

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

October 26, 2017

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.

Voting Members and Alternates present:

BSoM: Andrew Froehle, John McAlearney, Matthew Peterson

CEHS: Suzanne Franco, Sheri Stover

CECS: Michael Raymer, Arnab Shaw

CoLA: Awad Halabi, Chigon Kim, Valerie Stoker

CoNH: Tracy Brewer, Misty Richmond

CoSM: Lynn Hartzler, Scott Watamaniuk

RSCoB: John Cook, Jim Hamister, Kim Lukaszewski, and Andrew Beauchamp (alternate, non-voting)

SoPP: Michelle Vaughan, Janece Warfield

Lake Campus: Chuck Ciampaglio

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members present:

Barry Milligan (interim dean and chair), K.T. Arasu, Frank Ciarallo, Erika Gilles (scribe), Deb Poling, Sheila Shellabarger, Jim Tomlin, and Jonathan Winkler.

Other Attendees:

Amanda Steele-Middleton

II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Sept. 21, 2017 meeting were approved as written without comment or correction.

III. Report of the Interim Dean (Barry Milligan)

Update: VPR and DGS Searches – The search committee for the VP Research met earlier this week; Dr. Milligan is a member of the committee. The committee recommended that a national search be done, but without a search firm in order to save costs. Instead, the committee asked that the search be given internal part-time administrative support. The search for the Dean of the Graduate School will be held in the spring. It has not been determined if it will be a national search as well or open to internal candidates only.

Update: Faculty Constitution Quadrennial Review – Faculty will have an opportunity to vote online for the proposed changes to the Faculty Constitution Nov. 20-22. Dr. Milligan briefly explained that the changes proposed in the Quadrennial Review would dissolve the Graduate Council itself but would retain four of the five subcommittees of the Graduate Council (the two curriculum committees will be combined into one). A benefit to this structure: the graduate and undergraduate committees will be more directly coordinated and both will report directly to the Faculty Senate. A detriment to the new structure: the Faculty Senate agenda will be longer, which could lead to less attention and/or discussion regarding curriculum and policies.

Report: Chancellor's Council on Graduate Studies (CCGS) – Dr. Milligan attended the annual CCGS retreat last week. In recognition that the approval process for new programs is very lengthy (often times, it takes two years to approve a new program), the Program Development Plan (PDP) phase has been suspended for one year. Any new programs proposed within the next year can be submitted as a Full Proposal (FP). The change is expected to reduce the approval time by six months. A detriment, however, is that the program originator will have less time to incorporate feedback from reviewers. The lead time for a Full Proposal to be added to the CCGS agenda was reduced from 60 days to four weeks. Another change announced at the retreat: Curriculum changes to an existing program that are more than 50% will not have to be submitted for approval as a new program; they may instead use the much simpler program change request form.

Reminder: The annual **Graduate Open House** will take place on Thursday, Nov. 9, 5:00-7:00 p.m., in the Apollo room. All graduate programs are encouraged to attend this on-campus recruitment event.

IV. Committee Reports

- a. **Student Affairs Committee (Mike Raymer)** – No report.
- b. **Membership Committee (Lynn Hartzler for Hannah Chai)** – The Committee met once to review nine applications for graduate faculty membership. Seven were approved for adjunct membership, one for regular membership, and one for temporary membership. The dean of the graduate school reviewed 34 applications. On behalf of the Membership Committee, Dr. Hartzler moved to approve all of the graduate faculty memberships. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.
- c. **Policies Committee (Suzanne Franco for John Gallagher)** – The Committee met once to consider a revision to Policy 5720.7 (and the parallel policy for theses Policy 5515.1.12) per the request of the Council of Deans after the decision was made to split the VP Research and Grad School Dean positions. On behalf of the Policies Committee, Dr. Franco moved to approve the following revisions:

“Students and their advisors may request an embargo of a dissertation from the required publication on OhioLINK for a limited period of time. Such requests must be in writing, signed by both the student and the student’s dissertation director or chair. The reason for the request must be explicit, and should involve circumstances beyond simply the desire for more time to write a manuscript. The funding source, if any, for the work should be documented in the request, and it must be clear that the embargo is not being required by a sponsor. All embargo requests must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate School Vice-President for Research. An embargo may be requested for up to one year. Renewal of an embargo must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate School Vice-President for Research on an annual basis at minimum. No permanent embargoes will be approved.”

