

	<b>Graduate Council</b>	
	<b>Date</b>	Wednesday, April 12, 2023
	<b>Time</b>	3:00 PM – 4:30 PM
	<b>Place</b>	Memorial Union Trails Room & Zoom: <a href="https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/91736338856">https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/91736338856</a>

**Roll Call**

Dr. Keith Bremer, Dr. Angela Pool-Funai, Dr. Kim Chappell, Angela Walters, Dr. Carrie Tholstrup, Dr. Jerrie Brooks, Dr. Janelle Harding, Dr. David Fitzhugh, Blake Roth (for Dr. Karmen Porter), Dr. Brian Weber, Dr. Kim Perez, Dr. Janette Naylor-Tincknell, Dr. Angie Howard, Dr. Jian Sun, Dr. Valerie Yu, Dr. Gary Anderson, Dr. Yuxiang Du, Misty Koonse, Caylan Harris, Les Mackey

**Standing Items**

1) Strategic goals for the Graduate School

a) Marketing/recruitment ([Goal 3: Strategic Growth](#))

i) Les – Recruitment Update

Have total of 7 accelerated programs at the moment, not including those in the works. If you have questions on submitting documents for accelerated programs, please email Dr. Bremer. This is definitely a good strategy for retention of our current undergraduate students.

Marketing- we have reached out to departments and a few still have not responded (Art & Design, Chemistry, HHP, History, Management, Social Work and Teacher Education). Les has been emailing since December, anyone who was listed as the department graduate coordinator and the chair. Les will follow up.

Dr. Jerrie Brooks- Teacher Ed. may be interested in an accelerated program, but are waiting to get through accreditation first.

b) External funding ([Goal 4: Resources & Infrastructure](#))

i) OSSP report

FY23

28 submissions totaling \$8.7 million

23 awards totaling \$3.5 million

FY22 this time last year

33 submissions totaling \$7.1 million

23 awards totaling \$4.4 million

Misty has 12 on her list that she’s working on, with 10 of them being due this fiscal year.

## **New Business**

- 1) Action Items: Curriculum Committee
  - a) Action items: Courses and Programs for GC approval
    - i) Program Approvals:
      - 1) MS High-Incidence Special Education  
**(Program was approved)**

Dr. Kim Chappell- this should be MS Low-Incidence

- ii) Course Approvals:
  - 1) SPED 808 Assessment in Low Incidence Special Education  
**(Courses were approved)**

The Curriculum Committee sent these back for a few revisions, the author sent them back in with the changes, and they are ready for approval.

Dr. Chappell asked for a motion for approval

Dr. David Fitzhugh moved to approve

Dr. Jian Sun 2<sup>nd</sup>

Dr. Jerrie Brooks abstained, no opposition

- iii) Tabled course needing a vote:
  - 1) CSCI 601G Advanced Programming  
The Curriculum Committee will discuss this course again and will bring this to Graduate Council in May for a vote.

- 2) Action Item: Graduate Advising Survey Instrument
  - a) See Document in Blackboard
  - b) Should we approve or do we need changes?

This was brought forth through Faculty Senate and they are asking for input.

Dr. Kim Chappell had an issue with #4 “My graduate advisor discusses with me how my program of study enhances my current or future job/career goals”. She has an issue with this because of the large load of advisees and does not have the time to discuss with each and every student to discuss their career plans. She would instead like for it to say “my advisor provides me with information about how my program of study gives us opportunity to share information in larger settings” (i.e. she has a website dedicated to advising with information).

Dr. Kim Perez asked if the whole question could be removed. The students in her department come in with very specific career goals and that is why they are getting a Masters and they know what they are doing and don't need convincing they can go other career paths.

Dr. Janette Naylor-Tincknell agreed as her department is the same. They know that they will be either clinical or school psychologists. There are very clear, state-board regulated classes that they must take, with maybe 2 electives to choose from. Their career goal does not need to be discussed because they are already working on those goals.

Dr. Bremer said this is also supposed to incorporate the graduate professional advisors (3 in AEP, 1 in MBA) that may be a question that is hard for them to answer for some of those programs.

