



**COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES**  
 Office of the Associate Dean for Administrative Affairs and Graduate Education  
**GRADUATE PROGRAM COORDINATORS MEETING**  
**September 25, 2009**

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Shawn Fitzgerald, FLA; Averil McClelland, FLA; Barb Scheule, FLA; Anita Varrati, FLA; Ellen Glickman, HS; Karen Gordon, HS; Dianne Kerr, HS; Kim Peer, HS; Robert Pierce, HS; Karla Anhalt, LDES; Richard Cowan, LDES; Kristie Pretti-Frontczak, LDES; Rhonda Richardson, LDES; John West, LDES; Connie Collier, TLC; Jim Henderson, TLC; Marty Lash, TLC; Nancy Padak, TLC; Nancy Barbour, EHHS; Nancy Miller, EHHS

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mary Ann Devine, FLA; Mark Kretovics, FLA; Mark Lyberger, FLA; Jason McGlothlin, LDES; Phil Rumrill, LDES; Melody Tankersly, LDES; Bette Brooks, TLC; Lettie Gonzalez, TLC; Janice Hutchison, TLC; Pat O'Connor, TLC

GUESTS: None

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION TAKEN
<b>Dismissals and Probationary Admits</b>	Nancy explained the process for semester warning letters. She explained to the group the difficulty in tracking students on probation. She shared that files for students in danger of being dismissed will be sent to program coordinators for review. At that time any extenuating circumstances could be discussed. Coordinators were requested to discuss the student with their faculty regarding performance. Files need to be reviewed in a timely fashion. We want to be fair to the student, but need to make the tough decision. This needs to occur prior to the beginning of the next semester.	No Action Necessary
<b>UESP and impact on committee membership</b>	There is concern with regard to students in dissertation phase whose committee members have taken advantage of the early separation agreements, decide to retire, or leave the university. Nancy asked the group if they felt the need to develop a policy regarding this and asked for feedback. In the past, faculty members have continued to serve on a committee even after leaving the university. After much discussion and many suggestions a motion was made. Discussion focused on giving the student the opportunity to put together a new committee and possibly even change the topic/design of their dissertation. Nancy explained that once the dissertation proposal has been approved it is considered a contract with the candidate. Several suggestions were made including: informing the student that their director must be employed full time at KSU, if a candidate had co-directors one would have to be full time faculty member, and that the student be given one semester to reconstitute their committee. Nancy stated this still did not address the issue of committee members who have left the university and their ability to continue to be a part of the committee. It was discussed that the smaller programs may not have enough faculty members with graduate faculty status. Nancy stated what she liked about the reconstitution was that it would force the program director to	Motion put forth by Jim Henderson that if one person leaves the co director would become the director. Motion seconded by Karen Gordon.  Motion was withdrawn by Jim Henderson in favor of a new recommendation.  John West made a motion to add a statement to the handbook that if the director of a dissertation

	<p>have a conversation with the student. When asked what the procedure for a reconstitution would be Nancy stated that she felt as though the student would be the trigger of the conversation. Nancy stated that perhaps there was not a need for a policy, but she needs to add it to the handbook as a comment.</p>	<p>committee leaves, the student has the obligation to reconstitute the committee in consultation with the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies within one semester.</p> <p>Motion was seconded by Marty Lash. <b>Motion passed unanimously</b></p>
<b>GA Budget Allocations – program needs</b>	<p>Nancy explained she will shortly be asking program coordinators for information regarding their use of graduate assistants.</p>	<p>No action necessary</p>
<b>Centralized admissions</b>	<p>Nancy shared that it is Provost Frank’s goal to unify the graduate schools into one. There was an effort to centralize all admissions into RAGS last year, but this did not go well. Each graduate school has been asked to nominate several faculty members to work with Mary Ann Stephens on this project. Dean Mahony will be choosing the faculty members involved.</p> <p>Nancy shared that she will be overseeing Research in place of Melody Tankersley.</p> <p>The university will be centralizing some research functions. Faculty will still have access to the Bureau. They will continue with the contracts.</p>	<p>No action necessary</p>
<b>Masters 30 credit hour minimum – curricular approval</b>	<p>EPC recently voted to lower minimum masters program credit hour requirements to 30. Nancy explained that if coordinators choose to move to the 30 hr minimum there would need to be curricular approval. It was also explained that with the 30 credit hour minimum, Nancy will hold to the limit of 12 credit transfers.</p>	<p>No action necessary</p>
<b>Doctoral form – personal data sheet or vita</b>	<p>The group was asked to review the personal data sheets. It was suggested that perhaps it might be time to move to a curriculum vita. This will be discussed later after everyone has discussed it with faculty.</p>	<p>To be discussed later</p>
<b>Late Fees for Graduation applications</b>	<p>The current procedures and deadlines for graduation were reviewed. Students who apply late and the problems it causes were also discussed. Nancy explained that starting spring 2010 a \$200 late fee will be in effect for anyone applying for graduation past the cutoff date. She explained that this is not a guarantee of graduation, but rather that their application would be processed. She explained that the fee is non-refundable. She explained that this is a university policy. Nancy M. pointed out that the student would have the option of waiting until the next semester.</p>	<p>No action necessary</p>
<b>AERA Doctoral Survey</b>	<p>Nancy explained that we have agreed to be a part of an AERA doctoral survey. This was discussed with the Dean as a good way to have the doctoral program reviewed. The survey will only be looking at Education doctoral programs and inquired if it was a research or practice doctoral. She and the Dean discussed</p>	<p>No action necessary</p>

	that our doctoral programs are indeed research degrees.	
<b>AQIP</b>	Nancy explained to the group that this is an opportune time, since the reorganization, to stop out and take a fresh look at reporting. She requested that they look carefully at all reporting bodies to avoid reporting the same information to three different bodies. She asked them to think about how reporting to only one body would work for their programs. She asked them to think about how they would like to be accountable with regard to their college and program goals.	No action necessary
<b>Reviewing Graduate Policies</b>	<p>Coordinators were asked to carefully read the handbook and be prepared to discuss what is not working about the handbook. The need for the pre-defense meeting to take place physically in person was discussed. The brochure and what it contains was also to be reviewed.</p> <p>There were questions regarding the changeover to the APA 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Nancy shared that candidates defending for fall can continue to use the APA 5<sup>th</sup> edition. If they will be completing in spring they will need to move to the 6<sup>th</sup> edition.</p>	No action necessary

The meeting was adjourned at

Next meeting: **Friday, October 30, 2009, 10:45 – 12:00 noon**

Respectfully submitted

Luci Wymer  
Recorder