	Graduate Council	
	Date	Wednesday, November 15, 2023
	Time	3:00 PM – 4:30 PM
	Place	Memorial Union 226 - Pioneer Room and Zoom: https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/91736338856

Roll Call

Janett Naylor-Tincknell EA	✓ Kim Perez	✓ Gary Andersen
✓ Medhavi Ambardar	✓ Janelle Harding	✓ Suzanne Becking
Blake Roth EA	✓ David Fitzhugh	✓ Jian Sun
✓ Kim Chappell	✓ Rhonda Weimer	✓ Keith Bremer
✓ Kenton Olliff	Erica Bittel EA	✓ Les Mackey
✓ Laura Wilson	✓ Carrie Tholstrup	✓ Caylan Harris
✓ Perry Harrison	✓ Angie Howard	Angela Pool-Funai EA
✓ LeAnn Brown	✓ Valerie Yu	
✓ Brent Goertzen	✓ Angela Walters	
✓ Hussam Ghunaim	✓ Jerrie Brooks	

Standing Items
1) Strategic goals for the Graduate School
    a) Engagement/retention (Goal 2: Student Success)
        i) Policy Update
            Appeals policy updated and voted on last meeting. This has been published on the Graduate School website in 2 different places.
        ii) Handbook update
            Still currently working on
    b) Marketing/recruitment (Goal 3: Strategic Growth)
        i) Les – Recruitment Update
            Spring 2024 admits- 156 students admitted and 229 applications still outstanding in the application process. They could be completed and pending departmental review or the applicants are still adding the required documents to their applications. Dr. Bremer mentioned that there are also programs that admit students in mass so this could be contributing to this. One of those programs is School Counseling and Clinical Mental Health. There are issues right now with the background check program Validity- this is part of the Kansas court system that was hacked and not much is moving through right now. There are other options, but it does cost more money. The KBI background check is around $20-$30 to complete, but

the applicants who are waiting on their Validity background checks have already paid for those. There are some students waiting for those. Dr. Kenton Olliff mentioned that there will be 2 sets of interviews to help catch the students who are still waiting on the background checks.

Compared to last spring 2023 with 485 admits
- c) External funding (Goal 4: Resources & Infrastructure)
  - i) OSSP Report
    - FY 24
      - 14 submissions totaling $7.9 million
      - 12 awards totaling $2.5 million

      - FY23 this time last year
        - 10 submissions totaling $4.3 million
        - 11 awards totaling $2.1 million

  - ii) Endowed Scholarship Funds ($7,090.11)
    This needs to be $10,000 before it can become an endowed Scholarship. We are looking for ideas to raise money. We thought about doing something like what the History department did for trivia night at Defiance. We are open to suggestions to try to promote, and are planning to promote this scholarship fund during Giving Day later in the year.

New Business
1) Action Items: Curriculum Committee
   a) None at this time.
2) Faculty Senate update on course submission process.
   Dr. Kim Chappell provided an update on the university curriculum approval process that they have been working on for a couple of years, and the KACE ticketing system. This had also just been presented to Faculty Senate.

   There has been lots of confusion about approving the KACE ticketing system and approving it. Dr. Chappell wanted to stress that they are not approving the software package, but what this is doing is creating a ticket system. This helped to create a university curriculum process that would be standardized across Graduate & undergraduate, so this would be one process. There was also some confusion and concern with faculty governance and concerns about things happening without their knowledge. The committee did inform everyone about this process a year ago, and again this year. They were a brainstorming group that came together to identify some weaknesses in the curriculum approval process. They were some issues identified including duplicate courses, collaboration issues between undergraduate and graduate courses, issues with

TILT support, issues with Workday, issues with SharePoint lacking flexibility, and logistics issues. The committee decided that in order to address all of these issues, they would try to go to a one university system and start with the ticketing system in KACE and then it would go through all of all of the steps and then goes into either the Graduate Council "bin" to get approval or into the Academic Affairs "bin" to get approval. This system is now ready for the pilot course after two years of planning. The first course was piloted and the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee looked at it last month and had an opportunity to see what it looked like. This is just an application process, not set in stone. This will be sent for approval after the "kinks" have been ironed out. Please email any concerns with this to Dr. Chappell and she will bring those forward to the group who is working on this.

Step one- the course will be proof of concept. A tentative course description needs to be provided and discuss where this fits in the program, and include some general information. The concept of this course should exist- there is not any duplicate issues. Once this has been submitted it goes to the chair for approval, then to the dean, then to the academic counsel. The concept of the course gets approved, then goes into the next process.

Step two- the TILT process. They are only available in this process as a support and as a reviewer in terms of support. Andrew Feldstein has developed three levels: basic review, CourseTunes, committee review.

Dr. Laura Wilson asked if this means that faculty needs to do CourseTunes now, not TILT? Dr. Chappell replied that you can if you know how to, or you can work with TILT.

