The Meeting was called to order by Valerie Janesick, Chair.

Review Minutes from 11/06/2009

There was a motion made by Marcus Kilpatrick to approve the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by John Ferron. A vote was taken and the minutes passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Approval of Consent Agenda - none

Reports

Update on recent meetings of Doctoral Program Coordinators

Dr. Keller provided the committee with a set of handouts containing: a Proposal to the GPC concerning Doctoral Programs/Concentrations within the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) degree, Proposal for C&I Common Core, Program/Concentration Template, Curricular Template and the syllabus for EEX 7743-901.

There was a discussion about the proposed process, the ownership of the core course, and how faculty would be “certified” to teach the course. It was suggested that the GPC be the body to “certify” faculty to teach the core course and be made privy to all student course evaluations for that course.

After discussion a motion to vote on the following was made by Nancy Anderson and the motion was seconded by Brenda Walker.

“The GPC approves in concept (with corrections) the proposed outlined process to move forward to the faculty with the proposed outlined process with further discussion over the next two semesters, spring 2010 and fall 2010.”

A discussion was also held about the need for departments to identify doctoral students who have gone beyond their time limits of completion so that assistance could be provided to get them back in proper standing.

New Business

Valerie Janesick asked committee members to return to their departments and encourage everyone to update their online vita, profiles etc.

The meeting was adjourned.
College of Education
GRADUATE PROGRAMS COMMITTEE
Friday, November 6, 2009
9:30 a.m., EDU 219

Minutes
Members Present: Valerie Janesick, Jane Applegate, Haichun Sun for Marcus Kilpatrick, John Ferron, Barbra Shircliffe for Carlos Zalaquett
Members Absent: Rosemary Closson, Brenda Walker, Nancy Anderson
Ex-Officios Present: Harold Keller
Ex-Officios Absent: Diane Briscoe
Others Present: Lora Crider

1. Call to Order... ................................................................. Valerie Janesick, Chair

2. Review Minutes from 10/16/2009
   There was a motion made by Jane Applegate to approve the meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Carlos Zalaquett. A vote was taken and the minutes passed unanimously with no abstentions.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda - none

5. Reports
   a. Update on recent meeting of Doctoral Program Coordinators
Proposition to COEDU GPC concerning Doctoral Programs/Concentrations within the Curriculum & Instruction (C&I) degree

Context: Over the course of the Fall 2009 semester, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs convened a number of open meetings with faculty, with specific invitations to Doctoral Program Coordinators, GPC members (from 2008-2009 and 2009-2010), and representatives from departments teaching foundations courses in the current C&I doctoral degree. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss and identify a common core for the C&I degree, which will enable programs/concentrations within the doctoral C&I umbrella to deliver programs that address the unique needs of their students, and in a manner that maintains high quality and addresses the strategic priorities of the university and college.

Proposal Overview: The Associate Dean and a set of faculty have drafted the following proposals for consideration by the COEDU GPC: one, a proposal for a common core; secondly, a proposal for a template to be used in the GPC review of doctoral programs within the C&I umbrella; and thirdly, a proposal for process of implementation. The proposed common core is based upon a single course that is important for all doctoral work, providing introductory conceptual underpinnings to multiple approaches to educational research and to alternative frames for criticism. The proposed template ensures that each proposed new or modified doctoral program must document how it addresses central values, skills and competencies necessary for doctoral study, including disciplinary knowledge, multiple research competencies, understanding of multiple forms of diversity, understanding of technology application, and engagement in research throughout the program. The template is based upon the COEDU Conceptual Framework and guidelines for independent doctoral program review. The template with appropriate modifications can be used to review all programs/concentrations proposed to GPC. Subsequently, if program disaggregation is again supported, programs will be able to easily adapt the information for formal application for independent doctoral program status.