No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

Dr. Franco also reported that the Policies Committee will begin a review of all graduate procedures and the policies and procedures contained in the Graduate Council Manual in the coming weeks. The purpose is to identify procedures that should be policies (so they can be included in the University Policy index) and to make revisions if needed.

d. Curriculum Committee A (John McAlearney)

On behalf of the Curriculum Committee A, Dr. McAlearney moved to approve the following new course request: EE 7030. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

On behalf of the Curriculum Committee A, Dr. McAlearney moved to approve the following course modifications: CS 7810 and PSY 5310. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

On behalf of the Curriculum Committee A, Dr. McAlearney moved to approve the following program of study modifications: MS Computer Engineering, MS Computer Science, and MS Electrical Engineering. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

e. Curriculum Committee B (Jim Hamister)

On behalf of the Curriculum Committee B, Dr. Hamister moved to approve the following new course requests: DOS 9015 and LDR 8011. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

On behalf of the Curriculum Committee B, Dr. Hamister moved to approve the following course modifications: EDS 6260, EDS 6270, EDS 6460, EDS 6710, and LDR 8010. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

On behalf of the Curriculum Committee B, Dr. Hamister moved to approve the following course deactivation: ENG 5620. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

On behalf of the Curriculum Committee B, Dr. Hamister moved to approve the program of study for a new certificate in the Leadership Studies department, the Program Evaluation Certificate, with one revision: one of the elective courses, LDR 8012, will be replaced with LDR 8020. No discussion. Dr. Milligan called for a vote. Vote: All in favor. Motion passed.

V. Old Business – None

VI. New Business – None

VII. Discussion – Curriculog (Amanda Steele Middleton)

Amanda shared Frequently Asked Questions and answered Grad Council members' questions:

1. Messaging – Curriculog provides a lot more transparency than the old curriculum workflow in the form of daily (or weekly) messages. Users who are involved in the approval process will receive messages related to the proposals they need to approve. Grad Council members will receive messages about all graduate curriculum requests. Graduate proposals, when ready for Graduate Council review, will be listed on the "My Tasks" tab. Council members are encouraged to review the proposals, but do not need to take any action.
2. Rejections – If a committee (dept, college, or university) rejects a proposal, the proposal returns to the originator and the approval process has to start over. If a reviewer (dept chair or dean) rejects a proposal, the proposal returns to the previous step (dept or college committee).

3. Data Elements – Some required fields on the form (designated with a red asterisk) are system-enforced. These fields must be completed before the originator can launch the proposal and begin making edits. Other required fields on the form (designated with a gray asterisk) are not system-enforced. These fields must be completed, but only after the proposal has been launched. The process for an originator: complete required fields with red *, import course/program information from the current catalog, launch the proposal, and then complete the required fields with gray * and any other necessary fields. An originator will know that the curriculum request has moved on to the next stage of the approval process when there is a check mark in the associated little circle on the summary tab.
4. Course Outlines – One required field (gray *) is the Course Outline. HLC requires course outlines to demonstrate how objectives are delivered and accomplished. There also needs to be a course outline submitted for each mode of delivery. If a course will be offered face-to-face and also 100% online, then two course outlines should be provided.
5. Order of Approval (New Program of Study or New Course) – Sometimes a new program of study is entered into the approval process before all of the courses have been developed and approved. In this situation, the originator will not be able to import all of the program's courses and will instead need to manually add the new courses. The Graduate Council will need to decide if it is willing to approve a new program of study even though courses are yet to be approved.
6. Hierarchy – At the college dean level of the approval process, both undergraduate and graduate requests are reviewed. There have been several requests to separate the dean role so that undergraduate and graduate requests are reviewed separately.
7. Proposal Search – To search for specific proposals (for example: all the proposals in the system for a particular college), then click on the All Proposals tab. Choose Advanced Filter. "Found Under" allows the user to choose a department or college in the hierarchy. "Current Step" allows the user to see all items at an approval step (department committee, college committee, etc.).
8. User Tracking and Comments – Before reviewing any proposal, click "show current with mark-up." The originator's changes will be visible in red text. Changes made by other users (any member of any committee can edit a proposal while it is at the committee's approval level) will appear in a different color. The change will also be recorded in the comment section. Reviewers (dept chairs and deans) cannot make edits. Committee members can also make comments, but keep in mind that any comment made is permanently recorded in the proposal's history.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.