Date: October 19, 2006
Time: 2:30–4:30 p.m.
Place: MSR 130C

Attending: Kurt Baker, Randy Brown, Bret Carroll, Claudia Cortes, Diana Demetrulias, Chuck Floyd (for Margaret Tynan), David Lindsay, Mira Mayer, Peter Nelligan, Arnold Schmidt, Kenneth Schoenly (for Pamela Roe), Ramón Vega de Jesús, Shawna Young

Excused: Dennis Sayers, Andrew Wagner

Ex-Officio: Carl Bengston, Carl Brown

Guests: John Borba, Steven Graham, Ken Potts, Roger Pugh

Peter Nelligan called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

I. Approval of Agenda. A motion was made by David Lindsay to approve the agenda with the following revision:

- Change item IV B, Progress Report on Development of Ed.D. program, from a discussion item to an information item.

The motion was seconded by Randy Brown. The motion carried.

II. Approval of September 21, 2006 Minutes. A motion was made by Bret Carroll to approve the September 21, 2006 minutes with the following revision:

- On page 3, change all references to “MA in Education, Physical Education” to “MA in Education with a concentration in Physical Education.”

The motion was seconded by Shawna Young. The motion carried.

III. Action. There were no action items.

IV. Discussion

A. Progress Report on Development of Ed.D. program (Borba—time certain 2:45 p.m.). John Borba distributed a handout on the planned timeline of the Ed.D. program development. The committee overseeing the program development process has been meeting twice weekly to develop a comprehensive program document, which includes a detailed five-year budget. The committee is also developing syllabi for twenty-three new courses. The planned timeline is as follows: submit the program document to the Curriculum Committee by October 23, 2006, and the syllabi by October 30. Move the documents through the College of Education’s governance committees in November with the goal of submitting them to the College Dean the week of December 11, 2006. The program document and syllabi will also be sent via email to the members of FBAC, UEPC, and Graduate Council before December 18, 2006.
A number of specific issues were addressed, including impact on university resources, coordinating efforts with the other CSUs also developing Ed.D. programs, and faculty workload. All these issues are addressed in detail in the program document. Graduate Council-approved policies may need modification to address doctoral programs (as opposed to the master’s programs for which they were originally written). Peter Nelligan and Diana Demetrulias will work together to determine if documents and policies need modification and report back to the Council.

B. 7005 Continuous Enrollment (Graham)—Attachment #0607-4. The issue of the continuous enrollment policy, and most specifically how it applies to students taking comprehensive exams to fulfill the culminating experience requirement, was addressed. After much discussion, the Council agreed upon the following:

- The continuous enrollment policy as stated in the catalog ("Once all coursework is completed it is expected that students will maintain continuous enrollment in 7005 Continuing Thesis or Project until all degree requirements have been met.") shall apply only to thesis/project students, and not to students taking comprehensive exams.
- Thesis/project students shall continue to be required to register for 7005 in all four instructional terms: winter, spring, summer, and fall.
- All students, including those taking comprehensive exams, shall use 7005 to satisfy the requirement that a student must "be enrolled in graduate course work in order to apply for graduation."
- If a student applies for graduation and is found not to have complied with the continuous enrollment policy, the student shall be back-charged up to $500.
- Each department offering graduate course work shall list 7005 in the Schedule of Classes as a reminder to students of the need to maintain continuous enrollment.

Issues still under consideration include whether students taking comprehensive exams should be subject to the same 7005 fees as thesis/project students, since they may not generally use the same resources as thesis/project students. It was agreed to explore at a future meeting the option of a 7006 course, which would be used by students taking comprehensive exams to fulfill the requirement that they be enrolled in order to graduate and which would carry a lower fee to reflect actual resources used.

C. Electronic Template for Thesis Formatting (Bengston). Carl Bengston presented an electronic thesis template, adapted from the template used by CSU Sacramento to fit our formatting guidelines. The template is a Microsoft Word document with preset margins, pagination, etc.; the student simply inserts his/her content into the provided text boxes and the finished document will meet the approved thesis/project formatting guidelines. It was generally agreed that this would be a great help to students. After some discussion, it was agreed that the document should be finalized according to the Council-approved formatting guidelines and made available on the Graduate School website. A direct email link for student feedback will be posted on the same page as the template. The template will also be sent via email to the members of the Council.

D. Faculty Involvement in Theses/Projects (Brown). Randy Brown raised a concern regarding faculty compensation for chairing a thesis/project committee, suggesting that faculty might be allowed to bank the partial units earned in this capacity until they add up to a full course, rather than losing all partial units at the end of each term. Provost Covino will attend the next Council meeting and may offer another perspective on the issue when he shares his experiences and views on graduate education. A proposal such as this should be put in writing and submitted formally to the Graduate Council for consideration.

E. Master’s Degree FTES (Pugh). Roger Pugh updated the Council on changes in calculating graduate FTES. The total units required for one FTES (Full-Time Equivalent Student) has been reduced from 15 to 12 per semester. In addition, enrollment is now broken down by resident and non-resident students, and only residents are used to calculate FTES; as a result, the only enrollment growth which will lead directly to higher FTES is an increase in resident students. The reason given for this change is that non-resident students pay higher fees than residents, and the higher fees make up for the FTES funding. Enrollment targets will be recalculated to apply to resident students only. More information on graduate enrollments will be forthcoming from the CSU system.

V. Information. There were no information items.

VI. Reports
A. Academic Senate Report (Nelligan). Deferred.
B. Associated Students Report (Cortes). Deferred.
C. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee Report—FBAC (Lindsay). Deferred.
D. Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Policy Committee (Baker). Deferred.
E. Vice Provost (Demetrulias). Deferred.

VII. Announcements. There were no announcements.

Randy Brown moved to adjourn the meeting; Kurt Baker seconded the motion.
Peter Nelligan adjourned the meeting at 4:31 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Alyssa Mazzina