Process: The intent is that GPC will deliberate on the common core proposal, formally move, and vote on its “initial” acceptance/rejection (see process proposal below). If the common core is passed by GPC, then GPC will deliberate on the template, formally move, and vote on its acceptance/rejection. If the
template is passed by GPC, programs/concentrations will be reviewed and voted upon vis a vis the

Concurrently, it is proposed that a series of meetings/forums be conducted throughout the Spring 2010
semester (and Fall 2010, if needed), whereby doctoral programs present their revised/proposed programs
within the context of the new core, the Program Template (section VIII only), and the Curricular
Template. The forums will enable faculty and programs to learn from each other, and perhaps lead to a
reaffirmation of the core or a revised core.

Note also that it was seen as desirable to conduct this Spring a faculty seminar, led by Jim Paul and other
faculty who have been nominated to teach the core course, on the content so that all faculty can become
more knowledgeable about the core and build upon it in their courses.
Proposal for C&I Common Core
a) EEX 7743 Philosophies of Inquiry (3 cr) -- Change prefix to EDE 7743 (and teach as EDE 7931 if implementation occurs before prefix change is approved)
Doctoral introduction to multiple approaches to educational research and to alternative frames for criticism, including postpositivism, constructivism, poststructuralism, pragmatism, critical theory, narrative, race and gender, ethics, and aesthetics.

b) Successfully completing EDE 7743 will ensure that students acquire a basic understanding of the multiple approaches to educational research and their conceptual underpinnings. Programs/Concentrations will ensure that all students will acquire a comprehensive understanding of the theory and application of the research methods and design necessary to conduct their dissertation research.
Program/Concentration Template

I. Program Description and Relationship to System-Level Goals
   A. Briefly describe within a few paragraphs the degree program/ concentration under consideration, including a) level; b) emphases, including tracks or specializations; c) total number of credit hours; and d) overall purpose, including examples of employment or education opportunities that may be available to program/concentration graduates.

II. (Only if a proposed New Program or Concentration) Demand:
   A. Describe data that support the assumption that students will enroll in the proposed program/concentration. Include descriptions of surveys or other communications with prospective students.
   B. Identify projected student headcount (HC) and Full Time Equivalents (FTE). Describe the rationale underlying enrollment projections.
   C. Indicate what steps will be taken to achieve a diverse student body in this program, and identify any minority groups that will be favorably or unfavorably impacted.

III. Institutional Mission and Strength
   A. Describe how the goals of the proposed program/concentration relate to the institutional mission statement as contained in the University Strategic Plan.
      a. Community Engagement
      b. Global Literacy and Impact
      c. Integrated, Interdisciplinary Inquiry
      d. Research and Innovation
      e. Student Success
   B. (Only if a proposed New Program or Concentration) Describe how the proposed program/concentration specifically relates to existing institutional strengths, such as programs of emphasis, other academic programs, and/or institutes and centers.
   C. (Only if a proposed New Program or Concentration) Provide a brief narrative of the planning process leading up to submission of this proposal. Include a chronology of activities, listing both university personnel directly involved and external individuals who participated in planning.

IV. (Only if a proposed New Program or Concentration) Program Quality Indicators – Reviews and Accreditation
   A. Identify program reviews, accreditation visits, or internal reviews for any university degree programs related to the proposed program, especially any within the same academic unit. List all recommendations and summarize the institution’s progress in implementing the recommendations.

V. Curriculum (see Curricular Template)
   A. Describe the specific expected student learning outcomes associated with the proposed program.
   B. Describe the admission standards and graduation requirements for the program.
   C. Describe the curricular framework for the proposed program, including number of credit hours and composition of required core course(s), restricted electives, unrestricted electives, thesis requirements, and dissertation requirements. Identify the total number of semester credit hours (minimum) for the degree.
   D. Provide a sequenced course of study for the concentration, and areas of emphasis or specialization within the proposed program/concentration.
E. Provide a one- or two-sentence description of each required or elective course.
F. Briefly describe the anticipated delivery system for the proposed program/concentration (e.g., traditional delivery on campus, nontraditional delivery such as distance learning, self-paced instruction)

VI. Faculty Participation
A. Identify existing and anticipated ranked (not visiting or adjunct) faculty who will participate in the proposed program through Year 5. Include faculty name, highest degree held, academic discipline or specialization, contract status (tenure, tenure-earning, or multi-year annual), and percent of total annual effort that will be directed toward the proposed program/concentration (if less than 100%, indicate areas of contribution, e.g., instruction, advising, supervising internships and practica, and supervising thesis or dissertation hours).