Dr. Kim Chappell moved to remove #4 from Advising Evaluation Instrument  
Dr. Kim Perez 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion  
No opposition/no abstention

Dr. Valerie Yu agreed with the motion, particularly the DNP, as there is not any counseling to students as they already know what their career goal is by completing this program.

Dr. Angie Howard discussed that sometimes there is a piece of career advising and mentoring in terms of going out and finding a career, but in terms of program of study she agrees with what has been shared by the group. If we keep this, it needs to be broadened as an and/or situation, as she can see the concerns with how it is stated for many faculty.

Dr. Bremer continued the motion

No opposition/no abstention

Motion passed

Dr. Angela Pool-Funai said that this motion/recommendation will be taken back to Faculty Senate. Part of the frustration is that at the end of the day, Graduate Council does not have the control stop this survey from being approved by Faculty Senate. However, we hope that in the spirit of collegiality they will respect the decision of Graduate Council. She also appreciated Dr. Rob Byer recognizing the input of this body and pausing this until Graduate Council reviewed it.

Dr. Janette Naylor-Tincknell discussed that advising should be used as a metric of evaluation, but it could become a problem if this is used to “ding” a particular faculty member in disparate to other faculty members. This could become a problem down the road as other pieces shift and change.

Dr. Gary Anderson wants to look at it from the other side as well, even though he voted for the motion. He stated there has been a lot of pressure from universities and colleges to make their students employable. He can see that there might be pushback on this in that we do need to be held accountable for Graduate programs leading to legitimate work and for promoting the life of

the student. The way this was worded, it did not work. However, he wanted to go on record stating that he does see the other side of this.

Dr. Bremer said that these comments would be taken back to Faculty Senate first thing tomorrow (4-13-23).

3) Action Item: Accelerated Program Document

a) See Attachment 1

b) Issue with highlighted part: How should we interpret this?

“Accelerated degree programs are only offered through departments that offer a bachelor's and master's degree in field”. The reason this came up, is as we are pitching accelerated programs, sometimes there are programs that offer a bachelor's degree and a master's, but they do not require a student to have a bachelor's degree in that program to get a master's degree.

Dr. Bremer is interpreting it as, in order to have an accelerated program, you have to have an undergraduate program and a master's program. Dr. Goertzen was interpreting this as it has to be in the same department, the student can't come from outside the department, which limits this tremendously.

Dr. Angela Pool-Funai would like to incorporate this into the Graduate School handbook once approved.

Dr. Jerrie Brooks had questions about the tuition part of it in regards to tuition assistance. Dr. Pool-Funai asked if it was the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of once a student becomes a graduate student, financial aid is not available for undergraduate courses. This is stating that once a student is classified as a Graduate student taking Graduate courses, they no longer qualify for a Pell Grant.

Dr. David Fitzhugh asked for clarification on the accelerated program as 3+2 program or 4+1. Dr. Bremer stated they were originally termed 4+1.

Dr. Fitzhugh asked why are these programs not considered a program unto themselves and uniquely categorized as a program? When he was doing his Athletic Training masters program, they were going to do an accelerated program (3+2), where the students would have had to complete a bachelor's of science degree in HHP to do that within the sport and exercise science concentration, which would have then lead to the first 3 years, then they would have tied in some other things within the 2 year athletic training program to complete that degree. But that would have technically been a program unto itself. That doesn't mean that they wouldn't have accepted that had bachelor's degrees in other areas as long as they met the pre-requisites. He thinks that we may get into a lot of issues if we are not careful because some of the bachelor's degrees don't align with other programs. They aren't getting a bachelor's degree in Athletic Training, they were getting a Masters in Athletic Training, and technically most schools don't care what students

have a bachelor's degree in when they go into a master's program, just as long as the program pre-requisites are met. A lot of the pre- healthcare fields are like that.

Dr. Angela Pool-Funai said that the difference is that it is just 9 credit hours – not a stand alone program, it is just a chance to take Graduate level courses as an undergraduate.

