) for College of Education graduate programs.

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Griffin-Shirley moved to approve the January 2007 Meeting Minutes.

Seconded by Dr. Bradley.

Open Discussion

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: Requests a spelling correction of TOEFL on page 2.

Dr. Claudet: Asked everyone to sign in on the attendance list and to review the attendance list from January's meeting. It was noted that Dr. Jennifer Wilhelm's name needs to be added to the January meeting attendee listing. Dr. Claudet thanked Kay Gleghorn and Esther Lucey for recording minutes, and noted that it is very difficult to take minutes with so many people. These Graduate Faculty meeting minutes are part of the required documentation for accreditation/assessment in the College of Education.

Dr. Claudet: Asked if there were any further amendments? None were cited. The question was then called. Motion *passed as amended*.

All were in favor; Opposed – zero; Abstain – zero

Dr. Claudet stated that today's meeting agenda is a rich and interesting one. Dr. Claudet explained that part of his philosophy in calling graduate faculty meetings is he personally believes there are very important issues in a complex environment that require open conversation and input from all graduate faculty members. We create forums for issues to be brought forward with all perspectives heard. So thanks to those who brought forth issues. These meetings belong to you; they are not structured in advance. Does anyone have an issue or email notice to add today before we begin with the formal proceedings?

None offered.

Let us move forward. As a way of organizing agenda items for today, please note that some are continuing discussions from January's meeting and some were moved forward to become action items.

Agenda Item 1: COE Visioning Process and Action Agenda for Graduate Education (Dean Santos)

Dean Santos: Hi everyone; sorry I missed last time. It is okay that I was not at your meeting the last time because it gave me a chance to read the minutes and talk about department issues. One is we haven't had these conversations for a long time. This is my 4th year – I am serious about doctoral education, I've given it a lot of thought, particularly in terms of the best way to have a visioning process. I will frame my remarks around the discussion of a vision. This is really a faculty decision and it is currently in your hands as faculty. One question is: Think about should all of our doctoral students, when they graduate, be able to demonstrate mastery of a certain set of expectations regardless of program area?

Core courses revisited: Many graduates work in a university setting, may not at first, but wind up as adjuncts, or as retirees from other educational careers. Is there a baseline that we put a stamp on with a Double T? Are we sure that person is well representing this college regardless of major, program, Ed.D., or Ph.D.? That level of specificity, is there some baseline? Look about you, a TTU doctoral person may be presenting this question: What do universities look for in a new graduate? People out of doctoral programs are practitioners, in counseling or administration and wind their way to a doctorate to go into an institution somewhere in the US or abroad, not just Texas but the world.

I am a hiring agent and I know what I look for and what the committees look for: Do you have a research agenda, publication, professional meetings, transcript, and mastery of some research tools? No transcript with no research or skewed qualitative vs. quantitative methods - Are you a little reluctant? The question is for you to look at the mixed methods, to know if they are aware of the issues today. Was their program relevant to public policy, content, K-12? Can they teach at a college level, adults, diverse, handicapped? Are they collegiate, speak well in public, present themselves well in colloquia, had an opportunity to conduct a colloquium? Do they have academic writing skills? Given those concerns, I know what I look for in an ABD or someone I may hire to join us at TTU - whether an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. is not a consideration. If you look at a directory at any university, both degrees are represented. So, keep in mind, given those concerns, the big question is: Are we providing the opportunity to our students to leave here with employment options? Are we proud of our graduates and about the quality of their dissertations? Do we have an oversight committee to study what these degrees look like in terms of new things from the grad school, as to options, requirements, and models?

I really think it is time to study, self study and assess quality of doctoral experiences including admissions. How do we select, recruit, retain, grade? Are there grade inflations? Are there studies of retention? Dr. Muñoz has mentioned retention. Do they drop out because they are tired or

are we not attending to their developmental needs? The timeliness to degree - are we working well at that? Research tools - are students feeling confident? Can they speak authoritatively about their core research tools? Foundations - confusion of what is in the 21st century? Do they know what that means - what is a foundation? We need to have that conversation amongst yourselves and with your students.