B. Provide the number of master’s theses and/or doctoral dissertations directed, and the number and type of professional publications for each existing faculty member (do not include information for visiting or adjunct).

Faculty Name:  # Theses directed & completed – total & last 5 years
# Dissertations directed & completed – total & last 5 years
Professional Publications in national/intl peer-reviewed
Outlets (books, chapters, journals) – total, last 5
Years, last 3 years

C. (Only if a proposed New Program or Concentration) Provide evidence that the academic unit(s) associated with this program/concentration have been productive in teaching, research, and service; including average course load, SCH annually last 5 years, FTE annually last 5 years, student HC last 5 years, degrees granted, time to degree over past 5 years, external funding ($ amount & # grants), as well as qualitative indicators of excellence.

VII. (Only if a proposed New Program or Concentration) Non-Faculty Resources
A. Describe fellowships, scholarships, and graduate assistantships to be allocated to the proposed program/concentration through Year 5.
B. Describe currently available sites for internship and practicum experiences, if appropriate to the program/concentration. Describe plans to seek additional sites in Years 1-5.

VIII. COEDU Conceptual Framework
A. Briefly, describe how the program/concentration ensures that all students acquire deep knowledge of the field/discipline, its theories, research, and practice. List relevant courses and experiences.
B. Briefly, describe how the program/concentration ensures that all students understand and enact a commitment to collaboration (e.g., with cross-disciplinary faculty/students in research, with faculty research, and/or with schools/community partners in research and/or curricular activities)
C. Briefly, describe how the program/concentration ensures that all students acquire deep knowledge and experience with enhancing learning and development of those with whom they work.
D. Briefly, describe how the program/concentration ensures that all students acquire deep knowledge of the full range of diversities with whom they work, through theoretical and practical experiences that focus on the political, cultural, and social contexts of the interface between education and multiple forms of diversity.
E. Briefly, describe how the program/concentration ensures that all students acquire a deep understanding of ethical issues facing practitioners, educators, and researchers in the discipline.

F. Briefly, describe how the program/concentration ensures that all students acquire an understanding of the use and application of technology within their discipline.

G. Briefly, describe how the program/concentration ensures that all students
   a) acquire critical knowledge of the theoretical and research literature in the discipline, and demonstrate their understanding via high quality writing and other forms of communication;
   b) demonstrate knowledge in and competence to use the conceptual and technical tools to conduct research in at least the genre used to address her/his dissertation questions;
   c) are actively engaged in research and scholarly writing throughout the doctoral program in such a manner that leads over time toward independent scholarship and successful and timely completion of the doctoral degree.

G. Briefly describe (or refer to urls) currently active programs of research and scholarship by faculty that will support student commitment and engagement in research (one to two sentences per faculty member, and supported by evidence, e.g., in VI.B. above).
**Curricular Template**

**I. Common Core (3 cr) EDE 7743 Philosophies of Inquiry**

**II. Research Methods & Tools** (over and above core) (6 cr min.; may be more)
Articulate courses that will ensure students acquire a comprehensive understanding of the theory and application of multiple research methods and design.

**III. Concentration** (specify # cr. min.)
A. List courses in concentration, clearly indicating required courses and elective courses.

The following areas are optional if consistent with program/concentration goals. Then a planned set of courses/experiences must be specified.

III.B. Subspecialty within Concentration (# cr. Min.)