The basic review would include an assigned instructional designer who would go over the course and provide feedback. This could include needing to work on something or feedback of it looks great, so this would move along to the next step. The second level of TILT, called TILT Consultation, a specific instructional designer would be assigned to you and work with them with whatever level of support is needed. There is a third level offered as well, a TILT certificate. They are developing a course development institute and with that comes a stipend funded through the Provost. You can have whatever level of support needed. After this, the course will go to either Graduate Council (800 or 900), or Academic Affairs (100-400), if it is a 600 level, it will go to University Curriculum Committee that will be made up of Graduate Curriculum members and Academic Affairs Curriculum members to work on the 600 levels together. That committee will look at the 600 & 600G courses together at the same time. If it is a Gen. Ed. course, then it has to be reviewed by the Gen. Ed. Committee as well. From there, once approved by the council, the course moves to the Assistant Provost who will have the course entered into Workday at that point.

Dr. Jerrie Brooks asked what is CourseTunes? Dr. Chappell responded saying that it is a software package that allows us to "map" like curriculum mapping, concept mapping, etc.. where you are mapping your course outcomes to your assignments. Essentially, you are assessing what you are teaching so your outcomes match your assignments and you can generate a report where you can see all the connections. Some people have their entire programs built into it and you can map courses to program outcomes as well. This will also help AFIS piece of the house where we have to map assessments.

This KACE ticketing system will eliminate a lot of the extra work on the committees, help expedite the process, and the faculty can have the support to do this, which is where TILT comes in. If the expectations to come out of this pilot work for courses, then the process for programs to be done will come next. This will provide the ability for collaboration, flexibility, record-keeping, tracking, a curriculum that will support the mission and strategic plan, recruitment and retention, quality syllabi that have aligned outcomes and assessment, efficient approval process that is going to have the appropriate workload. This will also give a more streamlined effective process for building curriculum in Workday, so the course won't be going into Workday until it is ready to go. Currently, if a course is put into Workday whether or not it was approved, it would show up in the university catalog. In this process they want to build a one-stop shop toolkit for everyone across the institution, whether working on a 100-level course or 900 level courses.

Dr. Laura Wilson has some questions regarding the rationale for going through Academic Council?

Dr. Chappel said that the idea being that if there is a question about a course, the department chair should be guiding their dean into what needs to be argued and supported within the Academic Council. The other piece to the Academic Council was to also look at the course as far as looking at the mission, strategic plan, does the course need to be in the program.

Dr. Laura Wilson asked why the classes need to be a dean's level decision.

Dr. Chappell said that this is just a concept at the moment, and they are in the process of determining if this is a feasible process and is this going to do what is needing to be done. This is not set in stone, and she will make note of the concerns.

Dr. Laura Wilson also had questions about TILT involvement. Will this include both on campus and online courses, every class that has ever been developed and do new faculty coming in taking over faculty that have left or retired have to go through this process?

Dr. Kim Chappell said that the only time TILT would be involved in this process is if it is a brand-new course getting approved.

Dr. Laura Wilson had some concern about the workload for TILT since this will involve working with on campus and online courses.

Dr. Chappell said that this same concern was brought up when she addressed Faculty Senate. All she knows is that this is what TILT suggested.

Dr. Laura Wilson asked another question asking if and when faculty would get paid for this and are faculty going to be paid for on campus and online course development?

Dr. Chappell said the only thing that comes with pay is if an instructor decides to go through TILT's certificate process.

Dr. Laura Wilson asked if this can be done every time an instructor develops a course? And who owns that content?

Dr. Chappell was unsure about if this can be done every time a course is developed, and stated that as far as she understood, all curriculum developed at FHSU is still property of FHSU.

Dr. Wilson said that this is only if you are paid for it. If you are doing this as an overload, they do not own it and that is why faculty began getting paid to develop courses, so the university made faculty sign a certificate saying that FHSU owns the course and content. This is like the Ken Neuhauser Rule- he would not let other people teach his courses because he owns that content knowledge. So now, if faculty develop a course and are not paid for it, they don't have to share it with their department and don't have to let others use it because those classes are tied to curriculum assessment.

Dr. David Fitzhugh mentioned that this would create issues with assessment though. Because if those courses are tied to curriculum assessment, and five sections of the class are offered, they have to all be doing the same thing because otherwise the assessment does not work.

Dr. Laura Wilson was concerned that this would take away academic freedom.

Dr. Fitzhugh did not agree. He said what the university will tell you is what you have to assess, and that how you teach the course is up to the instructor.

Dr. Chappell mentioned that a similar question was raised and asked what if another instructor picks up a course and they do not want to do the same assessment. This is fine, it is not that an instructor is tied to how the course was developed through the approval process, this is just the approval process. The idea being is that these outcomes for this course is what is intact. So that if an instructor wants to assess differently, that is fine as long as teaching and assessing the same outcome.