Are we talking about a true accelerated program where they are tied together, versus just being able to take 9 hours while still an undergraduate. Dr. Bremer said that the students apply to a Masters program before they start, so those 9 hours can only apply to the master's program. Dr. Janette Naylor-Tincknell read this as a department can't offer an accelerated program if they don't have either a bachelor's program or a master's program. Not who gets in and what degree they have to have. If they only have 1, they don't qualify.

Dr. Bremer- This particular department wants to reach out and recruit business students because there is a lot of overlap in the masters degree and what students would want to do in the future.

Dr. Naylor-Tincknell asked if this department offers a bachelor's degree? Dr. Bremer- Yes  
Does this department offer a master's degree? Dr. Bremer- Yes  
Then, how do they not meet the requirements? Does it matter where they are recruiting?

Dr. Bremer doesn't think so, but Dr. Goertzen was concerned that is what this meant.  
Dr. Bremer wants to make sure that doesn't matter but didn't want to misinterpret the document.

Dr. Jerrie Brooks said that Teacher Ed. is discussing this with and AEP, because KBOR is reducing the number of credits that are required. So those extra hours (9 hrs) they could take and apply for the Master's program and get 9 hours on their master's while completing their undergraduate degree.

Dr. Kim Chappell said that the way this reads is "department" and that is crossing departments. Dr. Carrie Tholstrup mentions that this causes a problem for AEP because their dept. only offers masters programs, not bachelors. And Teacher Ed., the program- the degree they get- is an initial teacher's license, so there is no point in continuing that because they already finished step one, so the students need a bridge into the next step, which is what AEP offers. So in order to make this beneficial to everyone, there would need to be language that would allow collaboration at least within a college. Dr. Chappell added that AEP is grad and Teacher Ed. is undergrad, but they do have 1 graduate program, but it is an initial licensure program, so it wouldn't help students.

Dr. Angela Pool-Funai asked if maybe an edit could be "offered through departments, who offer a masters degree in the field and not necessarily a bachelors degree".

Dr. Chappell said that would be helpful for AEP, because then they could offer some accelerated programs.

Dr. Jerrie Brooks asked if undergrad students can already take graduate courses if they are an FHSU student? Dr. Pool-Funai said they can, but it wouldn't apply toward their undergraduate degree. The way we have handled this to date has been that the credit for the course goes toward the graduate program once they are matriculated as a graduate student. The undergraduate credit is actually awarded as CPL, which is a conversation for another time.

Dr. Angie Howard added that maybe the better qualified would be that accelerated degree programs are established through departments and that departments set their own standards regarding admission requirements. It doesn't seem that anyone is opposed to being more flexible in terms of cross-departmental work and this would only benefit people. Maybe a qualifier could be added that not all programs offer accelerated programs and it is up to the department discretion to set those standards for admittance.

Dr. Bremer shared that there is a case though in each department is different at the undergraduate level. For example, if we were to look at 2 departments, Biology and Geosciences, Biology only has 3 or 4 electives that they allow their students to take, the rest are already scripted for them to take, so those 9 hours wouldn't work to allow those students to come into Geosciences. They could only take 3 hours. So, if they are recruiting like that, they have to realize that even though they can have 9 hours, if they are going to complete their Biology degree, Biology doesn't have to agree to accept those advanced courses. That is the only other concern that he can see with this.

Dr. Kim Chappell asked, if from a Workday standpoint would that be a separate process? Dr. Angela Pool-Funai & Dr. Bremer answered that we are treating it through cohorts, and is essentially a special program of study.

Dr. Chappell said So there is already a process in place, if we update the language a little bit, that opens up the opportunity for departments.

Dr. Pool-Funai suggested that it makes sense to leave a sentence like "only departments that offer masters degrees" .

Dr. Carrie Tholstrup's concern is that the program is initiated on the Teacher Ed. side, then it moves into the graduate program with AEP. What if a department doesn't have a master's program. She is concerned about getting too limited.

Dr. Pool-Funai said that her interpretation is the opposite, that the accelerated program would actually be AEP's program, which the graduate credit going towards AEP, and then Teacher Ed. would have to agree to take the CPL credit, but the entity proposing the accelerated program would be AEP.

