

Minutes from Meeting
2:30-4:00 pm
Rooms 2102 (Bloomington) and 3138B (Indianapolis)

Members Present: Alexander McCormick, Chad Christensen, Scott Bellini, John Hitchcock, Kelzie Beebe

Ex-Officio Present: Elizabeth Boling, Brendan Maxcy, Ghangis Carter

Members Absent: Marjorie Manifold, Sam Museus, Sandra Strain

Staff: Liyao Zhao

Presenters: Jim Scheurich, Frank Di Silvestro, Marje Treff, Tom Brush

- I. Review and Approval of Minutes from February 2, 2016
 - *John Hitchcock moved to approve the minutes from February 2, 2016, with the following changes: under Discussion Item A, the word “are” should be replaced with “may” in “are only available to in-state students”; under Discussion Item B, the minutes should say that ELPS is conducting several program reviews at the moment.*
 - *Scott Bellini seconded the motion.*
 - *All in favor.*

- II. New Business
 - A. **Proposal for UES Doctoral Program Qualifying Exams Policy**

The committee first addressed a proposal for changes to the UES doctoral program qualifying exam policy. Jim Scheurich presented and fielded questions on this item. The committee members recommended changes to a number of items in the policy. Under item A.4, Hitchcock recommended that the word “current” be added in front of “APA” to ensure that students use the most up-to-date version of APA. Under item B.6, it was recommended that the certain language be removed (references to pregnancy and second language students who might hypothetically need more time to complete questions) in favor of the all-encompassing term “documented extenuating circumstances.” The addition of “documented,” here, would also serve as a failsafe should students perceive inequities in how committees determine how much additional time to give to students retaking their qualifying exams. Under item A.1, McCormick recommend to change the language to “if there is a fourth member, this person can require a question”. Under item C.3, McCormick recommended to drop the word “three” when referring to committee members giving questions on the qualifying exam. And, finally, under C.4, the policy should clearly state that a rewriting of the questions with additional time constitutes a retaking of—a second attempt at—the qualifying

exam. If the student fails that rewriting, he or she has failed the second attempt at the exam. There were a number of smaller issues that the committee asked about, but ultimately, the policy as written adequately addressed those issues.

- *John Hitchcock moved to approve the policy with the following changes: Under A.1, change the language to “If there is a fourth member, this person can require a question”; under item A.4, add the word “current” in front of “APA”; under item B.6, change the language to “Given documented extenuating circumstances of the student, the Advisory Committee could change the length of the writing period”, and delete the phrase “such as second language issues, pregnancy, etc.” ; under item C.3, delete the word “three”; under item C.4, add “retaken and” in front of “failed”.*
- *Chad Christensen seconded the motion.*
- *All in favor.*

III. Discussion Items

A. **Program Review**

a. MEd Program in Adult Education

The committee then tackled program reviews for the MEd Program in Adult Education. Frank Di Silvestro and Marje Treff presented on this item. Di Silvestro listed the recommendations of the MEd program review as follows: develop and publishing a course plan that indicates the semester and order of courses through the program. Continue to have the Participation Training course (P.T.) early in the program and possibly hold PT concurrently with annual IST Conference. Consider developing tracks or concentrations within the program; recruit and hire a new full time faculty member. Seek administrative support for reducing the faculty-teaching load. Increase faculty presence in publishing in peer reviewed journals and presenting at local, regional, and national organizations. Develop programmatic approaches to participation training (the program has succeeded in this with training for ESL students). Reduce credit hours from 36 to 30 (the program did not comply with this recommendation). Develop a marketing plan; and, finally, reduce the GPA and GRE requirements for entry into the program (this is under consideration although the program prefer their higher standard GPA of 3.2).

b. PhD Program in IST

The committee then tackled program reviews for the PhD Program in IST. Tom Brush presented on this item. Brush listed the recommendations for the PhD program in IST as follows: bring in faculty with diverse interests. Mentor new faculty into the Research Groups, particularly assistant professors. Manage student logistics, so that students are

not jumping between research groups. Increase faculty resources for grant writing. Make sure that incoming students have enough funding (the program is complying with this recommendation by simply admitting fewer students and by removing the one-year fellowships). Finally, help international students with their reading and writing skills.

Carter asked if the program review had recommended that the PhD program in IST recruit a diverse body of students and faculty. Brush replied that it had not done so.

B. Graduate Student Leave of Absence Policy

Lastly, the committee addressed graduate student leave of absence policy. Boling noted that the school's current policy does not comport with others on campus in terms of providing funds for students who are on leave and need replacement (the only scenario in which students now receive funding is "parental accommodation"). She expressed the need for a subcommittee to address the issue. Scott Bellini volunteered to chair the subcommittee. Chad Christensen volunteered to be on the committee. The other members will be extracted from ELPS, CEP and SOEGSA.

At the end of the meeting, Carter asked if the names of the external reviewers were known. Boling noted that the names are listed in the full reports that are sent to the university graduate school. McCormick recommended that an inclusion of the visit date and external reviewers could be included in the executive summary.