5

Dr. David Fitzhugh was just making the general comment that we have to make sure that we are assessing the same things with how the university has gone to the assessment of Gen. Ed. outcomes. Especially if you are using the course evaluation software to tie into programming. This is all tied into assessments to make sure that we are all doing the program assessment, which HLC is requiring. If you are teaching and developing a class and an instructor is not paid for it, but it is one of six classes that is tied to some type of assessment, you are going to have to do the same assessment.

Dr. Bremer stated that he was not aware of any courses at the Graduate level that assess the same thing in the same way as they do at the Gen. Ed. level.

Dr. David Fitzhugh stated that they are just now getting to the point where they are doing assessments at the Graduate level. His department just spent the summer to their core of the MS in HHP for PLOs, but they teach the same course three times and the on-campus adjuncts teaching the same course, they have to assess the same way or else the course assessment doesn't work. If two instructors are teaching the same course, one on campus and on online, they need to be doing the same assessment. Otherwise, they cannot collect the assessment data for that master's degree. So, it does apply at the Graduate level, it's just now that the assessment committee is realizing that Graduate level programs need to have assessments. We are just scratching the surface on how much this is going to start affecting curriculum and assessment as they go together. We are trying to separate and keep it apart, but it just doesn't work that way. It has got to be the big picture so you know what you are assessing, how it fits into your program, and it may be part of the issue with the first part of the approval process with the chair/dean is that you are going to have to justify as to why you need the course and what it's bringing. There is also a course duplication issue.

Dr. Bremer mentioned that this will be an ongoing, continuing conversation for a while as the meetings are still happening. The interface has not yet been built.

Dr. Chappell said yes, it is still being worked on from the back end and they are continuing to learn more along the way. Even though there have been great documents, there were still some things to recommend, but on a much smaller scale and can be done more quickly and efficiently. This will also be a more centralized way of data collection and assessments. If you are about to develop a new course, please feel free to reach out to Dr. Chappell and she can help guide you through the pilot process. If you have any suggestions for changes as well, please bring those to her as well. The idea behind this is to have quality courses and have TILT as a support mechanism.

Dr. Angie Howard had a comment to add to this, having gone through TILT and using CourseTunes to develop a new course recently. One of the pieces of that process that is a little tedious and laborious that should be considered or at least communicated well in

terms of level of detail needed is what level mapping is required in terms of each individual learning outcome for each module tying to specific then learning activities- so the lectures, the videos, whatever you are doing being tied to those specific learning outcomes. Also, each of those having to be tied to additional specific ways of assessing that. So, there should be some consideration and thoughtfulness in terms of what is the expectation for level of detail there and considering that that can be a little tedious to complete and doing cost/benefit analysis and determining what level detail is really required or necessary to meet the aims of what we are trying to do. Also, having some training to accompany CourseTunes would be helpful, in terms of how to navigate the system.

Old Business & Updates
1) Action Item: Reading and Review Graduate School Handbook
    a. Any new changes to bring forward for consideration?
        i. Working on Language for 800 level courses – Coming soon
    b. Changes
        i. GPA Calculations Cumulative vs. last 60 Hours
        ii. Assistantships
        iii. Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)
        iv. No graduation fee anymore
        v. Non-degree Qualifications
        vi. Last date to add a student – need to add to handbook; who can add a student; absolute last date to add a student.

Please note that at the end of the handbook, there is a section at the very end highlighted in blue. This is something that is still being worked on. Dr. Pool-Funai has some phone calls and emails in to KBOR and HLC to see some of this language and how it should work. We have gotten some answers, but not everything just yet. You can look at the section at the very end, but this most likely will change.

There was one question from AEP on page 13 under Program Planning Procedures "the student's graduate committee will consist of the advisor as chair, and two other faculty members as selected by the advisor". The comment from AEP was that not all departments do it this way and there aren't three person committees. Perhaps clarify and make this more specific to a thesis?

Dr. Bremer stated that his understanding was that there was always supposed to be three committee members, whether it's thesis or not thesis for every student.

Rhonda Weimer asked what is the purpose of a Graduate committee?

Dr. Bremer replied that is for comprehensive exams, and if a student is doing a thesis for a thesis defense. There should be a written and oral part to comprehensive exams, and it does not seem

that everyone is doing that. The old workflow and Lotus Notes required you to put the committee in- they had to be listed. Now, there is nowhere to list this, but there still should be a committee when doing this. The rules require a committee, but not to record it. We could create a document to upload with every comprehensive exam and all the committee members could be included on it.

Dr. Jerrie Brooks had some questions as to how to keep record of committee members if there is not a place to record them, but the rules require having a committee.