What about leveling courses with deficiency plans upon admission? The GRE or something like that - a quick fix – yes, we let them in. What are they bringing with them as far as any deficiencies upon admission? How does the quality of our own masters pipeline to doctoral degree progress? Are we giving them an option to do a thesis? Many have no notion how to write - either they took a test or were asked to circle the dot. I don't know if that really tells you anything. Do they have any academic thought pieces - write in a scholarly way? Mentoring, advising experience by us - what kind of experience do they take away? Are we helping with development, writing a dissertation and development especially of non-native speakers of English, especially of those who have never written a dissertation before? Those with high GRE scores still have problems writing. What are the kinds of services we may need to offer to make sure students are successful? If you take someone on and have no notion, the high level of these issues, never had a research course coming into our program, but they had nothing after that in a doctoral program, without a knowledge base and we expect them to pull a dissertation out of a hat? Have we done studies about this?

Many questions arise and to generate just a few: Are we clear about the product? Can we be more efficient and predictable? We need to be clear off the assembly line. Do we know exactly what the baseline knowledge is and do they have to perform this ability? Better look at the admissions process. GRE - keep it or not? Programmatic - does it tell us much about their analysis abilities, speaking abilities, can they conduct research, ability to do research, write?

Therefore, I would like to appoint an ad hoc study group to develop questions. This committee would generate answers based on solid data and make recommendations to graduate faculty about a revised core. Research tools, foundations, technology, can they teach on line? Are they comfortable using WebCT? Do we provide seminars for them if they have deficiencies? What opportunities do they have to work alongside a professional teaching a course like that? What is the quality of the GA's experience?

The Graduate Academic Affairs Committee - is there some document to delineate better with evaluation of a GA - did we get that far? The current GAAC is really not set up for that. The representation is minimal across programs. The GAAC is made up of 6 representatives and they are departmental representatives. We (COE) have 12 programs. Each program is like a department. If you have no representation from Ed Psych or others, you do not have a voice. There has been no complete study out of that group, duplicative, doing their job.

What I am proposing is an ad hoc committee with a mission: study the quality of course offerings, have a discussion about the product we put out and a look see as to some other things - an overlap of scope and sequence. We have so many programs that are service oriented. Example: Ed Psych – do they know your program when offering a course? Is there a conversation and how is that course to be tailored? We have special education evaluation. There is another course on evaluations, how are they aligned? We need efficiency, tailored to their needs. We have to challenge the person to graduate with certain baseline performance levels. Do we worry about each specific doctoral program? What is the job market? These are some baseline questions. We really need to look at the scope of coherency, duplication, approval, efficiency. Housing our tools is a big question.

Ed Psych, C&I courses appear all over the place. We really have no data-driven process by which we determine what the courses are and where they are to be housed. Which faculty member, not in a specific program, has the experience or more experience than the one teaching the specific course within the specific program? How do you get people with experience in mixed methods to fit in or filter in to the research tool offering who are not in that program area?

Another issue is people like Arturo who is on all doctoral committees because he is an expert in statistics. Students who never take a course from him, who never have had access to him in his program, are using his expertise. Where is the expertise housed and how to make it an equitable work load? These are tough questions. The perception is one of being overworked, being on more committees. Is this an artificial dichotomy? Conversations can create hard feelings; tackle them so this does not become an Iraq with Shiites and Sunnis. A committee comprised of people with deep passion can duke it out in a reduced environment so their voices can be heard above the fray.

A couple of other concerns I have: These are very complex issues and I believe they can be resolved with all represented and all voices heard to capture the full picture. Look at the profile of our product. The COE with the hooding process should be able to fill in the blanks. We can all feel proud and not just you in your program. We all feel proud because we know that student has a baseline of attitude and abilities and is a credit to the entire COE and not one program.

Therefore, I would like as an Action item on the Agenda to request one representative from each program area in doctoral education to serve on this ad hoc committee. When you meet with your program, on the internet, or in the hallway, the program coordinator needs to poll all faculty members and select one person to represent your program. The representative has a very serious responsibility to represent the program and brings the voice of the group forward to the whole committee - not self. This is a big responsibility because you will say "my faculty feels this certain way about this". That can be contained and worked through like looking at a diamond with a lot of light shining – reality looks a certain way. The accomplishment is to see the whole picture with wise decisions made based upon data.

One more item, this is not a decree in pointing out what I hear, not my job, I don't have a vote. It is faculty who vote, I point out this dichotomy with Ed.D./Ph.D. Be careful of this issue - do we imply one? As a university we hire both as a practice. That person can go anywhere and teach anywhere and be hired. We need to ensure we stand behind the quality of both programs equally. Many prefer Ed.D. in some areas of study and we need to make sure it is a quality program.