III.C. Cognate (# cr. Min)

III.D. Interdisciplinary Focus (# cr. Min.) – a planned set of courses/experiences that foster interdisciplinary collaboration

**IV. Dissertation** (specify # cr. Min.)
Doctoral programs and Dissertation Committees must ensure that students acquire knowledge in and competence to use the conceptual and technical tools to conduct research in at least the genre used to address their dissertation questions.
Note: Recognize continuous enrollment requirements to maintain graduate student status, and enrollment in semester graduating.

**Notes:**
1) Articulate experiences/courses that engage all students in current active research/scholarly agenda that leads toward independent scholarship and successful, timely completion of doctoral degree.
2) Articulate supervised college teaching experience/course.
3) Qualifying Examination is taken at the completion of all coursework or in the semester when student is taking a final course. New programs must specify Qualifying Exam format per COEDU guidelines.
COURSE SYLLABUS

Spring 2010

Course Prefix and Number: EEX 7743-901

Course Title: Philosophies of Inquiry and Criticism in Educational Research

Instructor: James Paul
           jlpaul@aol.com

Office Hours: On request

Prerequisites: EDF 6481 or Equivalent or Permission of instructor

Time: W 6:05-8:50

Place: EDU 407

Course Description:

The purpose of this course is to introduce doctoral students to different philosophies of educational research and critical scholarship.

Course Objectives:

• Students will understand and be able to describe different epistemological and ethical stances employed in the critique of educational inquiry, including pragmatism, constructivism, postpositivism, poststructuralism, critical theory, narrative, aesthetics, ethics, race, and gender;

• Students will be able to critique quantitative, qualitative, and interpretive research from different epistemological and ethical perspectives;

• Students will develop, and/or refine, their skills in the critical analysis of research;

• Students will understand and be able to describe the critical role of scholarly communities in maintaining standards for inquiry.

Textbook and Readings

• Procopy Packet
• Dictionary (Cambridge, Oxford, Runes, or Flew)
Assignments:

- Actively participate in class discussions. This is a doctoral seminar and it is anticipated that students will read all of the assigned material and that their participation in discussions will be thoughtful, insightful, and informed by the readings.
- Develop a deep understanding of two philosophical perspectives and be prepared to represent those perspectives in class discussions of assigned studies. Students are expected to share in the preparation and presentation of one perspective in class. The presentation will be evaluated on the basis of the quality of the scholarship and instructional value of the presentation. In addition, students are expected to prepare detailed notes to guide their participation in the six critiques. The notes should be turned in at the end of those sessions.
- Write and submit briefs (3-5 pages) on one of the assigned readings being discussed each week.
- Write and submit a weekly journal on your perception of the interactions of knowledge, self, and method and a personal epistemology at the end of the semester that reflects an integration of your insights.
- Write a final examination.

Evaluation of Student Performance:

Students whose participation in class and written assignments consistently reflect doctoral level performance and who pass the final examination will receive a grade of B.

Students who want to earn an A will need to write a scholarly paper on a selected topic in philosophies of educational research. The topic, along with a preliminary outline of the paper and a list of related literature, must be approved in advance by the instructor. The paper will be evaluated on the basis of standards of scholarship, criticism, and writing expected in doctoral study.

Outline of General Content

- Philosophy, knowledge, and method
  - Discussion of the empirical, rational, existential, and aesthetic foundations of knowledge claims and justifications.
- History and philosophy of educational research
  - Discussion of basic ideas and scholars who have shaped educational research perspectives.
- Research Perspectives and Criticism
  - Discussion of nine different philosophical perspectives that provide the bases for criticism of educational research.
- Critiques of different approaches to research
  - Application of nine perspectives in critiques of six studies representing different genres of research.