Dr. Brooks said that they have even talked about who advised- at what point do the advisors switch over. Dr. Bremer said that each department is different and there are still some of those issues being discussed and worked out.

Dr. Pool-Funai asked to add this to the agenda in May to add the updated accelerated program to the Graduate School handbook. Dr. Angie Howard pointed out to make sure that what is updated above, needs to be updated below as well.

Dr. David Fitzhugh wanted to also make sure that we don't stifle opportunities for different departments to actually form these relationships, especially with the gen. eds. changing. There is going to be more opportunities, especially cross-discipline opportunities, for the benefit of our students. So the language is going to be very important to still allow that, but to have checks and balances.

Dr. Bremer will update this and bring it back to the meeting in May.

- 4) Action Item: Final Title Due in the Graduate School
  - a) We would like to do away with this requirement.
  - b) All checks will be done on final thesis/field studies.

Right now, if a graduate student is writing a thesis the 1<sup>st</sup> part of the thesis (title page up through the 1<sup>st</sup> page of the 1<sup>st</sup> chapter) is due at the beginning of April. We use this to essentially to check formatting and once the formatting is approved or changes are requested and made, then the thesis is finished and sent to the Graduate School for review.

We would like to get rid of this first check and just do the review at the end. This will be easier for the students and one less thing for them to worry about. Sometimes, students will submit those first few pages and not graduate for a few years. If we do this review all at once, it will be easier. Any opposition?

Dr. Kim Chappell moved to remove this first check of thesis.

Angela Walters 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion

No opposition

Motion passed

Dr. Angela Pool-Funai also asked to remind students to make sure that she sees the thesis before bringing the form for her to sign. Students should not bring the signature page until she has read the thesis.

### **Old Business & Updates**

- 1) Action Item: 600 and 600G Courses

- a) Clarifying policy 600G/600 level courses.
- b) New wording to add to current policy (highlighted in yellow):

The program of a graduate student will consist of no less than 30 semester hours of graduate credit. Please note that some programs require more than 30 semester hours. If the advisor and the departmental graduate committee determine that the student needs more than the minimum number of hours in order to complete the requirements for the degree, the student's program will be adjusted accordingly. *Under no circumstances can a course be used on more than one program of study.* If the student is working on an additional masters or an advanced degree and courses required for the second degree were also required for the previous degree, the advisor must notify the Graduate School of substitutions for those courses. CPL is not accepted as a substitution for the courses for the second degree. This includes equivalent courses such as the 600/600G courses. If a student took the 600 (undergraduate) version of a course, regardless of the grade or credit earned, the student cannot enroll in the 600G (graduate) version of the course for credit towards a graduate degree. In instances where variable title courses are part of a student's graduate program of study (i.e. courses assigned the same course number but cover various, distinct special topics) each distinct special topic course may count as credit toward one graduate degree. (Grad School Handbook)

Dr. Janette Naylor-Tincknell moved to accept these changes.  
Dr. Gary Anderson 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion

Dr. Kim Chappell added a point of discussion. What if a student failed a 600 undergraduate course, managed to get into a graduate program, and then needed to take the same course, but as a 600G course, the way we have it written is that no matter what the grade is this can't be counted.

Dr. Pool-Funai said that the work around that some shared would be that an independent studies type of course that would be assigned to override and allow the student to take the material, but earn the credit a different course number or substitution if there is a class close enough to it.

No opposition  
Motion passed

Dr. Pool-Funai also wanted to note that if your programs has variable topic courses that are offered regularly, please route them as a stand-alone course so that they can get through the curriculum process and set them up as their own course. Because there are times where



repeatable courses make a lot of sense, but in the rare instance where a student is unsuccessful in a course and they earn a D or U and then take a course by the same number, that D or U does not get taken away, it just gets averaged out, so there is no replacing a poor grade in a repeatable course. There are a lot of times where it makes sense to have repeatable courses, but especially if it is a variable topics course that will be offered regularly, please go through the process and get it set up.

Dr. Kim Chappell asked for a point of clarification- if the course has been offered in the past is there any different process for a course that has been offered for several years as a problems class with a variable title or does it need to go through a full review cycle?