We talk about international programs like Egypt and Saudi Arabia. They do not accept the Ed.D. and will not give money for that program because they have never heard of it. I have spoken, as we try to admit students, with ambassadors of ministries of education that this degree is specific to education and just as high in status as the Ph.D. I show directories (Harvard, etc...) with faculty having Ed.D. and Ph.D. The core coursework and appropriateness is a little different. Be really careful not to diminish the quality of the different degrees in our own minds as we look for students/faculty.

These are faculty issues. I am here to frame the final product. Our reputation, our credibility as a degree-conferring university – we want to feel proud they hired one of our graduates. I think it is important, especially now as the COE is trying hard to increase research, to live up to our name, get more grants, more dollars, and the quality of your name attracts students everywhere. We want students to know if you go to Tech you get a really good opportunity and we produce professors who are proficient in what a professor needs to be. I agree to participate on the ad hoc committee as an ex officio, the chairs will be ex officio and we won't vote. We will come up with questions. Shane will

look up data info, do surveys of students who left 5 years out, questions as to how we trained them, what could be done differently, where are they, did they receive support money and do graduates donate money? How do you see the graduate council? Is there a value in the need for numbers and online programs and the quality of students? With quality people fighting to get into our programs, is there one other piece - active recruiting? Talking about online or increasing the number of students, students with deficiencies need leveling courses, talented, but naïve about higher education, not socialized for this, offer seminars, leveling courses, more access to the mentor professor who pays attention to the student. The role of the advisor, is it a worry or a waste of time at the doctoral level? Any questions?

Dr. Thomas: I am interested in how you will manage any changes recommended by this ad hoc committee. How will we handle it procedurally and what is the time line?

Dean Santos: Let the committee deal with this, this semester. We may not have a quick answer, it took us this long to come up with the questions.

Dr. Thomas: Will it be a year before the programs might change?

Dean Santos: Agreement by faculty depends upon the recommendations of the committee. Hope to host sessions, engage in bringing in speakers, ask everyone to pay attention to this. We have to have action at the end of this conversation and a recommendation to go forward in a certain way.

Dr. Godina: Mentioned some of his ideas; commented on rigor of COE programs; TTU augmenting research in publications. I noticed there are a lot of places for improvement - students can have a M.Ed., language and comprehensive exams, status not acceptable at places I was at. I will be happy to speak about my experiences.

Dr. Benavides: You all do a wonderful job, great faculty; we have the proper venue for a conversation to study and focus in on things festering and come to a conclusion with closure. Not a premature closure and not with bad feelings among/between faculty in a dichotomizing way. Not a sinking ship. While these things are important, we don't need a fast decision. We need to engage in these things when things are going well, not as a sinking ship. The way things are need to come out in a proper way and venue, not to create chaos.

Dr. Hamman: What are the things affecting parts of the college, retention, the graduate's role?

Dean Santos: The issue is a push for enrollment growth, by having new programs or programs offered in new ways. That issue goes back to what Doug says. Not wholesale to get more students. Come up with some great ideas, with funding for them, and you will hear more chairs asking about programmatic ideas, wonderful programs, and some ways to garner new resources from the Provost. I think when you have good programs, enrollment increases because people want to get in. Zenaida spoke with William about the *U.S. News and World* report that is based on perception - by looking at names of institutions that our peers use and they ranked them. We don't really know, because they are out there promoting their greatness. Need something to promote, small item, and go with the promotion such as good documents, good students, who gets hired, positive standings in the *U.S. News and World* report.

When I get a phone call and they are looking for a faculty member and I also call other places to ask if they have anybody coming out because we have a search occurring, I am looking for those names, so chairs need to discuss and send back to the program coordinators, talk with faculty, who are to be on this ad hoc committee. We pay careful attention to what requires a meeting.

Dr. Claudet: Additional comments before moving on?

Nora Griffin-Shirley: As to your Deans' meeting in Austin - please address 2 key points.

1. What is going on in the state?
2. It is very important for all to hear that.

Dean Santos: The meeting was very disturbing - the Texas Association Conference of Deans of Colleges of Education. One thing was the governor's business council. His advisors may or may not have any real knowledge of colleges of education. It looks like they will monitor colleges more, teacher education, K-12, basing our worth as a college on how well our product is able to increase academic achievement of those students they will then teach. They want a big brother database to show where graduates are employed, what class they teach, what students, and TAKS grades. So there is a perception in the way documents are written, that colleges of education are not doing a good job. The perception is based on how it was 30 years ago, when some of them majored in education 30 years ago before there were field-based experiences, diversity attention, technology, mentoring, induction, so they have old ideas. They talk about colleges of education specifically, not alternative programs, in the same breath. They are not subject to the same scrutiny but probably will be - may meet same qualifications. We will be ranked accordingly, as to acceptable recognition/knowledge, low performing students.

