College of Education
GRADUATE PROGRAMS COMMITTEE
Friday, January 11, 2013 Meeting
Minutes

Members Present: Don Dellow, Zorka Karanxha (Chair), Bill Campbell, Darlene DeMarie, Allan Feldman (Vice-Chair), Audra Parker, Yi-Hsin Chen, Bruce Jones
Members Absent: Allan Feldman
Ex-Officios Present: Harold Keller, Michael Stewart, Kathleen King
Ex-Officios Absent: Sherman Dorn
Others Present: Miranda Sloan, Lora Crider

Call to Order
Zorka Karanxha, Chair called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

Review of Meeting Minutes
A motion was made by Don Dellow to approve the set of meeting minutes from 11/02/12 and the motion was seconded by Bruce Jones. A vote was taken the minutes passed unanimously and there were no abstentions.

Approval of the Consent Agenda
There was no consent agenda.

Acknowledgement of Electronic Votes
The new Plan III track in the MA in Reading was on the acknowledgement agenda.

Reports

Graduate School Update
Harold Keller reported that the electronic signature policy which was voted on last meeting is being moved forward for adoption at the Graduate Council level
Miranda Sloan reported on the following items:

Graduate Studies Office Mission Statement
After review and consideration of our office’s services, function, and guiding principles, we’ve created a new mission statement:

*The Graduate Studies Office provides advising and administrative support to the College of Education graduate community and its partners to foster an environment of student success and academic excellence.*
We are also working on a vision statement which we hope to share soon.

Listening Tour
Graduate Studies Office will be visiting COEDU academic departments and support units around campus during the Spring 2013 semester as part of our listening tour. The purpose of the tour is to better understand how our office can improve processes in order to support graduate faculty, staff, and students.
as well as to introduce several new initiatives our office has undertaken. Vanessa Quintas will coordinate the meeting schedule.

**Qualifying Exams**

We’ve made changes to the Qualifying Exam application:
- There’s a coversheet explaining the process for the student’s reference
- There’s a statement just above the signatures for the student and the major professor describing items which must be on hand at the Graduate Studies Office in order to ensure successful clearance for exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2012 Qualifying Exam Review</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>College-Wide</th>
<th>Program-Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Completion and Admission to Candidacy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Pass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried Forward to Spring 2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2013 Qualifying Examination Schedule
Applications Deadline: Jan. 22
College-wide Exam Dates: Feb. 18, 19, 20
Results Due to Graduate Studies: March 29
- Please note that the Verification of Scores and Admission to Candidacy for successful candidates will be sent together and that both forms now require the signatures of each committee member, not just the chair.

**GSO Webpage**

We are continuing to make changes to our web resources page with the goals of:
- Providing a launch pad for COEDU graduate student information
- Providing easily accessible, audience-specific information

Many of the changes are small. For example, we’ve merged the New Doctoral Committee Form onto each of the doctoral program of study forms so that they may be signed and submitted at the same time. One of the most frequent barriers to Qualifying Examination clearance is a missing committee form and this move will GSO clear students more quickly.

**Graduate Council Update**

*Policy Committee*
Sherman Dorn was not present to report.

*Curriculum Committee*
There was no report.

**Review Team Guidelines**
Audra Parker presented the draft of the review team guidelines with a special emphasis on the resolution of an impasse between a review team. The GPC liked the process as it had been outlined and a motion was put forward by Don Dellow that the guidelines be adapted. The motion was seconded by Audra Parker. The vote for approval was unanimous with no abstentions.
New Business

New University Policy on the Role of Outside Chairs
Sherman Dorn and Kathy King have drafted a document on suggested College of Education Policies for the Outside Chair and this document will be shared with the committee. The members of the committee are asked to take this document to their respective departments and bring back any comments/suggestions to the February meeting.

Ethic Statement from the Graduate School
Don Dellow had asked if anyone had any comments on the new statement sent out by Carol Hines-Cobb. Some discussion took place with several feeling like they were forced to take the mindset that everyone was going to cheat/plagiarize their dissertation and didn’t like that negative feeling. Graduate students must now complete the IRB training and have proof of completion before registering.

Revised University Policy on Student Grievances
This document is to be shared with the committee and they are asked to send comments prior to the February 1st deadline to the General Council. The revised policy would only allow for a student to grieve a final grade or a dismissal from a program. The college had been doing this in practice but now it is in the formal policy from the university. The revised policy seems to give some good specifics which strongly supports the College of Education’s practices.

For the good of the Order

Fulbright Scholar Program
Darlene DeMarie encouraged everyone to attend the one woman show “Crush Hopper” which will be presented on January 17th and to come meet the new Fulbright Scholar Director.

