The meeting was called to order at 3:30pm. The January 2018 and March 2018 minutes were approved as distributed.

**Old Business**

None

**New Business**

**Proposal to Reduce Biochemistry Graduate Course Requirement**

Associate Professor Bovilsky asked if the Proposal assumes that students entering the program already have an MS degree and have taken a lot of coursework. Doctoral Student Schlientz responded that this is not necessarily true, as some students enter the program with only a bachelor’s degree. There was discussion about the requirements for receiving the degree and whether it is appropriate to earn a PhD with very little coursework.

Associate Professor Bovilsky asked if graduates of this program are mostly going into academia or industry, and if there is teacher training for those going into teaching. Doctoral Student Schlientz confirmed that students in this program teach their first year. Senior Instructor Prikryl pointed out that they are doing this to be in line with biology. She pointed out that advisors may require more coursework if appropriate, but the proposal should be more clear that three is the minimum.

Doctoral Student Schlientz asked if this will be retroactive for current students. Associate Vice Provost Bramhall confirmed that current students can choose either the new or the old curriculum.

Associate Professor Bovilsky moved to approve the Proposal to Reduce Biochemistry Graduate Course Requirement. Assistant Professor Girvan seconded the motion. The Graduate Council voted unanimously to approve the Proposal to Reduce Biochemistry Graduate Course Requirement.

**Program Change to Doctorate of Education (DEd) Degree Program**

Associate Professor Bovilsky referred to two sentences on pages 2 and 4 of the proposal and asked if the students or the faculty would be doing the “aligning.” She also asked how cohort would be found.

Assistant Professor Girvan commented that it would seem difficult to complete a dissertation in a year, especially while working full time.
Professor Chakraborty asked if this was similar to the science model where students choose a lab to apply to. Interim Dean Hodges replied that it’s not really like the science model. These students are practitioners, not scientists, and they are not going to be instigating research programs such as those from which their dissertation projects are drawn.

Associate Professor Bovilsky asked how recruiting groups of students would work. Associate Professor Whalen explained that it is common in education for school districts to partner with universities and have groups of teachers/administrators enter a program together and work on practical problems applicable to their districts.

Associate Professor Whalen posed the question of how the DEd dissertation will differ from the master’s thesis.

Assistant Professor Girvan said that while it’s innovative to have a common assignment across multiple terms of courses, he questions how that will work in terms of credit allocation. That is, can a student pass the first class without completing the final product at the end of the year?

Senior Instructor Prikryl confirmed that the new courses are currently in progress with UOCC.

Lecturer Jo Smith from the COE then joined the Graduate Council meeting to discuss the proposed program change.

Associate Professor Bovilsky asked how students will be paired with faculty members. Lecturer Smith explained that they’re piloting that with the current cohort. During orientation, faculty members came and talked to the cohort about their research. Then in fall students interviewed faculty members. In winter, faculty came and talked to students about their research centers. Spring term, faculty members present specific projects and data sets that might be available for students to work on. They expect that some current students will link up with research centers and some won’t.

Associate Professor Bovilsky asked how specifically students choose a research center. Lecturer Smith said students work with their advisor to coordinate and link up with the most appropriate research center. It will be Lecturer Smith’s responsibility to make sure that students find an appropriate research center during the summer before their coursework begins.

Associate Professor Bovilsky asked about the budgetary impacts section; specifically, is the expected revenue greater than in the past? Lecturer Smith did not have specific information regarding this issue.

Associate Professor Whalen asked how the dissertation will differ from a master’s thesis. Lecturer Smith explained that the dissertation will follow the standard dissertation format, but that DEd students will be looking at problems of practice and will be creating applied research. These students have to form their own research questions, even if they are using extant data from faculty member research.

Interim Dean Hodges asked about the “thematic products” that are required and how those would be tracked and whether these products would be evaluated as part of coursework or outside the courses. Lecturer Smith explained that the product will be completed in the last course of the sequence. She said that each product could end up being a part of the final dissertation.

Interim Dean Hodges suggested adding a section listing faculty, expected cohort sizes, which faculty advisors are also part of research centers, etc. to demonstrate there is sufficient staffing to support students in the program.

Senior Instructor Prikryl asked why some courses are increasing from two to three credits. Lecturer Smith explained that they have additional assignments. It will also streamline the program so that the courses will all be the same number of credits, and students can take three three-credit classes in order to be full time with nine credits.
Assistant Professor Girvan asked about the feasibility of completing a dissertation in one year while working full time. Lecturer Smith explained that this is the current model, and that the current three-year completion rate is about two-thirds. The program revision is designed to improve the completion rates by linking students with research centers. Also, creating “products” along the way that will be included in the dissertation will help complete the dissertation more quickly.

Lecturer Smith then left the Graduate Council meeting, and the Council decided that they would like EMPL to address the following items before voting on the proposal.

- What happens in cases where the initial pairing between a student and a research center is not a good fit?
- Clarification of the budget impacts, i.e., will this represent increased revenue for the COE or not?
- Listing faculty who are involved including who will be advisors, who is in the research centers with potential projects, etc.
- Expected number of students per year and how many advisees per faculty member.

Graduate Council members will email any further questions about the proposal to Assistant Dean Nagel or Associate Dean Karduna. The Council will then vote by email about the proposal after receiving information in answer to the questions listed above.

New Graduate Program in Ethnic Studies

Senior Instructor Prikryl confirmed that all the core courses are in process with UOCC.

Interim Dean Hodges posed the question of where courses taught by participating faculty fit into the program requirements and how faculty get on the list of “participating faculty.”

Assistant Professor Girvan asked if one five-credit methods course is sufficient for a PhD degree.

The Graduate Council discussed issues of adequate graduate employee funding and policies about retaking exams.

Associate Professor Ernesto Martinez and Professor Laura Pulido from Ethnic Studies joined the meeting.

Graduate Council members brought up the following questions/comments:

- Twelve courses are listed—is that two courses per term? It seems that the coursework could be finished in two years. Suggestions included: Eliminate coursework from the third year; Reconsider whether the prospectus defense could happen at the end of the third year; Consider combining the exams into one term rather than spreading them out over several terms.

- MA terminal paper—deadline is in the summer. Students are not usually paid in the summer and faculty usually are not working. Suggest revising this timeline.

- Courses taught by participating faculty—can they count toward primary area requirements? If the answer is yes, that needs to be clarified in the proposal.

- What makes a course eligible to be included in the “Courses taught by participating faculty” category? Professor Pulido clarified that faculty member can apply to be on the list, and Ethnic Studies faculty decide if it’s appropriate to approve them.
• One methods class seems light. Associate Professor Martinez responded that methodologies are also woven into coursework. Also, the theoretical foundations class is also considered to be a methods course.

• The Graduate Council suggested moving prospectus approval to winter term so that students can have it approved by the end of the academic year and have the first summer to write.

• Is there any coordination with COE on the K-12 piece? Professor Pulido responded that she is working on getting a meeting set up with the COE.

The Graduate Council decided not to vote on the proposal until the suggested changes are incorporated into a revised proposal. They would also like to see a written agreement regarding a guarantee of funding from Executive Vice Provost Scott Pratt.

**Mandatory Attendance Policy**

Associate Vice Provost Ron Bramhall reported that the Undergraduate Council agrees with moving the course "add" deadline to 11:59pm on Sunday of the first week, and the course "drop" deadline to 11:59pm on Saturday of the first week. He will redraft the proposal for both the mandatory attendance policy and the “add/drop” deadlines and send them to the Graduate Council before the next meeting.

The Council adjourned at 5:02pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Shanka Chakraborty
Graduate Council Secretary