The Governor's announcement, with chancellors/presidents, said the monies are tied to how well the students do on their exit exams. For us at TTU COE, no problem, we do this. Other majors do not, such as arts/sciences and business majors. Money will be tied to results. Universities will give back money - very complicated. The governor is surrounded by people saying opposite things. Now conversations occur suggesting getting rid of the 4-8 Certificate. In two days, a decision goes to SBEC reporting to TEA (4-9). TEA talks about colleges of higher education and told Susan Hetzler to stay out of it. Very confusing. The middle schools do not have enough teachers, pipeline numbers, so suggesting a change of certificate to K-6 and 6-12. So, we the deans are trying to talk with HR people, they want bodies in the classroom. Superintendents are removed, so we have people in west Texas crying for teachers, get back to distance learning, cannot be insulated and thinks we are. Political entities have perceptions, we have to be out, we have to make concessions, and we have to work with them.

Dr. Marbley: This will have implications on our AAT program with South Plains College - K-6 - think about this, if they have no 4-8, only a major in a subject matter. Teach one subject maybe, if they major, what happens to middle school? Now it is 2 for 1. One person to teach one subject matter. Biology graduate goes to high school, not middle school; so there are challenges before us. Same document of business council advocating a K-8 reading certificate for middle school. We don't want too many certificates; but now business council says we need more. Competing voices, very difficult. Our voice has to be heard in a way that ensures we are part of the solution and not the problem. Now, it is framed as if we are a part of the problem.

The national dialogue suggests a shortage is not the issue; with study - it is retention - senior people leave at 2 years. So 2 issues arise from research: One, we are not preparing teachers for the environment and they leave. Two, the reason they give - they are not prepared. They feel alone. They are putting together ads showing teachers as a team; thus, informing policy makers that the movement is the team, no teacher is seen. The focus on diversity; thus proving we do not have enough teachers.

Dean Santos: HR1 passed and there is a big move afoot for administrator training programs to move them to storefront level. That is a big issue. There is also a move that people believe you do not need to have any knowledge of education to be an administrator. Those returning from Iraq can be a good principal. All of this affects our grad program. Most go to a college of education at some level to be prepared and as leaders in this struggle we cannot be weak. We have to pay attention with the ultimate price being if we don't do our job, our children grow up stupid and docile and oppressed. Total relationship with what we do, mission, and research is important and to disseminate it with reality. Put out a dissertation for students to talk to policy makers and make a difference out there. It is high stakes.

Dr. Midobuche: A Jones lecturer - Dr. Valenzuela - told us about this. It is sad.

Dean Santos: Pay attention, be the best we can be, don't lose hope. Life is short. Don't make it meaningless, our passion is our life's work. Everyday I struggle and love this job. We can't afford to lay back and let things take the course. Bring students to work and find them with that passion to develop.

Dr. Claudet: At these graduate faculty meetings, these conversations are of value - they help us think about quality. Bottom line is quality of graduates in market and beyond.

Dean Santos: Thanks all.

Agenda Item 2: Continuing discussion item: College of Education Graduate Assistantships – multiple year limit (Dr. Runnels)

Dr. Claudet: This is an item from the Nov. 2006 meeting that we did not get to complete. The issue of the COE GA's employment – consideration of a possible limit on the amount of years employed. This item was first brought to our attention by Dr. Runnels. Dr. Thomas will facilitate this discussion. Dr. Claudet indicated he will share specific numbers on the recent history of GAs' length of continuous employment in the COE.

Dr. Thomas: Mary cannot be here to share her concerns in the way we support GAs. There is opportunity for a student to delay progress in his/her program. So some are here for extended periods of time, extra years. I would like to initiate limitations in the graduate assistant's employment.

