

College of Education
Faculty AssemMH-T7 s6u4/J 0n4(t)gTc 0 Tw 3.28 0 11.32 6acr

Yes. The Graduate College is a young college and it is not a perfect system. But the college is working to take care of concerns. For example, The Graduate College is moving towards web-based forms that will be expandable.

There are a number of Dissertations that have procedures already set up to vet, we know that vetting is completed in the Graduate College office. It would be helpful if the COE faculty could receive a checklist to know what the Graduate College looks for, such as the formatting.

Dr. Rosson agreed that we need to move towards a standard formatting.

What supersedes APA or the Dissertation and Thesis guidelines?

Dr. Rosson stated that we need to follow the guidelines, but allowed that the guidelines need to be clearer.

How long and how often will we have to resubmit forms?

Once the POS forms go online (VIP and Web-Based forms), faculty will not have to resubmit forms.

The advisors and committee are held accountable for the Thesis and Dissertation forms; however, the advisor does not get the approved POS. Can the Graduate College better connect with COE advisors and committee members?

Dr. Rosson stated that we have VIP and we will have web-based forms in the future. In the meantime, we should ask the students and remind the students that their POS is their responsibility.

We should revisit in the middle of the fall semester to see if the problems have subsided.

This is something that can be looked at that time.

When is a POS revision due?

The POS is due the last semester before graduation.

Can we have "The last semester before graduation" placed on POS?

Forms are not sent back from the Graduate College because courses are out of order.

Dr. Rosson requests that COE faculty have students fill out POS forms, even if there are uncertainties about the courses.

Dr. Rosson again thanked the COE faculty and left.

Follow-up Suggestions and Questions

VIP is not available unless faculty has had Banner 1, 2, and 3 training.

Faculty should be able to put on the POS general outline, such as 18 elective credits, rather than having to list courses that may or may not be offered.

Some faculty expressed concern about the number of forms, and lack of staff, at the Graduate College.

It was noted for clarification that the reasons that some students are not submitting the new POS forms early in their programs, especially the doctoral program, appear to relate to an attempt to avoid having to resubmit the form once the actual sequence of courses can be predicted. The fact that the Graduate College POS form is not routinely submitted early, however, does not indicate that COE faculty are not continuing to meet with new graduate students early in their first semester (or sometimes before) to discuss requirements and develop a draft program of study. The College of Education faculty understand the importance of early advisement and routinely offer it. The new information that a POS will not be returned because the courses are not listed in the order taken should remove this problem.

President Warde then presented talking points and expressed how they were met by Dr. Rosson and his presentation.

1. Lack of two (three) –way communication between graduate school staff, students, and faculty advisors.
VIP and Web-Based Programs should solve this problem.
2. Plans of Study (POS) forms are not reviewed by graduate school until student’s last semester prior to graduation. This creates a myriad of issues for both faculty and student if deficiencies are found at such a late date and jeopardizes student’s graduation.
There is a backlog, explained earlier that it is time frame based on time utilization.
It is a goal to get POS out before the last semester.
3. Advisors cannot access student’s POS to verify acceptance with grad school or to make any necessary changes while students move through coursework.
VIP and Web-Based Programs should solve this problem.
4. Committees need to be named on Form 5 for doctoral students. Neither students nor their program advisors have any idea who these people will be at the beginning of their doc programs.

- x Faculty-mentor task force for recruitment and retention. Contact Dr. Deborah Shepherd if interested.

Goal 3: Technology

- x With the help of Steve Diaz, ED 313 will be turned in to a full-

Report on Provost's P&T request – Pat Maslin-Ostrowski and P&T Committee members / FA action plan

Dr. Maslin-Ostrowski began by giving a brief background on the Provost's request for faculty to review the COE's criteria for promotion and tenure. Each department shared its notes from departmental meetings.

CCEI- The department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry discussed this issue on several occasions during departmental meetings. We unanimously passed two motions pertaining to this issue.

- 1) Earlier in the semester, CCEI sent a memo to the Chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee requesting that the Committee review the criteria per the Provost's

EL- The department discussed the Provost's second request to review the College of Education's criteria for promotion and tenure. Individual program areas had an opportunity to discuss this prior to the full faculty meeting, similar to last year's review of the college criteria process. Faculty agreed that overall, the current College of Education criteria are clear, fair and rigorous. While faculty appreciate the importance of reviews of this type, given the present pressures of coping with extreme budget cuts, e.g. unfilled faculty lines that have increased individual faculty load, no funds to travel to meet professional responsibilities, concerns of losing positions, etc., people feel like they have a great deal "on their plate" at this time. As such, faculty concurred that a revision of the criteria is not a priority in need of an "emergency" overhaul. Yet, given that the Provost has expressed his desire for more faculty review of the criteria, the EDL faculty recommend, if faculty colleagues across the College agree, that the COE form a special College-wide committee to respond to the Provost's request. The Committee will be charged with studying this issue and making a recommendation to the COE Faculty Assembly. In other words, this special College-wide committee will determine whether the College should move forward with a review and, if a review is recommended, the processes and timelines for

The Faculty Assembly is an advisory body. As such, it passes along the faculty concerns, recommendations, and motions to the Dean. The Assembly does not create or prohibit