Dr. Pool-Funai said that if it is a problems class and the department wants to offer it as a class with it's own course title, it needs to go through the process. What has been done systematically is when there is a repeatable course that is the same course and the course subject is not changing, it is able to be set up without going through the curriculum process (Ex. Studio 1, Studio 2, Studio 3). But if the course itself is earning a title and had been a variable title course in the past, it does need to go through the process.

Dr. Bremer mentioned that that in his understanding, a department is only allowed to offer a variable courses two or three times before they are supposed to go through the approval process. In theory- there is no trigger in Workday to stop this.

Dr. Pool-Funai said that as we move forward with our catalog and start implementing it, hopefully as soon as the spring, we will be updating academic program templates and scouring through all of the programs of study again. This is a perfect time to be looking at this sort of thing and make changes as necessary.

- 2) Exit Survey
  - a) University of Washington Example
  - b) Only feedback received was from Psychology and Social Work
  - c) Please look over and mark what you like and don't like. We need to create a document that works for all, so I need everyone's input.

Please email Dr. Bremer any feedback- in the March meeting folder in Blackboard. This will carry over into next year, but can go ahead and get started on it.

- 3) Update: HLC Reaccreditation Process

Dr. Pool-Funai updated that the exit survey is a perfect segway into this as we, as a university, are held accountable to HLC for tracking our alumni and to know how successful our students are. Historically we have relied on the first destination survey that Career Services has used, but

being more deliberate in trying to capture that information ourselves is only going to speak positively for us with HLC.

We are on track for the assurance argument due in September. Site visit is still scheduled for the end of October. She is planning on having a full draft of the narrative before commencement. She finally got access to the portal for HLC to put in evidence files and will work on collecting the documents during the summer. One caveat is as we go through the affiliation agreement with the two tech schools, this could adjust our accreditation cycle, but all of that is yet to be seen, because the change of control application triggers it's own set of site visits. It's a matter of HLC deciding what timeline, and it is a matter of when we, the collective three schools, submit that application. Please be on the look out this summer and fall for announcements for a serious focus group-style sessions to build hype and momentum and enthusiasm about the site visit. She wants to switch that narrative and celebrate and give stories, examples and accolades so that when the site visit team is here, we can have a meaningful interaction with them.

Other items for the good of the group?

Dr. Bremer brought up the membership renewal for Graduate Council for next year. The members whose term is up this year include: Dr. Karmen Porter, Dr. Eric Gillock, Dr. Tom Schaffer, Dr. Brian Weber, Dr. Brent Goertzen, Dr. Janette Naylor-Tincknell (replacing Dr. Dharma Jairam), Dr. Perry Harrison, Dr. Kim Chappell. He will send an email to these department chairs to let them know. Please let your department chair know if you would like to renew or if they need to find a new member.

Angela Walters asked to bring up the academic advisor topic as a representative of Graduate Council on the Academic Advising Committee. Her subcommittee on Academic Advising has been working on the faculty mentoring model for FHSU. There is a draft going around and she asked for input from Graduate Council. As it stands now, this is a voluntary program through Blackboard so faculty can raise their hand and say that they want to volunteer to be a faculty mentor, students can raise their hand and say they are ready to be mentored, and faculty can gather resources in Blackboard organization or course shell, Professional Advisors are added to the shell so they are part of the communication. She heard back from Dr. Arensdorf, and putting an asterisk was suggested. Dr. Janette Naylor Tincknell added that there are two problems. Currently, advising is part of the teaching responsibilities for faculty in their MOA. It is wrapped up in expected duties. There was a question as to whether or not the MOA stated "may" advise or "must" advise. Dr. Naylor-Tincknell said she would need to check on that. Part of the problem is that if some faculty do mentor and some don't, that may come out in merit standards or department criteria for tenure and promotion that might need to be adjusted. Some departments are using activities such as Tiger Days or Grad Fest as "mentoring" and as long as faculty is doing something under those mentoring activities, it would count towards this. Making it voluntary, can become "sticky" for some departments in their ASRs, merit standards, and tenure/promotion folders. The other thing in the document that is throwing people off is that

advising is written as a service, and in the MOA this is under teaching. In order to make those changes to move mentoring to service, it has to be negotiated through AAUP.

