

APGC Meeting Agenda
January 17, 2017
12:00-1:00
Wardlaw #214

Committee Members in Attendance: Christian Anderson, Cathy Brant, David Stodden, Mary Styslinger, Kimberly Teasley, Rob Dedmon (Ex-Officio), Adam Pennell

We reviewed two new courses:

EDEX 891T – Anthony Plotner

The justification for the course should read, “The South Carolina Department of Education has recently approved a new endorsement in the area of secondary transition planning. This endorsement will consist of 6 courses that have been developed by faculty in the Special Education program.”

In course description remove the word “addresses” and begin with “issues.”

The prerequisites for the course should be changed to, “EDEX 523, or an introductory course in Exceptional Children, or consent of instructor.”

The grading system and grade allocation need to be made consistent, the course generates 225 possible points, but the grading system requires a maximum possible total of 300.

Change learning outcome number one from “gain” to “demonstrate.” The course was approved with proposed changes made.

Rob will meet with Anthony Plotner after the meeting regarding the course proposed (891T); Kimberly will send minutes to Rob for reference.

Ph.D. in Educational Psychology and Research (Program Change) – Christine Distefano

The program has been changed to reflect 63 hours of study in each track (EDPY and EDRM). There was a review to ensure that the courses aren’t on both programs of study and counting for both. Verified that there is a reduction in the number of courses required in the EDPY core courses (students must select four). One edit on page 2, change “approval” to “approved.” Clarified that the EDRM 878 course will be taken twice, for three credit hours each time. The course was approved.

Continued discussion of 3 column comparison of 2003 COE Policies and Procedures, 2013 CE Policies and Procedures, and Grad School Bulletin Policies and Procedures

- The committee reviewed notes on the three-column document regarding documents and positions that are no longer in use but referenced in the 2003 document along with policies that may or may not be in use currently. These will be verified by Rob and Mary before the next meeting.

- The committee members will present questions 1-5 to their respective departments using notes below from the discussion.

Standardized Test Scores Questions:

1) COE requires scores from approved examination for entrance into a degree program (GRE or Millers); this is not specified by grad school; this requirement often leads program areas to seek alternative evidence; 2) also refers to submission of test scores

- Committee Recommendations: Question one regarding standardized test scores for admissions: should this be a programmatic decision? If COE

deletes requirement, programs can still require individually. Programs will discuss this requirement with individual programs, suggestion to make the language in the 2013/2003 document match the Graduate Academic Bulletin of “standardized test scores, letters of recommendation, and other materials specified by the individual academic program may also be required.”
Suggestion to add language to “refer back to specific departmental and program documents for requirements of admission”

- Programs should review their bulletin entry to ensure that their entrance requirements are clearly stipulated

Committee Questions:

3) The graduate school does not specify readers for a master’s thesis

- The language in the 2003/2013 document does not specify the number of readers for a master’s thesis; some programs have the option of a master’s thesis. The document specifies that there should be “an advisor and one or more readers will be appointed.” Committee members will gather suggested language if programs support this decision. The committee feels that keeping this language.

4a) The graduate school does not specify that chair of doctoral committee be a member of the graduate, tenure-track faculty; graduate policy states that non-- tenured track USC faculty who hold a PhD or other terminal degree may be appointed to associate membership in the graduate faculty and made direct theses and dissertations

- Committee members will discuss this with their program faculty

4b) Graduate school does not specify that the chair of a dissertation committee have served on at least one doctoral committee before being eligible to serve as chair

- Committee members will discuss this with their program faculty
- Committee supports this language

5) COE stipulates retired faculty may chair a doctoral committee for a maximum of two years following retirement; Grad policy (my p. 10-backside) states that emeritus faculty who continue to serve as chair must have endorsements of academic program faculty, chair of the department, graduate director and academic Dean. A petition must be presented to the dean of graduate studies for approval.

- Committee members will discuss this with their program faculty: Do we want to adhere to the maximum period of two years following retirement?
- Committee recommends adding in the graduate school language for the approval process

Mary proposed a timeline for reviewing the three-column comparison of the advanced graduate programs and policies and procedures documents.

AGPC will gather feedback from respective departments during Feb-March meetings; this feedback pertains to larger questions of policy. During these months, Mary works with Rob to make updates and edits to the 2003 COE document, taking into consideration the edits and updates suggested by the 2013 COE document not vetted, and will use TrackChanges to make edits. WE should have a complete document by April to present at the COE faculty meeting,

- The meeting was adjourned.
- The next meeting for APGC February 15 at 10:00 in room 214