

College of Education
Graduate Faculty Meeting
and Working Lunch
Wednesday, May 2, 2007
10:00am - 2:00pm
College of Education, Rm. 001

MINUTES

Approved at November 21, 2008 Meeting

Attendees

Mary Frances Agnello, Amma Akrofi, Connie Anderson, Judi Atcheson, Devender Banda, Alfredo Benavides, Loretta Bradley, Katie Button, Yoke Meng Chan, Joe Claudet, Steven Crooks, Lee Duemer, Paige Furgerson, Charles Geer, Pam Halsey, Fred Hartmeister, Carole Janisch, Peggy Johnson, JoAnn Klinker, Carol Layton, Deann Lechtenberger, Jay Leist, Mellinee Lesley, Robin Lock, Aretha Marbley, Nancy Maushak, Sally McMillan, Sylvia Mendez-Morse, Eva Midobuche, Susan Meyers, Barbara Morgan-Fleming, Juan Munoz, Zenaida Munoz, John Murray, Arturo Olivarez, Gerald Parr, Valerie Payton, Peggie Price, Roy Rodriguez, Loretta Rudd, Dora Salazar, Rene Saldana, Shannon Sanderson, Sheryl Santos, Rosa Sheets, Doug Simpson, Kamau Siwatu, Walter Smith, Karen Spears, Tara Stevens, Mary Tallent-Runnels, Reese Todd, Eugene Wang, Patricia Watson, David White, Jennifer Wilhelm

Guest: Dean John Borrelli

Recorders: Esther Lucey, Patsy Mountz, Kay Gleghorn

A G E N D A

1. Approval of February 2, 2007 Meeting Minutes
2. Dean Santos' Remarks

Old Business:

3. Graduate Education Ad Hoc Committee Report and Proposal (Joe Claudet, Mary Runnels)
 - 3a. January meeting tabled motion
 - 3b. Consideration of Ad Hoc Committee Report
 - 3c. Respondent Panel
 - 3d. Table group discussion
 - 3e. General discussion

Working Lunch

4. Current Graduate Assistantship (GA) data (Joe Claudet)

New Business:

5. TTU Graduate School policy regarding doctoral qualifying examinations (Dean Borrelli)

Agenda Item 1. Approval of February 2, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Dr. Claudet welcomed everyone and requested a review of the handouts. Discussion held on the Minutes.

Dr. Layton made the motion to approve the February 2, 2007 Minutes as altered to replace “terminator” with attrition.

Seconded by Dr. Bradley.

Motion approved as amended.

Agenda Item 2. Dean Santos’ Remarks

There is a Motion on the floor tabled from the January meeting. It is an old one - to vote about flexibility. We formed the ad hoc committee to study the issue before passionately voting. The ad hoc committee’s proposal will be up for consideration but do not vote on it until we have discussed it completely. Towards the end of this meeting we can vote on the current proposal. The idea is that this is not etched in stone and not forever. We want to hear your voices, so please speak.

Agenda Item 3 & 3a. Graduate Education Ad Hoc Committee Report and Proposal

Dr. Claudet: This semester the ad hoc committee began by focusing on the research tool courses and where we are. The committee voted to continue work next year. We will continue next year and look at additional facets of graduate education. Before Dr. Tallent-Runnels speaks, let’s proceed through Agenda Item 3a. You have a copy of January’s Minutes. On the third to last page we have a motion that was tabled. About a third from the bottom the amended motion reads “Doctoral students in the COE complete 12 hours of research to be managed by individual programs.” It was presented by Dr. Murray and several seconds with amendments. Finally after discussion, Dr. Murray tabled the motion voluntarily. We do have a tabled motion before the graduate faculty. I open the floor on how we might expedite the resolution of this tabled motion.

Dr. Button made a motion to remove the tabled motion.

Seconded by Dr. Marbley.

Motion approved.

Agenda Item 3b. Consideration of Ad Hoc Committee Report

Dr. Runnels: I move we substitute the proposal by the ad hoc committee for the motion just taken off the table.

Seconded by Dr. Walter Smith.

Motion approved.

Presentation by Dr. Runnels on the proposal. Discussion held in table groups with ad hoc committee members as facilitators at each table.