Angela Walters asked- Is advising and mentoring the same thing? Dr. Naylor-Tincknell said that when they discuss this at the negotiation's table, administration's stance had been that the current language in the MOA is flexible enough to count mentoring in the same vein as advising because it does have the word "mentoring" in there. Angela Walters asked- So to clarify the "stickiness" what is the best step to move forward? Dr. Naylor Tincknell said that at this point, putting an asterisk on the flow chart would be the best and that any changes need to be negotiated through the MOA negotiations process, which does not open until 2025. We are in the first year of a 3-year cycle.

Angela Walters asked if this puts a halt on this then? Dr. Naylor-Tincknell said not as far as how the Blackboard shell/organization is done, as long as it is not moved to service. Angela Walters said that when the subcommittee met with department chairs, they were interested in this and want to use this as negotiable that if some faculty wanted to do this as part of their service and some faculty as part of their teaching, they would have that flexibility. Dr. Naylor-Tincknell stated that flexibility is not in the MOA.

Dr. Bremer asked is there no way to amend this, like no special re-negotiation before the three years? Dr. Naylor-Tincknell said that at the end of each negotiation cycle, there is a clause in the MOA that says items can be negotiated if determined... there is a continuance clause. At the earliest, it would be next spring. But both sides would need to agree to add that to the agenda/docket. The other thing is that KBOR has to agree for us to talk about it. Even if both sides agree to talk about this, KBOR can decide whether or not that this issue would be discussed.

Angela Walters asked if the only way it could be moved forward is if it stays in teaching and all faculty have to do this? Dr. Naylor-Tincknell said she would have to pull up the MOA and look at the language. When this discussion has come up in the past where mentoring falls and who has to or doesn't have to, administration's that the language in the MOA is vague enough to cover mentoring. The problem that is you are separating advising and mentoring, what do you do with advising? And there is only a handful of graduate advisors. By moving advising, this would create a domino effect of some other problems. Angela Walters said that it interesting because at the undergraduate level, this was intentionally separated so that we have professional advisors with the intent that the graduate level could model this. But, graduate programs are a different nature. At the undergraduate level, we have professional advisors, but faculty members at the graduate level are advising still. Dr. Naylor-Tincknell added that by pulling the advising out, you would be moving it to some faculty for service and some for teaching, which creates a problem, unless done consistently, which then needs to be negotiated through the MOA, which reads "must".

Angela- asked if the language does include “may” is used in the MOA, does this give the flexibility? Dr. Naylor-Tincknell said no, not to pull them apart. To make it voluntary, yes. But to move to service, no. Moving it will create a snowball effect.

Angela Walters added the intent behind it was a program, very much like our assessment activities here at the university, is evaluated at the program level, not at the faculty level. So the assessment and evaluation that would occur would be your program’s faculty mentoring. How well did the program service students, not how well a particular faculty member serviced students. Some faculty love to mentor, some faculty love to research, so why have one faculty member doing it all? Why not play on faculty’s strengths and putting the faculty who really want to make a connection with students in front of students, and those who really want to research do the research. Because both of those are incredibly valuable to the university, why have one faculty member try to do everything?

Dr. Naylor-Tincknell asked, what happens what a program is tied to one faculty member? What if only one person does that program? If a student is evaluating the program, they are technically evaluating the faculty member. The problem would come in with disparate work and there are some faculty who carry additional things and are not being compensated equally. If a faculty member has to teach 12 hours, but another faculty member teaches 12 hours and an additional load in their teaching because they volunteered, this creates disparate work. This could also be a larger federal labor-relation board problem because that faculty member is being evaluated under a contract that applies differently to them than another faculty member.

Dr. Bremer asked if there were any more events planned on campus to further discuss this issue. Angela Walters said that the subcommittee has talked to all of the department chairs on campus and have provided their input. The model/draft that is currently seen now is based on all of their feedback and input. She would advise further discussion with your department chair.

