Graduate Committee Meeting
October 28, 2011
Meeting Notes

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Dr. Randy Pembrook who asked everyone to introduce themselves and their connection to the Committee meeting.

Those present included:
   Randy Pembrook, Nancy Tate, Monica Scheibmeir, Taylor McGown, Bob Boncella, Judith McConnell-Farmer, Michael Rettig*, Gordon McQuere, Cindy Turk, Catherine Hunt, Phyllis Berry, Willie Dunlap, Kayla Waters, Bruce Mactavish, Dave Provorse

*Designates Presenter/guests

The Graduate Committee had three (3) agenda items left from the previous meeting to discuss:

1. Proposal from the Education Department: Master of Education
2. Administrative issue from AY 2010-2011
   a. Course Numbering System
3. Discussion regarding the modification of the Committee membership

Dr. Pembrook indicated the previous proposals (DNP from the School of Nursing; two (2) Master Programs from the School of Applied Studies) were submitted and approved by the Faculty Senate on October 24, 2011. A question was posed at Faculty Senate as to whether these proposals should be returned for a second reading by the Faculty Senate. Discussion by this committee involved the feeling the proposals were approved by this committee as the 1st reading and sent to the Faculty Senate as the 2nd reading.

1. A short overview of the Master of Education proposal was provided by Judith McConnell-Farmer.
   a. A summary of the last meeting includes a concern about having students receive two Master of Education credentials without having a clear delineation of the name for each degree. There needs to be some way to show differentiation. It was decided this was a naming/descriptive issue with a need for clarification from the education department.

The resolution offered by the Education department is that all Master of Education degrees will be MEd in “specialization”.

This proposal was moved and seconded. After further discussion the committee asked the Education Department to submit the courses that would be required for each of the specific degrees so a proposal could be put forth for each degree. The committee gave
final approval on this proposal and will submit all paperwork for each degree offered to the Faculty Senate.

2. The course numbering system was introduced by Dr. Tate with information regarding the two year process this proposal has gone through. After discussion, the following items remained on the table:
   a. There was a friendly amendment to the current proposal from the Director of the MLS program. That amendment reads, “Courses co-listed as both graduate and undergraduate, but taken as graduate credit, can be accepted toward a graduate degree at Washburn University dependent on the specific requirements of the graduate degree program”. This was approved by the committee.
   b. There was a proposal to standardize the Undergraduate and then the graduate course numbers. If approved, all Grad courses would be at the 500 level which would allow some undergraduate participation, 600 level courses would be Grad level only, with 900 level courses doctorate level only. For further clarification, a representation of a numbering system based on this discussion might look involve:
      000-099 Undergrad review
      100-299 Undergraduate lower division
      300-450 Upper division
      451-499 Undergraduate capstone
      600-750 Masters
      751-799 Masters capstone (e.g. thesis, Internships)
      800-950 Doctoral
      951-999 Doctoral capstone

Dr. Pembrook asked for volunteers to work through the current proposal to determine if there would be any 500 level courses, to determine what type of work and how much work would be involved and whether this could be handled within the local departments. Psychology and School of Nursing has volunteered to go through the proposal. They will report back to the committee regarding their findings.

3. The committee membership was reintroduced by Dr. Pembrook with a DRAFT proposal for the make-up of the committee created specifically to foster discussion on this topic. This draft proposal showed two faculty members from each of the schools and the college, one faculty member from the SOL, one representative of the library and representative from the VPAA’s office.

   a. Some discussion had involved the fact that not all of the graduate programs would have representation on the committee. It was felt if a new program were to be invited to the committee meeting to share their presentation and answer questions, then the committee members would be the ones voting on the proposals. The SON and SOBu representatives
indicated they felt only one representative was needed from their respective areas.

b. It was also suggested that only the faculty who teach in graduate programs should be on the committee.

c. The question was asked about the purpose of the committee. If the purpose is to have this as a working committee, then only certain members should be present. If the committee is Administrative in nature, then other members could be present.

This led to a larger question of whether there should be a “School” of graduate students at Washburn to oversee University wide policies regarding admission processes, academic standards (e.g. GPA), etc. More discussion is required on this topic at future meetings.