- Number One: The first sentence of the proposal document is on the principles. *“The principles behind the following guidelines are that doctoral advisory committees should be allowed flexibility in choosing research tool courses for a degree plan that represent the student’s needs and that doctoral committees should choose a list of tool courses that prepares them to be active researchers.”* The word flexibility is important here and we believe the doctoral committee should have flexibility.
- In the COE right now a minimum of 12 hrs is required.

- Number 2: “*Exceptions to number one above may be dealt with individually by the student’s doctoral advisory committee with consultation and approval from the Department Chair and the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies.*” It, also, is 12 hours and they can take the hours from somewhere else and they can take more. Several programs require students to take 15 or 18 hours and not just from the COE.
- Number 3: “*The Graduate School’s graduate handbook delineates the procedure for transferring courses from other universities. See page 73 of the 2006-07 catalog for general information on transfer credit.*” This was put here because the myths were that we could not transfer courses in. We can and if they are equivalent, transfer in or as over and above the minimum.
- Number 4: “*How to get a new course approved as a tool course.*” We can add to this list. In other words, present your course to GAAC, if approved it goes on through the regular process, which is like today.
- Number 5: “*Utilizing courses from other colleges: Any course from another college at Texas Tech that is approved by the individual student’s doctoral committee can be substituted.*” Like Number 3, it talks about utilizing other courses from other colleges - another myth. We may need to add them for the courses over and above Number One’s 9 hours.

Agenda Item 3c. Respondent Panel

Dr. Benavides, Dr. Olivarez, Dr. Simpson, and Dr. Claudet each presented their perspective in reaction to the ad hoc committee’s proposal.

- Dr. Benavides: My focus is on diversity and qualitative, quantitative and mixed methodology within a core set of courses with programmatic flexibility. We need a procedure, an operating mechanism for ensuring we can add or delete core courses.
- Dr. Olivarez: “One of the dangers I see is this could explode into too many core courses.” What we face with this basic core is we are trying to introduce students to a mix of fundamentals of research. I would like a minimum of 12 hours as an introduction to fundamentals of research. In the book *Research in Mathematics Education* edited by Richard Shumway, Bernard K. Forscher writes a letter entitled “Chaos in the Brickyard” (Professional Reference Series, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1963, p. 5) emphasizing the quality of research and to guard against confusion.
- Dr. Simpson: “My comments are made in the light of a number of ideas already mentioned. One idea is that we want to be able to have flexibility to prepare students to have a real depth in their areas of research.” In terms of exceptions, as stated on Number 2, I don’t have anything to add. I accept that there is nearly always the need to make an exception. On Number 4, I think there has been long standing interest to add to core courses, but we have not been sure how to go about it. This makes it explicit that we now have a means of going about creating tools that people well qualified to teach can propose.
- Dr. Claudet: First, I am for anything that affirms and enhances the method rigor that we provide our graduate students. Second point is broader in scope, spend time thinking

about the notion of service and compare that to the notion of resource. With that in mind and as food for thought with the table discussion, I have two proposals for you to consider: One is if there is enough interest, next year, as a body, please consider staging a number of different learning resource discovery sessions about graduate education in the college whereby individual faculty members teach courses, this is what I do, learn, here is the payoff if your student takes this course, to use as colleagues and students. Host a series of graduate education learning resources to discover services, where we are diverse and re-discover some of the resources we have. Some of the best resources are right at our fingertips. Second idea is to play off of the creative idea by Dr. Klinker at the Feb. 2nd meeting in reacting to conversation surrounding the graduate school and university as to continuous enrollment of graduate students, That impacts a large number of our students during the summer. Dr. Klinker's idea was to create a series of one hour courses about foundational or research topics that our students could enroll in feasibly and to continue enrollment. Playing off that proposal, doctoral research seminars that are team taught by a number of folks in both methods and content specialists. I think that might provide another opportunity to discover and rediscover the valuable resources in each of us.

Working Lunch

Agenda Item 3e. General discussion

Dr. Claudet: This is to be a general discussion relating to the proposal from the ad hoc committee. Floor is open for general comments, reactions to the proposal from any members of our graduate faculty.

