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I. Approval of the October 22, 2009 minutes

The University of Kansas
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

MINUTES
OCTOBER 22, 2009, 11:00AM
STRONG HALL – ROOM 210

Members Present: Jeanette Blackmar, Bart Dean, Dale Dorsey, Boone Hopkins, William Lindsey, Gwen Macpherson, Michael Moody, Ed Morris, Lisa Rausch, Gina Westergard
Also Present: Assistant Dean Kim McNeley, Acting Associate Dean Jim Mielke, Executive Assistant Dean Rebecca Peterson, Savanna Trent (COGA)

Acting Associate Dean Jim Mielke served as Acting Chair. The meeting was called to order by Dean Mielke at 11:05 AM.

Minutes

The committee approved the Minutes of September 24, 2009, as written.

Report of the Policies, Procedures and Awards Subcommittee
(Reported by Ed Morris)

- Due to Dean McNeley’s schedule, the discussion of “P” grades was moved to the top of the agenda

Discussion of the “P” Grade:

Assistant Dean Kim McNeley presented a potential change to the University Senate Rules & Regulations because the Committee of Academic Policies and Procedures may be voting on this proposal soon. Since the “I” grade has often been used in the past as a placeholder for courses that span multiple semesters, there is a possibility that there will be a greater demand for an alternative now that the “I” grade will revert to an earned grade within a set time period for graduate students as well. One alternative to the “I” grade is the “Progress”, or “P” grade. Yet, the “P” grade is commonly misunderstood (e.g., pending, pass, etc.); furthermore, there is some concern that faculty may want an alternative to use if a student is failing to make progress in a course (e.g., “no progress” or “NP”). The following was presented as suggested changes to University Senate Rules & Regulations:

2.2.4 The College or any school may use the letter P to represent satisfactory progress or NP to represent no progress during one a semester of work for which a grade will be given only upon the completion of the course or project in a subsequent semester.

2.2.4.1 At the completion of the course sequence or project, the final year’s P grades will revert to the letter grade that is given in the semester in which the project is completed. P grades recorded beyond a year’s time will not be replaced. NP grades will not be replaced.

OR

2.2.4.1 P grades recorded within one calendar year of the last day of the semester in which the project is completed will revert to the letter grade that is awarded at the
completion of the course sequence or project. P grades recorded beyond one calendar year’s time will not be replaced. NP grades will not be replaced.

After Ed Morris presented some additional suggestions made by the members of the subcommittee on this topic, additional discussion ensued regarding the impact the proposed P/NP grading option may have on College graduate courses. The committee members suggested that one objective of grading options should be to create more engagement between faculty members and students. There could be a contract to illustrate the expectations to be met within the semester being graded, as we have seen in other College departments (e.g., History of Art). There was also some concern expressed about NP grades not being replaced; thereby creating a double standard such that “P” was a placeholder that would be changed (when another grade was finally earned in the last semester of the course) and “NP” would not be changed for the same completion of the project. The CGS provided Dean McNeley with the following feedback to report to the University Senate Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures (AP&P):

1. The P/NP grading option may be useful to some divisions, and thus, it would be fine to set this university-wide policy.
2. The College wants to reserve the right to set a stricter policy within the guidelines of the broader P/NP grading options such that service-learning and internship courses may only qualify for this option on their grading menus.
3. NP grades should be able to change as well as P grades.

**Action Item:** Dean Peterson will draft some language to present to the Subcommittee regarding how the P grade would be utilized for graduate courses in the College.

**Report of the Curricular Changes Subcommittee**
(Reported by Gwen Macpherson)

- The Curricular Changes Subcommittee presented and recommended approval of the following new courses to the CGS: GEOG 801, MATH 824, PSYC 844

*The CGS approved the following new courses:*

- **GEOGRAPHY: GEOG 801**

  **CHANGE: NEW COURSE**

  GEOG 801 Indigenous Peoples of the World (3). A survey of the native peoples of the world at the time of contact with Europeans. An overview will be presented of various Indigenous cultures. A few detailed studies of selected groups will be used to explore environmental settings, settlements and subsistence patterns, and the world view of the Western Hemisphere’s Indigenous societies. (Same as GINS 801.)

  **LEC**

  **JUSTIFICATION**

  Since this course will be taught in the department as a cross-listed course with Global Indigenous Nations Studies into the foreseeable future, this will provide its own unique designation.

  **Note:** The motion was passed by a vote of 6 aye, 3 nay and no abstentions pending the following:

  **Pending minor edit:** The CGS requested the word “view” be made plural.

- **MATHEMATICS: MATH 824**
CHANGE: NEW COURSE

**Math 824 Algebraic Combinatorics** (3). An introduction to the fundamental structures and methods of modern algebraic combinatorics. Topics include partially ordered sets and lattices, matroids, simplicial complexes, polytopes, hyperplane arrangements, partitions and tableaux, and symmetric functions. Prerequisites: MATH 724 and MATH 791, or permission of the instructor. LEC

**JUSTIFICATION**
The goal of the new class would be to prepare graduate students for research at the M.A. or Ph.D. level in combinatorics. At present, the regularly offered combinatorics courses are Math 724 (Combinatorial Mathematics) and Math 725 (Graph Theory), which are offered as a two-semester sequence every other year. These courses are not in themselves sufficient to prepare graduate students for research, for a number of reasons. First, Math 724/725 serves undergraduate students as well as graduate students (it is one of the two-semester sequences that can count toward a B.A. or B.S.). Second, there is a lot of basic knowledge beyond basic enumeration and graph theory that is necessary for research.