Outline of Sessions
Topics and Readings

January 13   COURSE OVERVIEW

Review of Syllabus
Introduction to Philosophies of Research – Basic Concepts and Issues

January 20

Philosophical Concepts and Issues - continued


January 27

Video: Mindwalk

Philosophical Concepts and Issues - continued


February 3

Epistemology – Professor Darrell Fasching

HISTORY OF SCIENCE AND PARADIGMATIC ARGUMENTS
(write assigned brief)


EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SCIENCE
(write assigned brief)


**February 10**

Theater and Acting: Knowledge and Representation – Professor Marc Powers

**GRADUATE PREPARATION IN PHILOSOPHIES OF RESEARCH**
(write assigned brief)


**POSITIVISM**


**February 17**

**PRAGMATISM**
(write assigned brief)


**February 24**
HUMANITIES: NARRATIVE, HISTORY, AND ARTS BASED RESEARCH
(write assigned brief)


March 3

POSTSTRUCTURALIST
(write assigned brief)


CRITICAL THEORY, RACE, AND GENDER


March 10  SPRING BREAK

March 17

PHILOSOPHIES OF RESEARCH – Textbook
(No written briefs for the rest of the semester)
Stone, L. Philosophy of educational research. Introduction to the Philosophies of Research and Criticism in Education and the Social Sciences. Columbus, OH: Prentice-Hall/Merrill, pp. 21-42.


Presentations of Nine Perspectives


Lincoln, Y. (2005) Constructivism as a theoretical and interpretive stance, Introduction to the Philosophies of Research and Criticism in Education and the Social Sciences. Columbus, OH: Prentice-Hall/Merrill, pp. 60-64. (3 presenting the perspective – 30 minutes)

March 24


March 13


April 7
Critique of Experimental Research - The Carr et al. Study (90-134)
(1-2 presenting the study – 20 minutes)
Critique of Ethnographic Research - The Heath Study (135-170)
(3-4 presenting the study – 20 minutes)

April 14
Critique of Autoethnographic Research – The Alexander Study (171-205)
(5 presenting the study – 20 minutes)
Critique of Correlational Research – The Raudenbush et al. Study (206-249)
(6 presenting the study – 20 minutes)

April 21
Critique of Narrative Research – The Ellis Study (250-283)
(7-8 presenting the study – 20 minutes)
Critique of Arts Based Research – The Sullivan Study (284-314)
(9 presenting the study – 20 minutes)

April 28 (Last Day of Classes)
Sharing Projects and Epistemologies

May 5
Epistemologies
Exam
Briefs: The briefs should provide clear and concise summaries of the content of the readings and should end with two or three thoughtful questions to stimulate discussion. They should be well written and enable anyone who had not read the pieces to understand and appreciate their content. They should begin with biographical comments about the author(s). It is anticipated that the briefs will be 3-5 double spaced pages in length. The following will provide the basis for evaluation: 1. adequacy of the brief in summarizing the piece, 2. clarity, logical coherence, and quality of the writing, and 3. insightfulness of the questions.

Notes Informing Critiques of Studies in Class: The notes should include the following: 1. basic descriptive information about the study; 2. Information about relevant points in the perspective being used to discuss the study; 3. Outline of the logic of arguments to be used in the critique; 4. The values implicit in the study and in the critical perspective. The notes will be evaluated on the basis of the following: 1. Demonstrated understanding of the study and the critical perspective being employed; 2. Clarity of the analysis and appropriateness of the arguments.

Personal Epistemology: The focus of the personal epistemology will be on a reflective analysis of the interaction of your own views and values with the readings and discussions in class. You can structure the epistemology in any one of several ways: 1) two categories – I thought and now I think, 2) basic shifts in thinking about research, 3) critical questions I now have about the nature of research, or 4) a parable or an art form (painting, drama, music) that depicts your experience of learning about knowledge and knowing and something about the substance of what you learned. A minimum of five pages is expected if you choose to write. The product will be evaluated on the basis of the thoughtfulness and quality of reflective analysis.

ADA Statement:

Students with disabilities are responsible for registering with the Office of Student Disabilities Services in order to receive special accommodations and services. Please notify the instructor within the first week of classes if a reasonable accommodation for a disability is needed for this course. A letter from the USF Disability Services Office must accompany the request.

Attendance Policy:

Students are expected to attend all scheduled sessions of the course unless there are mitigating circumstances that prevent attendance. The instructor should be informed of any reason for missing a session of the course. Students are excused for observance of religious holidays.