Dr. Bradley motioned to accept the doctoral research tool core proposal. Dr. Benavides seconded the motion.

- Discussion was held on the issue.
- Some felt it was not ready to be voted upon yet.
- Dr. Furgerson felt that we need a process for Number 2, degree plans.
- Dr. Rodriguez suggested that the committee talk to the department chair before putting a course on the degree plan.
- Dr. Marbley suggested that an issue might be on how you define a tool research course. Advance courses would not be considered a tool course.
- Dr. Claudet pointed out that Number 4's wording was defined by the sub committee.
- Dr. Rodriguez encouraged everyone to go ahead and vote on the proposal. Our programs have to be flexible.

After the discussion, the Motion was read again. A vote was taken. Those in favor of the motion (by a show of hands) totaled 32. Those opposed totaled 2 and those abstaining totaled 1. The motion carried.

Agenda Item 5. TTU Graduate School policy regarding doctoral qualifying examinations

Dr. Claudet: Following the Dean's recommendation, we will move to number 5, which is the TTU graduate school policy regarding doctoral exam qualifications and cover Agenda Item Number 4 later.

- In your handout, the last page is a photocopy of page 74 from the graduate school handbook. The intent is that the exam for admission to candidacy is a formal exam that both synthesizes and applies knowledge students have been exposed to throughout their coursework and have completed all language and tool requirements. This is a formal exam of at least 6 hours. It is a written exam with a follow up oral. The point is it is a formal exam on coursework taken. And with that as a point of departure it gives us something to compare and think about when we think about the ways we may engage in qualifying students for candidacy in our different departments and programs through the college. Some may adhere to the letter of this policy and we also have engaged over the years with a qualifying exam experience to include a form of concept paper of some type.
- I believe we certainly want to be in compliance with the graduate school in meeting the rigor and the intent of a qualifying exam for admission to doctoral candidacy.
- It is an honor to introduce Dean Borrelli to address this issue.

Dean Borrelli

- First, I have reviewed degree plans concerning the knowledge base these students are to have for their degree. To test to see if they can synthesize, apply, think on their feet about the knowledge, explain in words, have an oral exam in which to solve problems, do an essay to understand the concepts, state of the art in their particular fields. Some places also include a readiness of the student to do the research and do a dissertation. Some break it into the exam and test knowledge base and minor field and then a candidacy test and just for their preparedness to do research and a dissertation.
- It has come to my attention that students were preparing the first 3 chapters of their dissertation as a concept paper and used that as their qualifying exam. After discussion with various people, it seems to us, is what we are doing with that process is short-circuiting the exam. Six hours is normal and then an oral exam. It is my understanding that is the way it is across most programs on campus. It does not have to be that way.
- The other thing I was told is that some of you may be telling the students the concept paper was their exam. Do not do that. If a student has been told already it is their exam and it is their anticipation that this is their exam, don't change it.
- I am asking you to reconsider how you do it and bring it in line with what the standards are for TTU. If you have good reason to do what you are doing, with a sound academic reason for doing so, bring your proposal to the graduate council and ask for a change in policy to include what you believe is best for your particular student. My concern is, I can remember my graduate school experience with milestones and the qualifying exam was one of them.
- The other thing is the concept of an urban legend and in fact some get a 4.0 in all coursework and all of a sudden they take the qualifying exam and cannot perform under those circumstances and they do, most times, get a second chance after 4 months and after reconsideration they are dismissed. This is something that is difficult, not just a formality. I remember we had a student regurgitate and repeat information with no ability to synthesize and that student did not make it. This is my concern and I brought it to Dean Santos and now before you. I will answer any questions.

Dr. Runnels: Dr. Borrelli, please clarify continuous enrollment.

Dean Borrelli: This was a command from higher up that came to the graduate school. At the last graduate council, a memo was sent to me about what happens in their program as they need graduate continuity. I composed a long email and sent it to Dr. Marcy, Dr. Whitmore and they backed down. They cancelled the whole thing. It is dead. No continuous enrollment except what you specify it in your program.

Dr. Claudet: Thank you, Dean Borrelli. Dean Santos has recommended having an open discussion regarding current practices relating to our qualifying exam practices.