The students with M.Ed.'s related to education - they should be able to make progress and complete a program in 4 yrs and for those who enter a Ph.D. program with a related education degree. Those without a M.Ed. or with an unrelated master, limit the GA employment to 5 years. Also, a student might come in as an assistant funded by a research project, externally funded. Hypothetically, employed for 2 years by the project, do they begin the doctoral program in those 2 years and will they still have COE GA eligibility of support of 4 years? We need to come up with managing continuing college support no longer funded by special projects. Mary would like this as an agenda action item eventually. She has visited with Dr. Claudet and has some history – is it a problem or not?

Dr. Claudet: I will start by sharing data from Sandy garnered from the PAF forms. Currently (for a total of 50) there are:

- 16 GAs in 1st year of employment as a GA
- 8 GAs in 2nd year of continuous of employment as a GA
- 10 GAs in 3rd continuous year of employment as a GA
- 6 GAs in 4th continuous year of employment as a GA

7 GAs in 5th continuous year of employment as a GA

Also, we found there are 3 additional students employed this year longer than 5 continuous years. Forty-seven employed for the last 5 years, 7 in their 5th year. This is a very wide, big picture. Patsy will be sending out a reminder of the form required for the GA annual review.

Open Discussion

Dean Santos: Question - what is an unintended consequence of such a policy change?

Dr. Claudet: We always have a large number of applicants; because of this, we turn many away. High quality people are part of the consideration. This issue may be related to the work of the proposed ad hoc committee. What is an appropriate length of time for meaningful, rigorous study?

Dr. Hartmeister: One big issue is students changing their majors – not doctoral/masters but EPCE/EPsy. That happens every year. It takes 4/5 years to complete a program. Consider student athletes, they have a limited time. Finish in a reasonable time in one program, might not be able to change majors.

Dr. Thomas: If a policy is set as to the number of years, could we allow exceptions?

Dr. Marbley: Shouldn't we make these decisions grounded in data? What is the graduation rate for students in general? What is the reality of what we do and what are the real issues?

Dr. Benavides: Wondering – and I agree with Fred – is there a danger? Why admit students who don't know what they want to do? Is this a mark of a strong student? Are they too young?

Dr. Claudet: This involves the program review process.

Dr. Olivarez: The sequence allows for 3 years to say I need courses lined up – to know to take the sequence – no discussion of this in Nov./Jan. meetings. He knew he had 3 years of funding and when it would run out. He finished his program because he knew he did not have funding. The scope and sequence of the program didn't allow him to take the courses he wanted to take. We need new students.

Dr. Bradley: At Purdue, we knew we had 3 years to complete at the front end. Employment was a maximum of 3 years. Another issue - do we have policy or is it an individual basis? Do all who stay, year after year; do they deserve it based on the ratings they get? Do they measure up? They can be out. There are 2 facets - time and performance.

Dr. Claudet: This conversation has been helpful with responses focusing on quality and rating the GAs. If a GA is not performing, evaluation feedback needs to be reflect this.

Dr. Hartmeister: We shouldn't wait for the GA evaluation to be sent out in March. If the employed person does not show up, tell us. Don't wait 6-9 months, do it every 2 weeks on the time sheet. This has the advantage of accountability built in. Secondly, the likelihood of being employed in the summer: It takes 4/5 years to finish with summer courses or not employed. This summer – no GA funding – monies are for hired faculty. Twenty-six students employed with 21 who were not employed and that was 4 years ago. International students go home and don't come back for many reasons.

Dr. Lechtenberger: One thing, we faculty don't put onus on GA's as to performance. The GA should document what they do and give them incentive vs. the faculty report. Entitlement issue? Dissertation time for students, make them accountable, research, literature review, grading, have monthly meetings with key faculty and advisors of accounting reports – hours vs. reports.

Dr. Thomas: Is it a fact the international students depend on employment? If they are not employed they must pay out-of-state tuition, will they finish in 4/5 years?

Dr. Bradley: Chaired the summer budget committee – a faculty issue – money will be for 2 courses or to graduate students – does faculty get the money, student employment, 2 courses? Question about international students – do they have to work in the COE? Are there other positions in TTU? Can we help them find other work for the summer? Priority is faculty because we are permanent employees. How to help the GAs? Work at the residence halls?

Dr. Claudet: I have already helped students find other employment at TTU through the Grad School. Yes, other positions are available on campus.

Dr. Lan: International students – finding positions outside of the COE is difficult because other hiring agencies don't want to offer 20 hours of employment which is an insurance issue. If not summer dollars, 18 credit hours, takes 4.5 years as the student's program has 81 hours requirement. This limits the international student to have only 1 semester to complete a dissertation. Is it possible to have 3.5 years for courses and 1.5 years for the dissertation?