## Coming Up

- 1) GradFest, April 26<sup>th</sup>. The Graduate School will have a booth in the Union Bringing it back since prior to the pandemic. We will be using this as a recruiting event.
- 2) Next G.C. Meeting – May 10<sup>th</sup>, 3:00 PM Zoom: <https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/91736338856>

## **Important Deadlines**

Application for Program Completion (APC): 4/15/23

### Comprehensive Exams

Final Date to Sign Up: 2/27/23

Exam Results Due (written and/or oral): 5/12/23

Master's Theses/Specialists' Field Studies

Final Title Due in the Graduate School:  
Final Copy Due in the Graduate School:

4/03/23  
4/24/23

**Attachment 1**

# **Accelerated Bachelors to Master's Degree Program Guidelines**

**Prepared and submitted by**

**The Graduate School on February 19, 2020**

**Approved by**

**Graduate Council on March 11, 2020**

The development and submission of this proposal is to formalize the policies and procedures associated with the Accelerated Bachelors to Master's degree programs. This document has been reviewed and edited by the Interim Dean of the Graduate School,

Graduate School Staff, Registrar, Undergraduate Degree Analysts and the currently operating Accelerated Degree Programs.

### **Accelerated Degree Program Guidelines**

Fort Hays State University's Accelerated Degree programs (Bachelor's to Master's) are designed by academic units to provide selected FHSU high-achieving undergraduates the opportunity to link advanced undergraduate coursework with graduate coursework for degree completion. These programs afford the student the opportunity for a head start on the Master's degree, by completing 9 graduate hours, while completing the Bachelor's degree. Accelerated degree programs are only offered through departments that offer a bachelor's and master's degree in field.

### **Proposal Submission Procedures**

Accelerated degree program proposals must be submitted to Graduate School and Graduate Council for approval. Programs proposals may be submitted by departments that offer a bachelor's and master's in the same program. The program development form must include the following:

- A program description
- Admissions requirements (if higher than requirements set by Graduate School).
- Degree requirements for undergraduate program, graduate program and shared hours.
- A sample plan of study for both the undergraduate and graduate portions of the program.
- Specify how the accelerated program will provide academic advising. The academic unit must clearly outline satisfactory academic progress guidelines, including specific timelines, as well as the consequences of not meeting these requirements

### **Admission Standards**

- Students must have a minimum of an overall undergraduate GPA of as stipulated by specific degree program requirements.
- Students are invited by a department to apply for admission to an accelerated master's option during their second semester of their junior year or after 75 credit hours. In order to apply, students must:
  1. Apply to Graduate School and be accepted to an approved accelerated program.

- a. See specific program requirements for application material.
- Students must meet all admission criteria established by the academic unit and the Graduate Program within the unit, except the completion of the baccalaureate degree.
- The admission standards for the accelerated degree must be consistent with the admissions criteria of Graduate School and the academic unit for the Master's degree. A written statement detailing the satisfactory academic progress requirements to remain in the accelerated degree program must appear in all recruiting, admission materials and website provided by the academic unit.
- The academic unit must designate a faculty member responsible for coordinating the admissions process.
- Students will be eligible to start the accelerated program after completing 90 (senior status) credit hours of coursework towards their undergraduate degree program. Students accepted into the accelerated program will be admitted to the graduate program, pending successful completion of all of the coursework for their undergraduate degree, and earned grades of B or better in all accelerated courses.

### Monitoring Student Status

- Upon acceptance into the program, advisors must submit an update for the degree summary to the student's degree analyst in the Registrar's Office and a graduate program of study to the student's degree analyst in the Graduate Office. This plan must identify the 9 graduate hours the student will be using to satisfy 9 hours of upper division undergraduate credit.
- Students in accelerated programs are not permitted to take all 9 graduate hours in one semester, to avoid the student being a full time graduate student while still being classified as an undergraduate.
- A student will be considered an undergraduate until all undergraduate degree requirements have been completed, at which time the Master's degree program will be activated. Undergraduate students enrolled in the accelerated programs will be eligible to enroll in approved graduate level courses and seminars. However, **they will not be eligible for most graduate services including teaching and research assistantships, financial aid, or graduate award programs until the undergraduate degree is completed.**
- Undergraduate students who have been accepted to an accelerated degree program prior to the awarding of their undergraduate degree must complete all of their bachelor's degree requirements and graduate within 12 months of the first day of the semester for which they were admitted to the accelerated program.
- Undergraduate students may not use graduate level courses taken before they have been accepted in the accelerated master's program (i.e., students cannot retroactively become part of the accelerated degree). A degree plan must clearly identify the graduate course of study and identify the 9 shared hours.

