

GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 1, 2010

Present:

Bruno, Clark, Cramer, Giesler, Henn-Reinke, Huebscher, Koch, Maher, Philip, Simmons, Splittgerber, Szydlik, Tippins, Verrett, Westphal, Wypiszynski, Yeo

Substitutes: Calewarts (for Lundy), Hostetler (for Roth), Miron (for Rauscher), Reljic (for Saginak)

Absent: Gibson, Lammers

The meeting called to order at 1:24 p.m. by Graduate Council Chair Jim Koch. Those present introduced themselves.

Wypiszynski initiated the pass-around file of informational items, noting that a mock-up of a proposed graduate education-marketing piece is included in the file.

Approval Items

1. Graduate Council Minutes of December 3, 2009

Motion/second by Westphal/Maher to approve the minutes as distributed. Motion passed unanimously. No discussion.

2. CAC's Recommendation of MPA Program Review

Motion/Second by Cramer/Szydlik to approve the Curriculum Approval Committee's recommendation to endorse the Master of Public Administration Program Review.

Motion passed unanimously. One abstention: Maher

Discussion

Craig Maher commented that the MPA Program appreciates the positive feedback from the Curriculum Approval Committee. The Program is interested in addressing the issue of contact hours per 3-credit course. Maher asked for suggestions. Currently classes meeting 5 times/semester for 6 hours each.

Question: Is there a minimum number of contact hours for graduate courses?

Response: Nothing documented. The minimum contact hours for three undergraduate credits are 42, which has been in practice as a rule-of-thumb also for graduate courses.

Response: Perhaps the Graduate Council should address this. Some on the Council believe there should be a clear definition for the number of contact hours and amount of work for graduate credit. Wypiszynski will try to gather information that addresses this issue.

3. Revised Honors Criteria – Reading Education

Motion/second by Szydlik/Westphal to approve the criteria. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion

As a procedural point, Reading Education Honors nominees for 2011 will include graduates from Spring 2010, Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011 in order to arrive at the correct cycle (prior summer and fall semesters, current spring semester) of

GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 1, 2010

nominees. As a point of clarification, the general graduate honors criteria established by the Graduate Council in December 2004 are the basis for a graduate program's guidelines and the program may include additional criteria. The Council must approve all graduate program honors guidelines. If a graduate program elects to use the Council honors criteria without any additions, the program should formally submit this as their criteria and get Council approval.

4. MSW Dual-level Rubric

Motion/second by Simmons/Cramer to approve the MSW dual-level rubric. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion

The Council clarified that any academic department which does not have a graduate program but offers dual-level courses should use the general dual-level course rubric approved by the Graduate Council in 2006.

Agenda Discussion Items

5. Graduate Education Development Team (GEDT) - Discussion and feedback on strategic plan

The Council had a lengthy discussion about the plan. The background and previous timeline for the status of the strategic plan was explained. The GEDT is now vetting the document through university governance and other groups. The Graduate Council will be the final group in the vetting process. The GC executive committee was involved in drafting the plan.

Comments

1. Concern was expressed that there has been no Council involvement, except the executive committee, in discussing and creating the strategic plan. It was explained that the vetting process going on now is the time for the Council to analyze the plan and help develop what the plan should be.
2. There is no mention of teaching assistants in the plan. This need varies by program but is important to share in the plan.
3. Page 5, "Weaknesses/Threats": "Many faculty members are resistant to non-traditional educational delivery methods." In some cases, a faculty member may view a specific course as not lending itself to a non-traditional delivery method. This is not the same as being resistant to teaching any and or all courses in non-traditional ways.
4. Page 5, "Weaknesses/Threats": "We do not matriculate a large number of top-level students and students who seek to enter Ph.D. programs." Not all UW Oshkosh graduate programs are logical steps to doctoral programs. Also, "Ph.D" should be changed to "doctoral."

GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 1, 2010

5. Geographically, Northern WI (as it relates to the plan initiative for northward expansion/recruitment) needs to be more fully examined as an area that would contribute to graduate education at UW Oshkosh.
6. The plan introduction should frame the issue(s) in terms of the problems' context and their history* as well as the history of Graduate Education at UW Oshkosh. Those not involved in the creation and initial vetting felt the need for more background with which to judge the initiatives.
- 7 Concern was raised about the source(s), availability and amount of resources to support the visibility initiative and graduate education in general.

*Information about what precipitated the marked decline in graduate enrollment in 1998 was provided. It was essentially due to changes in the COEHS undergraduate and graduate academic programs and was driven by changes in state licensure requirements.

Feedback is welcome from all Council members especially the program coordinators and should be sent to Alan Hartman, Fredi Giesler, Greg Wypiszynski, Fred Yeo or Jim Koch.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Postscript from Greg W.—Approved by the GC 5/6/2010