Dr. Mendez-Morse: Isn't it the responsibility of doctoral students to plan ahead? We should have high expectations for them to take the initiative with our help and advisement. Are we doing too much? Are they too dependent on us? "Move on please – it is your turn". This is a temporary job for now. Being a GA for 7 years is not something to brag about.

Dr. Layton: A few students change their degree program and are a GA for a long time. What is the goal: Is it a degree or to sustain employment? We owe it to help faculty morale and protect faculty money - huge investment for summer teaching.

Dr. Hartmeister: Having students as employees as 12-month appointments. Can we do it? Yes, instead of the "I need 10/20 hours of a GA" requested by a faculty member.

Dr. Lechtenberger: Accountability – 6 solid hours a week from the GA.

Dr. Hartmeister: We can use monies from GA attrition and from those who graduate to offer 12-month appointments vs. 9-month appointments. We can fill fewer positions for 1 year.

Dr. Akrofi: We should give students their due. GAs do not want to hang around – many want out as fast as they can. Consider that and just look at how much money we do have. Can we afford them for 4 years, inform them at the beginning – offer is 4 years financially.

Dr. Burley: I organized my RAs as a study group. This is successful in many ways. Progress to date is: One paper out; one ready to go; one to AERA and 5 students presenting at SERA. My focus is research and they police themselves as to who works and when. They are engaged in their own creative ways to do their research as a group. I suggest each professor to work with a group to get the hours and they work on their own research interests. The complaint I hear is they can't connect the dots between classes (theory, stats, proposals, public experience) of putting it all together. The study group works.

Dr. Marbley: Are we really clear on what the problem is? How many? Where is the data? Where are they as students? Are they ABD? Do they have the skills to complete a dissertation? Ownership of the student - the committee, advisors, how does the student graduate? What is the issue? We need data as to: Where are they? How many of them? Whose responsibility is it to get student from point A (admission) to graduation?

Dr. Thomas: Are we a voting body? Can I bring a motion?

Dr. Olivarez: We do not need more data - it is there - create the motion and go.

Dr. Claudet: Dr. Runnels will provide a motion on this at the next meeting.

De. Hammon: What will be the impact of this kind of a policy on a particular graduate student; please don't just act. There are reasons for GAs needing additional time to finish.

Dean Santos: Doug's reasoning is valid. We should ask the students their information and bring it to the next meeting.

Dr. Burley: We might lose a pool of applicants.

Dean Santos: My worries are: International students not coming back after the summer break. This frees up monies for the 12-month position? Impact on international students - talk with them before next meeting.

Dr. Lechtenberger: Are there positions available for work study students in the summer?

Dr. Burley: As to work study students, I met with Dean Borrelli one year ago; there is a percentage set aside for summer work-study students. This can extend a student's employment. Go after this aggressively which equals 3 GA's for the price of 1 and with all the benefits.

Dr. Morgan-Fleming: We need to look at the international students. Can they take courses during the summer or at foreign languages? Is there different funding for summer?

Dr. Marbley: These conversations and discussions need to be based on data, validity, funding, graduate council concerns. Blanket decisions need data.

Dr. Bradley: Through your office, Joe, can you come up with the 5 or 6 GA positions? Do international students qualify for work study? If you work with Dean Borelli to learn about positions across the university, can we offer 6 funded positions of 12-month offerings?

Dr. Claudet: I will discuss this with Dean Borrelli.

Dr. Bradley: To protect the international students, your office could possible assist as a link with other colleges.

Dr. Hartmeister: Yes, work study is a way to leverage dollars. No, work study does not apply to international students. What needs to be done for work study is to complete a FAFSA form. International students are not eligible if this is not completed. Is Dean Borelli holding back a percentage of work study positions for summer? We have 50 employed GAs with 20 of them international students.

Dr. Burley: Ditto what Fred said. Before we go outside, it is one way for leverage.

Agenda Item 3: Transcription needs in the College – staff transcribers / work-study students (Dr. Claudet)

Dr. Claudet: This was a November 2006 meeting agenda item presented by Dr. Wang. Please raise your hand if you have transcription needs (a large number raised their hands). Yes, work study students can be assigned. Transcription requires specific abilities. Any comments or motions to add transcriptionists/transcribers as staff members or in other ways? Are transcription needs being met?