## Degree Requirements

- Students in the accelerated degree program must meet all degree requirements of the Bachelor's and Master's programs.
- When a thesis is required for the Master's degree, undergraduate research projects/work may not be substituted for the master's thesis.
- Accelerated programs may use a maximum of 9 graduate credits to be shared between the Bachelor's and Master's program. All 9 shared hours must be taken at the 600 and/or 800 level and have prior approval prior to enrollment.
- Only 600/800 level approved courses (9 shared hours) in which the student receives a B or better will be transferred to the graduate program. These courses must be approved by advisor, Department Chair and Dean of the Graduate School.
- Transcripts – The transcript will show all completed coursework for Accelerated Degree students. Graduate courses taken as an undergraduate will be posted as Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) prior to the undergraduate degree being awarded. Courses will be recorded with the grade "CR". These courses do not count in GPA calculations, which may result in the cumulative GPA being calculated on a minimum of 111 hours. Graduate courses taken as a part of the accelerated program must post to the Graduate Transcript during the semester in which they are taken and paid for. With the exception of those courses posted as CPL, all courses shown on the undergraduate transcript will be used for degree completion and to calculate the undergraduate GPA. Graduate GPA will be calculated using only the graduate courses.
- The 9 graduate accelerated program hours taken as an undergraduate, may be used to meet the 120 hour degree requirement for the Bachelor's degree. These hours will be posted as UG CPL, at no cost to the student, so that they can be directly applied to the UG degree as CR. This will ensure that participants don't gain an UG degree with less than 120 transcript hours.

## Continuing and Graduation Requirements

- Maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher (in both undergraduate and graduate programs)
- Earn a grade of B (3.0) or higher on all double-counted, graduate level (600/800 level) courses.
- Complete the degree requirements within time limits set by the Graduate School and the degree-granting program.
- If a student does not meet the above the standards, they will be removed from the accelerated degree program by the Graduate School. The department will notify the Graduate school that the student is no longer in the advanced program. Once a student is



removed from the program, they may not return to that program and cannot not reapply to the accelerated program again. If the student wishes to continue in the graduate program, they must reapply for the degree program through the Graduate School.

### Program Monitoring

- The academic unit should outline a plan for monitoring the program's success after three years.
- For official university reporting purposes, students will be considered as undergraduates until the Bachelor's degree is awarded.

### Leaving the Accelerated Degree Program

- Students admitted to the Accelerated Degree program, who voluntarily decide not to pursue a graduate degree, or who are not admitted to the graduate program, may change majors back to a regular undergraduate program at any time. If an Accelerated Degree student chooses not to pursue a graduate degree, the student should notify the administering department in writing; this notification should include the specific undergraduate major that the student intends to pursue. At that time, the department will notify the Graduate School that the student is no longer part of the accelerated degree program. Once a student withdraws from the accelerated program, they may not return to that program and cannot not reapply to any accelerated program offered by FHSU.

### Tuition and Financial Aid

- Graduate tuition and fee rates apply to the 9 hours approved for the program of study.
- Undergraduate students may receive federal financial aid (through the Financial Aid Office) for both undergraduate and graduate courses.
- However, once a student becomes a graduate student, financial aid is not available for undergraduate courses. In addition, financial aid as a graduate student is not available until an undergraduate degree has been conferred. This is why it is important for Accelerated Degree students to complete all undergraduate degree requirements and apply for an undergraduate degree during the first four years. Students are strongly encouraged to contact the financial aid office to discuss financial aid options during the fourth and fifth years.