Dr. Laura Wilson added that if you want to hold committee members accountable, you can add their names to the comments when the advisor is entering into Workday whether the student passed/failed.

Dr. Bremer will check with Dr. Pool-Funai to see if there is a place where you can list names for committee members.

Dr. Bremer would like to plan to set approving the handbook to a vote in the February 2024 meeting. Please continue to have your departments and chairs look at it. As Dr. Bremer gets updates, he will go through and highlight them as they are added.

2) Continuing Review: Exit Survey
    a. See update on Blackboard.
    b. What 3 questions does your program want to ask?
        i. Questions received from:
            1. Psychology
            2. SLP

Dr. Bremer also received questions from Biology.

Rhonda Weimer added that Social Work is not submitting any because they have their own survey-as discussed in the last meeting.

Dr. Bremer is hoping to launch this survey in April, so he is hoping to get questions and have this approved by February or March.

Dr. Laura Wilson asked if this survey has been sent out before. Her concern is that this survey is long.

Dr. Bremer removed all of the advising questions and made a few changes that were suggested from the last meeting. The student's name question was left on the survey in case this needs to be linked later, but departments would never see the name- this would always be kept on the back end. Dr. Bremer is hoping to share the survey results every year automatically. This would be all of the survey plus each department's three questions.

Dr. Medhavi did ask about the consent question. That if the student did not consent to sharing the results, can the department receive a summary of the survey?

Dr. Laura Wilson added that if a student does not consent, this may change what she would advise her department to add, if there is a possibility that they do not see those answers then they will need to replicate some of those questions.

Dr. Bremer suggested removing that question. This is kept anonymous, so the department won't know who the student is, but they will still get all of the responses from it.

Rhonda asked if departments would receive their departmental information and an aggregate of all the graduate surveys.

Dr. Bremer said yes, the information would be broken out.

Dr. Kim Perez asked if their department has a separate survey, their department does not need to submit any questions?

Dr. Bremer stated that the survey would be sent out to all students and when they select their program and their program does not have any additional questions to add, the survey would end and say thank you. The department's specific questions do come at the end of the survey, so they won't affect the rest of the survey.

The majority of concerns regarding the survey was the length. The first part of the survey asking for demographic information does have to remain. However, questions such as ones asking like attitudes toward research, those questions can be removed or parts of those can be set out.

Rhonda asked about the demographic information, is this necessary. The university should already have this information.

Dr. Bremer said that they did need to keep the students' names in order to link the survey to the demographic information. But he will check with Dr. Pool-Funai if there is another way to link this information.

Dr. Laura Wilson said yes, but if you wanted to break down your answers to whether women are having different experiences than men in your program, you need that demographic data type specific questions.

3) HLC Update
Dr. Pool-Funai was unable to attend this meeting but sent information for Dr. Bremer to share. She said that the feedback that they received as the reviewers were leaving was extremely positive, and there would be some follow-up coming from HLC soon.

4) Other items for the good of the group?

Dr. Kim Perez mentioned that Dr. Pool-Funai had talked about putting on the agenda to discuss the timeline for the completion of the accelerated MA program. There is a requirement where they must be done within a year, but they have students teaching.

Dr. Bremer stated that there is working in that accelerated part that says that students must complete their degree within a year after they start and move into the full Graduate category.

Dr. Perez mentioned that they have students that go part time, they'll have students that go teach but then come back to get their master's because that will bump them up in pay a little. So, they have a lot of situations where students won't finish within a year.

Dr. Brent Goertzen wanted some clarification on this- is this after they have completed their undergraduate degree? He is familiar with the language stating that once admitted to an accelerated program, students have one year to complete the accelerated classes. The other part is confusing.

Dr. Bremer stated that on page 36 of the handbook, it only says "complete the degree requirements within the timeline set by the Graduate School and the degree-granting program". So, it sounds like your program gets to decide that. The policy from Geosciences was adopted by the English department based loosely on what they had given them.

Coming Up

1) Next G.C. Meeting – December 13th, 3:00 PM; Memorial Union 226 - Pioneer Room OR via Zoom: https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/91736338856

2) Graduation is on the 15th of December.
   a) The Graduate School Flag Bearers
      i) Dr. Todd Moore (8:30 AM Ceremony)
      ii) Dr. Elodie Jones (11:00 AM Ceremony)

Important Deadlines

Application for Program Completion (APC)
　　　Final Date to Sign Up　　　　　　　　　　　　　10/13/23

Comprehensive Exams
　　　Final Date to Sign Up　　　　　　　　　　　　　10/02/23
　　　Exam Results Due (Written and/or Oral)　　　12/18/23

Master's Theses and Ed.S. Field Studies
　　　Final Copy Due　　　　　　　　　　　　　　11/24/23
　　　Oral Examination Report over Theses or Field Studies　　11/24/23