Dr. Thomas: No, my transcription needs are not being met. I leave materials for transcription, but they are returned incomplete. I have not been satisfied in my 11 years of employment. I do it myself now and I don't look to COE for support.

Dr. Button: We need to provide a safe manner for transcribing such as not losing tapes or the results.

Dr. Claudet: It is clear that faculty transcription needs are not being met. I will take this to the administrators meeting for action.

Agenda Item 4: New Discussion Item: TTU Graduate Council vote regarding GRE requirement (Dr. Griffin-Shirley and Dr. Olivarez)

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: Dr. John Borelli will retire this summer. I am done with my 3-year term in May. We need a volunteer for my position. At yesterday's Graduate Council, a decision was made that students will need to be continuously enrolled. That means fall, spring, and summer for all graduate students both masters and doctoral. Policy was written by Graduate School designates.

The GRE is no longer required by the Grad School. This is now campus policy as directed by upper administrators. I am only the messenger. Each program is to choose its own evaluation criteria for admission. The GRE will no longer be on the worksheet. Each program must notify the Grad School. By default, the GRE scores will be received by the Grad School who pays to receive the scores. Why? A study of students with a GRE score of 1300 had lower GPA. Kay Gleghorn will email a list of programs which do or do not require the GRE. A high GRE is not a predictor of success. But yes, they complete the first semester. In most cases, the GRE is not waived. International studies and ESL are upgrading. Graduate level help for students in writing, forward thinking, products, employment. Grad school will help programs with a work study student to get the GRE scores from TechSIS, if we ask for it. There will be new software campus-wide and training/assistance will be provided.

Dean Santos: GRE, the TTU code?

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: The GRE TTU code goes to the Grad School. ETS wants to be global and there are issues regarding North Texas students' inability to access the technology. We need to know what our prospective needs are and our acceptance criteria.

Dr. Bradley: Her program will keep the GRE as part of 10 measures. Do they provide a letter to the Grad School?

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: Yes, each program is to notify the Grad School.

Dr. Claudet: I suggest each program make their decision regarding GRE requirement, then notify their chair, who will then notify me and Patsy Mountz.

Dr. Hartmeister: Each program coordinator can write a memo and copy all, the COE Grad Office and the Grad School.

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: The grad council member role takes approximately 3-10 hours a month, depending on what needs to be read. It is a 3 year term. The job position is posted, there are handouts available. Arturo, also, has research information.

Dr. Olivarez: Grad School has funded a project by the COE to assess drop outs/commuters. The data analysis will take about a month. The first issue: Why are we losing graduate students; dropouts vs. those who finish? The second issue: The Grad Council is hopeful the completion rate will get better.

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: The next topic for the Grad Council's consideration is the probation/suspension issue on page 71 of the graduate handbook. If you have any issues or questions, please email her and she will forward them to the Council.

Dr. Watson: Continuous enrollment issues?

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: The idea is to be enrolled in every session, not sit out a semester. This is a head-count issue. It affects 106 of the COE, roughly 30%, compared to 200 enrolled. Ours are all summer residency students, so ours will need to enroll for at least 1 hour. TTU is a flagship institution.

Dr. Hartmeister: Doctoral students need continued enrollment. Yes, they pay \$50 if they sit out a long semester and add 1 hour for enrollment for requirement to make up the hours missed in previous summer non-enrollment.

Dr. Smith: With my past at 3 other institutions, it can be very discouraging to part-timers. The trend now is for part-time students. To increase enrollment, when analyzing admissions, this is a counterproductive policy.

Dr. Olivarez: In this situation, we do not have good data. Our institutional research databases do not have it. Those that finish their degree, have a date entered. Those that do not finish – what is the current status listed on the survey? Eleven students said they dropped out. Many believe they are enrolled even if they are not currently taking courses. Are we reporting 2% dropout rate because we cannot find them? Monies are available to do the attrition study.

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: Dr. Borrelli will speak with us at our invitation. This policy impacts the COE more. Please write a memo of concerns, but add in recruitment policies for a positive note and this will be a strategy for administrators to bring up to the Board of Regents.

Dean Santos: Can we ask them to provide a fee as a “no credit enrollment fee” in order to track students?

Dr. Bradley: This impacts the COE more than other TTU colleges. One credit hour with fees is roughly \$800 for the summer. How many students need to work in the summer in order to afford to come back in the fall? This is an attrition impact.

Dr. Klinker: This policy may be an opportunity for us to put together a one-hour foundations or tools course.