Discussion held regarding an exam versus a concept paper with time limits, flexibility within and among programs and oral versus written exam with no motions.

Dean Borrelli: My recommendation would be for the oral not to be mandatory. Evidently there is more than one way of doing things in this college.

- Point is the policy as written in the catalog, which I assume came from the graduate council, does not mandate an oral exam.
- Providing a concept paper time limit and some statement written in a general policy as to take into consideration all the program coursework and in the minor, a breadth, it would be perfectly acceptable to what you are doing now.
- When this problem arose, it appears a little of us knew and this is how I started the process and explained my concerns. I think what you explained is acceptable. I don't see where anyone can argue. You do need a time limit.

Dr. Wang: If there is a student who comes to us after failing from a different program in the university and fails the qualifying exam here, does that satisfy for two failures or two in one program? So within the program, if a student fails 2 times and it is for the same program, they are out?

Dean Borrelli: You don't need to keep a student. The faculty can decide. You may not want to work with a student who has a 4.0 and a research topic. If no faculty is willing to work with that student, they are out. Nothing I can do about it. They are out.

Dean Santos: Sometimes our students don't do well under a certain committee or some type or whatever, bad grade, or not making it, so they dump their committee and plead with others to pick them up. Those who pick them up are not people they had classes with. They are kind and say ok this person has not graduated in 25 years, so quickly get him done. The other people found the student not qualified to be a doctoral student. Doesn't seem the professor doesn't have much say, so the student is the consumer and goes else where. Is that the policy or not?

Dr. Benavides: Can a student arbitrarily dump a committee because the committee asks them to do some work, and the student just wants to leave, states I have a job and I need to hurry and the committee wants me to know something so I dump them. What is the policy?

Dean Borrelli: The graduate advisor makes the recommendation. The student may tell the advisor, committee members to serve, and is approved by graduate advisor and committee members accepting to sit. Technically in the catalog, it says I have the power to do this.

- I usurp that power, but only if you want to take it.
- It is the up to the graduate dean to assign the committee. The committee needs some structure or the student will do that. Students will shop for programs these days, for money, for easiness, same as accepting the student.
- My policy is, if you get rejected by another program, you are not accepted in mine. I will not be a program of second choice for any student. For graduate students, yes they need to have a fit with their committee, on the other hand, some approval by somebody in the college, most cases it is graduate advisor who signs off

Dean Santos: Does the student need permission?

Dean Borrelli: The reality of the committee is the quality of control within the dept. and college. In essence, I would like to be more strict. However, the policy the way it operates now, quality control resides in the department and college. We do not interfere in these situations. We have tried, if a student we believe has run into conflict, cases where both faculty on both sides, we will ask other programs if a match to take the graduate student, but we never force them to take the student. I never forced anybody to take a student; none are forced as faculty member.

Dr. Runnels: If there is a student with a committee not doing their job, they take too long to grade a qualifying exam, or keep changing their minds, tell me to do one thing or do another, or there is an outside person on the committee, so what should they do? Go to the department chair? Go to the graduate advisor for the program?

Dean Borrelli: They invoke the chain of command. The Dean only handles this to solve problems. One of the things I did on the QT was to ask the graduate students to develop a bill of rights. There is some expectation of faculty members through the Graduate Council. They passed out a list of duties for graduate faculty, graduate's major professor, for committee members, for graduate students. What is on that list is to return things in a reasonable amount of time. There were students who waited for a year and waited for a professor to return from overseas. In these times it does not happen. I do think there are certain rights they should have. We did a survey of graduate students and have some positive things and have some shocking things that faculty need to be aware of.

Discussion held on committee members' and students' responsibilities, as well as, advising an admission within the COE culture with no motion made.

Agenda Item Number 4. Current Graduate Assistantship (GA)

Dr. Claudet: The charge to me from our last meeting was to generate meaningful data relating to the impact of possible changes in the way we employ GAs in our college and the impact on our enrollment in semester credit hours in general.

