

**FA Graduate Committee**  
**Wednesday 6 April 2011, 3:00-4:30 pm**  
**1027 Memorial Library (across from reference desk)**  
**Conference line number: 507-389-5077**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**

Present: Claudia Pragman, Nancy Fitzsimons, Bobby Bothmann (recorder), Donna Brauer (phone).  
Guest: Sue Bell, Nursing

1. Announcements

Graduate faculty status electronic system is coming along. Dr. Azarbod's class should have at least one working system by the end of the semester.

2. Approve minutes

The minutes of the 2 March 2011 meeting were approved.

3. Adopt agenda

Agenda was adopted as written.

New Business

4. Review survey from Grad Coordinator meeting (survey results attached) The survey was presented at the March graduate coordinators meeting and also e-mailed to the 49 graduate coordinators. Coordinators were encouraged to share the survey with their graduate faculty. 13 responses were received.

The survey responses show a lot of frustration with CDS and the curriculum proposals. There was good feedback for the committee and enough information to make sure to be very clear about what we want to see regarding and make sure we define what we want regarding student learning outcomes and proposals in general.

We discussed several ideas, among them the creation of a graduate curriculum committee for each college or graduate committee members as ex officio on the existing college curriculum committees. We agreed that we should discuss this at the next submeet.

**ACTION:** Discuss means to have more active graduate faculty roles in curriculum committees and ask GSR to facilitate a few members of this committee to create documents to assist with curriculum proposals that we can approve early fall semester

5. FA Grad Committee communication Much of this discussion was covered in the previous agenda item, but some points we wanted to make: FA graduate committee members should meet with college committee early in the year.

FA Committee needs to provide a model for the proposals and provide clear instructions for essential items that must be supplied

Another idea is to host a session for Professional Development day next year.

6. CDS Wishlist

We discussed desired changes for the CDS system.

- Remove "syllabus" attachment option? Or change the terminology? Opinion varied.  
Mainly we want to be sure that faculty know they only need to supply a course outline, not

a syllabus as the syllabus is intellectual property.

- Force pasting text of Course outline and Student learning outcomes? Opinion varied. Some of us like having the pertinent information in the proposal form without need to open an attachment. Others like having the attachments. Leave as-is.
  - Provide contextual help
  - Add box: Is there content in the proposal mandated by accrediting or licensing bodies?
- Explain
- Feedback note area in the Recommend/Revise section is too small
  - System response time is unacceptable: 6 seconds to load a proposal; 6-10 seconds to recommend a proposal; 18 or more seconds to revise a proposal, sometimes longer. These pages and actions need to load much faster.
  - Add the ability to make and save notes during the review process that can be shared at the committee level.
  - Absolutely need add an option to select multiple proposals to recommend or revise; the one-by-one loading and clicking process currently is excessively long

We also discussed a need to revise the proposals to request student learning outcomes (SLO) for certain types of modifications. For a change in bulletin/course description or number of credits we want to see SLOs.

For a course title change, grade change, time offered, no SLO or topic needed; Do they even need review?

For 4xx/5xx force showing a difference in graduate student learning outcomes; One example, create two columns to show the difference between the graduate and undergraduate SLOs

7. Other? Who is continuing? We identified the following members of the committee as continuing next year:

Bobby Bothmann, Nancy Fitzsimons, Bob Sorenson. Gretchen Perbix is continuing but will be on sabbatical. Donna Brauer pending election.

Old Business 8. Scholastic standards proposal (#6 in minutes of last meeting)--Get on the agenda for the submeet/documented in the minutes. 9. Capstone committee composition

Chris Mickle provided us with a draft revision of the capstone committee language found in the graduate bulletin. The changes are meant to reflect the reality of programs that do not have thesis or dissertation capstones. The committee recommended the following changes (in red)

### **Graduate Committees**

A Graduate Committee supervises a student's program, including comprehensive examinations (if applicable) and the completion of the capstone experience. Students should consult with their advisor prior to asking faculty to serve on their committee.

All doctoral students and students writing a thesis **or dissertation** must form a graduate committee. The College of Graduate Studies and Research does not require the formation of a committee for students enrolled in a non-thesis program, but individual degree programs may require students to form examining committees.

A student's **thesis or dissertation** committee must consist of at least two members of the University's Graduate Faculty, although individual programs may require committees of more than two members. The committee chairperson shall be the student's advisor, who must be a Regular or Research member of the graduate faculty and in the student's area of concentration. Other members of the committee must be members of the Graduate Faculty. Doctoral programs have additional requirements concerning who is eligible to serve on a student's committee. Please consult the University's policies concerning graduate and research faculty appointments.

Faculty from other institutions may serve without compensation as a member of a student's committee. These external or visiting members must be approved by the student's advisor and need to obtain Graduate Faculty Status at Minnesota State University, Mankato at the “Visiting and Collaborative Faculty” rank.

10. Review of new curriculum and program proposals  
TABLE FOR NEXT YEAR

11. Review of research rank graduate faculty status applications  
TABLE FOR NEXT YEAR

#### Curriculum

12. Review proposals

Sue Bell from Nursing came to discuss the program and course proposals: this is the proposal for MSU-only program (the consortium was dissolved); We went over several questions with some of the proposals. The committee approved both programs and all courses except

The “Essentials” are put out by national agencies; found out that some of the masters courses need to be updated; SLOs are tied specifically to the Essentials that demonstrates that they are following the national guidelines; to sit for the FNP exam, you have to have a certain number of clinical hours, certain courses; the practice part happens at the master’s level. The doctoral level adds on to that, but it is for practicing not for being college professors; it is a practice degree, not a research degree. Translate research into practice, not develop new knowledge. Went over

Some question over course numbers; approved both programs and all courses, except #2790 (NURS 664) will be sent back for a change to a 5XX and then approved.

Approved most of the other new or revised proposals. Had a discussion about some of the KSP and CSP proposals, recognize that these programs need to use specific language. There was not unanimous agreement that this language sufficed for student learning outcomes that summarize the course content and define the higher learning skills for graduate level work. The committee agreed on conditional approval and submit the following statement:

Conditional recommendation of curriculum proposals pending approval of SLOs as stated below:

In the interest of facilitating the COE programs we would like to conditionally recommend the proposals from KSP and CSP, the condition being that the authors supply student learning outcomes (SLOs) appropriate to the level of the courses using standard language that reflects the higher level cognitive skills appropriate to the course level. We acknowledge that accreditation and licensure have a role in what must be reflected in the syllabi. However, the graduate committee also has an interest in ensuring that student learning outcomes for graduate courses reflect a high level of quality and rigor using language that can be universally understood, not only by our peers outside of any specific college or program, but also by any outside/non-university entity who might have reason to review the student learning outcomes, particularly as these outcomes are required by MnSCU policy to be included in all syllabi. The graduate committee has asked for this detail in student learning outcomes for the past several years and in fairness would like to ask for the same type of language for these proposals. Generally, three to five student learning outcomes that summarize what is reflected in the course content and/or accreditation/licensure language is all that is necessary.

13. Post 1 April proposals--how to address them

If any exist, point out the deadline is past, please return them next year.