Agenda Item 5: Faculty student advisement reporting on annual reports (Dr. Lan)

Dr. Lan: I need your input, involvement, to advise the Grad School on the COE's annual report. No list of things was done last year. The Grad School has asked for a record of progress in their student study data. List your students, where they are, see the handout provided. An example: a doctoral student - the advisor does the degree plan yes or no; document completed hours each year; see the handout. Undergraduates – no place to report this – most of you are supervisors – do I add a table for them or will you use the comment section on the form? Add your comments/suggestions to Dr. Lan on what is not listed on this table. This is for the annual report.

Dr. Wilhelm: I do research with students and I am a primary advisor and a grad chair. How do I document that? If they are enrolled am I their advisor? I am a member of their committee, so I list myself as a member on this form?

Dr. Marbley: I have interdisciplinary students who are not COE students, how do I report that?

Dr. Lan: Only report your role with the student.

Dr. Marbley: I assist with portfolios and undergrads with their theses, such as honors students and senior theses. There needs to be a spot on this form for that.

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: Does the preliminary exam go under doctoral students in the table? I advise certificate and certification students – where do I report these 2 different programs?

Dr. Button: Masters students need advising on program areas without completing a degree plan.

Dr. Lan: List it as advisement of prospective students such as post-bac.

Dr. Hartmeister: Nancy Maushak suggests this table for the annual review and working with Shane on the annual review template to have your list of students' names to re-appear on the review form. We all received – via Patsy in the Grad Office – the Annual Report of Masters and Doctoral Students – page 73. This needs to be monitored. What have you done as performance status and grad school requirements? There is a copy in his file.

Dr. Lan: Table is not to replace the Grad School reports.

Dr. Olivarez: In his situation, he provides advanced data analysis for five COE and fifteen non-COE students. But, every student asks him questions and he advises them anyway if not as their advisor/chair.

Dean Santos: The concept is called advising vs. mentoring. Career development or research is called mentoring. Does it count on this table?

Dr. Lan: I will create another table of informal mentoring.

Dr. Mendez-Morse: Masters without thesis – she is on the qualifying exam committee – where does it go?

Dr. Lan: I will add it if necessary onto the table.

Dr. Olivarez: I recommend that the blocks have a date, not just a check mark.

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: As a former program coordinator, I got all the program questions and directed the students to the appropriate person.

Dr. Hartmeister: Is it advisement or informal mentoring? This is a part of teaching and part of the service we provide.

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: It should go in the annual reports.

Dean Santos: Like the IRS, create a file.

Dr. Hartmeister: Shane will make the 2007 table available for access everyday starting maybe as early as May.

Dr. Lan: Thank you. I will submit this form for your approval following revisions..

Dr. Claudet: Let's move now to the final item on the agenda.

Agenda Item 6: College adoption of formatting style for theses and dissertations (Dr. Mendez-Morse)

Dr. Mendez-Morse: I make a motion for the COE to adopt APA formatting for the theses/dissertations. Ed Psych program adopted this in January 2007. Do the programs need to vote and then send to the Dean? As a department, they voted and agreed to use APA as formatting for dissertations in Ed Psych. Is this a COE decision? Does it go next to the Grad School?

Dr. Shen: What about those students who need to complete the internal articles within the dissertation in a journal format or with a different format?

Dr. Peggie Price: We all submit what we are familiar with, it depends on the journal.

Dr. Wilhelm: The intro chapter, articles, conclusion, chapters – what to use?

Dr. Griffin-Shirley: Since most of the dissertation is not done in a journal format – use it as an exception and the Grad School will work with the individual.

Dr. Mendez-Morse: Is it a motion for the COE to the Grad School?

Dr. Walter Smith: I suggest an amendment to the motion and add the exception of the journal style.

Dr. Mendez-Morse: I accept this and second the motion.

Dr. Claudet: Motion on the floor. There was no further discussion; the motion was restated and the question was called: The COE graduate faculty agree to accept APA as the format style of theses and dissertations and with the understanding that students and advisors who use the journal format can elect to follow the formatting style prescribed by the journal within the chapters.

All in Favor – aye; Opposed – none; *Motion carries.*

Closing Remarks

Dr. Claudet: Thanks to everyone for your energy and commitment. There will be one more meeting in May, date to be announced. Thank you for your different viewpoints. These discussions are important.

Recorder: Esther Lucey and Kay Gleghorn
February 2, 2007