College of Education Building Maintenance
It was brought up that the classrooms are very cold and students have been complaining about the extreme temperatures. Michael Stewart commented that Physical Plant controls the temperatures inside the buildings.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 a.m.
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Program (New Track)
M.A. in Reading New Track III.........................................................James King
Reviewed by Allan Feldman and Darlene DeMarie
Approved by the GPC via unanimous electronic vote on 11/19/12.
Approved by the Faculty Council via unanimous vote on 11/30/12.
Graduate Program Committee Reviewers’ Guidelines

Formulation of Review Teams

- Review Teams are created by the Chair of the Graduate Program Committee prior to the first GPC Meeting in September.
- If at all possible, the teams of two members are to be comprised of one “senior” faculty member paired with a “junior” faculty member. (Senior is defined as seniority in rank and/or with previous experience reviewing proposals on the GPC)

Receiving Assignments

- Proposals are received in the Faculty Council Office (EDU 105) at all times of the year.
- Lora, after making a quick review of forms/signatures, will assign the proposal to a review team.
- These assignments are made based on the number of assignments received.
- Review teams will not be assigned proposals from their home departments.
- Once a review team has been assigned a proposal, Lora sends the team an email containing the links to the team’s review assignment(s).

Reviewing the Assignment(s)

- It is up to the review team to create a “structure” on who will take the lead, if anyone.
- Review teams can choose to communicate electronically or in person when reviewing the assignment.
- Review guides are provided on the webpage where the proposals are housed. It is the discretion of the review team on how they choose to use or not use these guides to complete their review of the proposal. These guides are suggested and not required to be completed.
- The review team is expected to write up **combined comments** after reviewing the assignment(s) in an e-mail and send them directly to the faculty sponsor/contact and cc (Lora Crider at lcrider@usf.edu) the tracking system can be updated. Please create a subject like “**Reviewers Feedback for ECT6760**” as such a title will make it easy for the faculty contact to understand what they are receiving.
- **It is requested that the review teams give their feedback to the faculty sponsor/contact within two weeks of receiving their assignment(s).**

After Contacting the Faculty Sponsor:

- After the faculty sponsor/contact has responded to the team’s feedback and made changes as requested and the review team is satisfied with the changes, please send Lora Crider an email (lcrider@usf.edu) with the subject line like “**Ready for GPC E-Vote**” and list the items that are ready for the e-vote by the GPC.

The Electronic Voting Process

- The faculty sponsor/contact should bring any updated documents to the Faculty Council Office after all corrections/revisions requested by the review team have been completed and approved by the review team.
- An e-mail will be sent to the members of the GPC asking for a vote on the proposal(s).
- Electronic votes must be unanimous and responded to before the deadline.
- The items that were approved unanimously prior to the meeting by electronic vote will be on an “approved “ acknowledge list and will not be up for discussion at the next meeting. Rather these will move forward to the Faculty Council Consent Agenda for vote at the next Faculty Council Meeting.
- An item that was not approved unanimously by the deadline with then move to a consent agenda to be approved at the next meeting of the GPC.
- Items that have not come before the GPC for an electronic vote, will not be placed on the Consent Agenda unless by decree of the GPC Chair.
• If the review team cannot agree on the process to move the proposal either forward or back to the department for more edits/changes, the review team needs to then move to the steps to resolve an impasse.

Steps to Resolve an Impasse/Dispute
• The Review team needs to first notify the Chair of the GPC that they have reached an impasse/dispute on what the next steps should be.
• The Chair of the GPC will then send an email to the full GPC Committee explaining that an impasse/dispute has occurred that will contain a link to the proposal(s) in question and the Committee will be asked to read/review prior to the next GPC Meeting.
• The proposal(s) in dispute will be on the GPC agenda for an item of discussion prior to voting.
• The Chair of the GPC will send emails to all stakeholders involved in the disputed proposal(s) inviting them to the next GPC meeting where their proposal(s) will be discussed.
• At the next GPC meeting, a discussion and presentation will take place illustrating the impasse.
• After an appropriate presentation and discussion of the proposal(s), a motion can be made to approve or send the proposals back to the department for further editing.
• A vote will be taken on the motion and the majority decision will be considered as binding and final.

Items on the GPC Agenda or Consent Agenda
• At the GPC meeting, a vote is taken on the Consent Agenda as a whole, unless there has been a motion to remove an item for discussion, or a motion to approve the agenda without a flagged item on it.
• After the GPC meeting, the GPC Consent Agenda, once approved, moves forward and becomes a part of the Faculty Council Consent Agenda for the next Faculty Council meeting.