- With help from our staff, you have in your packet four handouts. One is Easter-color coated of a listing of expected graduation dates for GA's for 2007. You have a second piece of a single sheet listing the number of international student GAs, with 20 total, and

the semester they anticipate their graduation date. You have a third sheet that originates from our Feb. 2007 Minutes, listing the number of GAs and their years of continuous employment as a GA. Finally, Shane generated data on the last four years of graduate semester credit hours for summer one. The first three handouts are facts. The last handout on semester credit hour generation, if you notice in the COE we have risen, 2002-2005, an increase of 17 percent and in 2006 a slight decline by 3 points. In 2005 we had about 15/16 graduate students we employed during the summer. They constituted approx 1.7 percent of the overall semester credit hours generated for our college in 2005. In 2006 we had approximately 7/8 GAs we employed and were able to calculate and account for one-fifth percent of the overall summer one semester credit hour generation. If you can think of other data generation ideas, let me know.

- I informed all current GAs there are no summer employment opportunities this summer as a GA.

Dr. Hartmeister: This summer, as a college using graduate tuition funds, we cannot hire anyone, not one. Zero. That is a problem especially for out-of-state and international students who can't afford to be here and pay out-of-state tuition. Most other colleges at TTU have moved to 12 month appointments for their graduate students. They employ fewer people over 12 months, not just 3 months. I was prepared to have a proposal, but thought about it, and decided to stick with flexibility.

- My proposal is if you would like to work with me or together to more creatively employ our GAs we might say to someone new or current, by the way we want you next summer and we will have you next summer. Will they finish their program sooner? I hope so. But we will not be saying goodbye in May and hoping they are back in September. I'm not prepared to say a one size fits all proposal, by program, or by a team of 3, we can work to share hours, or two teams with 3 members and they could have someone next summer for 3 months, they get, fee waivers, are employed and insured as a GA next summer.

A discussion was held on the GA issue.

- Dr. Sheets: I personally use my GA when I wrote my book. I needed more hours. I went to two faculty members who shared my GA and asked them for 2 weeks to meet my deadline. I said after I meet my deadline, you can have my person. I had no problem, they said yes, they made the switch, not instructional changes and it worked. If any of you negotiate with others, I do think we should go to a 12 month. I think the assumption is we need to do research and each person has a different research agenda and I would be lost without my GA with the type of work I do. And I would not give up a GA for someone else with different needs and we all have needs. Use a pool or not. Disperse fairly to all faculty members.
- Dr. Johnson: A cautionary note about reducing the number of GAs to treat them better with 12 months employment and better pay. The caution is we use the graduate assistantship as a recruiting device. We tell people to come as a GA to lure them in. Perhaps we need, as Chancellor Hance said yesterday, we need money. Money is the answer.
- Dr. Runnels: This whole issue revolves around money. What is left to use. We generate a huge amount of good will and of graduate tuition money for the university and us. Prior

to 7 years ago we could keep 75 percent and now we can't - so less tuition money for us to use. So when we sent money back, part of the tuition is our money we get some back. Is that right?

- Dean Santos: The money goes to the Provost and they allocate it.
- Dr. Runnels: So they give us our money back?
- Dean Borrelli: There are other uses for that graduate tuition money than giving back to the college. I don't allocate graduate tuition. I have money I use and distribute it on a basis and deliver it as a godfather but I also use student printouts to distribute money. By the amount of credit hours you generate and I look at it.
- Engineering students generate twice the money we do. There are other factors that go into it; performance funding systems for TX; formula funding in the State of Texas. They set the weighted amount. I think formula funding drives poor decisions. I don't believe in it. I would be more impressed by more research proposals than credit hours generated. I worked for 34 years and I have never been given a GA. I used and paid for one by my research dollars. Without the research dollars we will never get enough funding to do everything we want including a dependable supply of grad students. It can show success where faculty members turn out ten proposals per year and that is what it takes to be funded.

Dr. Claudet: This is a historic meeting as we approved a proposal and now it is part of the record and makes it a codified part of the policy. I want everyone to extend a special thank you to the staff of graduate education - to Kay Gleghorn, Patsy Mountz, and Esther Lucey who is still typing and working very hard in an office that needs at least 4 people to do that job. The final thing I we will mention is a reminder of the meeting in August. See you then.