**PSYCHOLOGY: PSYC 844**

CHANGE: NEW COURSE

**PSYC 844 Mental Health and Aging** (3). Reviews recent research and application in the field of mental health and aging. Theoretical perspectives appropriate for understanding mental health issues with increased age are discussed. The epidemiology, assessment, diagnosis, and treatment methods associated with a variety of mental health conditions are surveyed. The community mental health resources available for older adults are discussed as well as practically-related issues such as evaluations of functional independence and competency among older adults. Prerequisite: graduate student in psychology or related health field, or permission of instructor. LEC

**JUSTIFICATION**
This is a major area in psychology and we now have a faculty member prepared to offer the course. It will fulfill an elective requirement in our graduate program in clinical psychology and our graduate program in cognitive psychology.

*Note:* The CGS suggested that the Department of Psychology consult with other departments in which this course may be of major concern, such as Gerontology and Sociology.

- The Curricular Changes Subcommittee presented and recommended approval of the following course changes to the CGS: GINS 801, PUAD 827, SOC 814, SOC 824

The CGS tabled the following change in course listings:

**GLOBAL INDIGENOUS NATIONS STUDIES: GINS 801**

CHANGE: CROSS LISTING OF COURSE (OLD)

**GINS 801 Indigenous Peoples of the World** (3). A survey of the native peoples of the world at the time of contact with Europeans. An overview will be presented of various Indigenous cultures. A few detailed studies of selected groups will be used
to explore environmental settings, settlements and subsistence patterns, and the
world view of the Western Hemisphere’s Indigenous societies. LEC

(NEW)
GINS 801 Indigenous Peoples of the World (3). A survey of the native peoples of
the world at the time of contact with Europeans. An overview will be presented of
various Indigenous cultures. A few detailed studies of selected groups will be used
to explore environmental settings, settlements and subsistence patterns, and the
world view of the Western Hemisphere’s Indigenous societies. (Same as GEOG 801
and GINS 601.) LEC

JUSTIFICATION
In Fall 2008, GINS began offering this course with GEOG 771, Special
Topics…. GEOG has submitted a change in the number GEOG 771 to be
GEOG 801. Therefore, we want to crosslist GINS 801 with GEOG 801 since it
meets with it already. It also meets with GINS 601 (which was approved for
GINSP in Spring 2009), and we have added GINS 601 to the course description.

Pending minor edit: The CGS requested the word “view” be made plural.

Tabled: The CGS was concerned about the “Same as” designation. They
would like clarification if different coursework is required of students
enrolled in GINS 601. If so, it was suggested that language be added to
make this distinction clear.

The CGS approved the following changes in course listings:

- PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: PUAD 827

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION: Previously, PUAD had not consulted with HP&M
regarding crosslisting the course. The sub-committee posed the question: does this
need to be cross listed at all since the courses are not both in the college? After
speaking with PUAD, the answer to that question is no, the course does not need to
be crosslisted. The new description below reflects that change. Now, instead of a
crosslisting change, it is a title and description change.

CHANGE: COURSE DESCRIPTION, TITLE
(OLD)
PUAD 827 Health Care Policy and Administration (3). A seminar designed to
explore the development of public health policy in the United States. Particular
attention will be given to (1) the development of public institutions and policy goals;
(2) current policy problems such as expenditure-cost controls, prospective
reimbursement, utilization review, access, and public and private investment
planning; and (3) administrative problems in the current health care system. LEC
(Same as HP&M 837.)

(NEW)
PUAD 827 Health Policy (3). This course examines the development,
implementation, and evaluation of federal, state, and local health policy in the United
States. Particular attention will be given to (1) the development of public institutions
and policy goals; and (2) current policy problems such as cost controls,
reimbursement, health services utilization, program assessment and evaluation,
public health, and public/private investment and resource planning. Students will be
expected to synthesize and integrate knowledge to apply theory and principles in
ways consistent with professional practice as a health policy analyst. LEC
JUSTIFICATION

Note: No longer valid because they course will no longer be crosslisted.
Change in course title & description will bring PUAD 827 in line with HP&M 837, in order to keep the same as designation.

• **SOCIOLOGY: SOC 814, SOC 824**

**CHANGE: COURSE DESCRIPTION, PREREQUISITE**

(OLD)

**SOC 814 Health Services Research: Epidemiology, Evaluation, and Survey Methods** (3). Students learn the logic, assumptions, designs, and procedures involved in conducting the major types of research found in the health services field. Students develop an informed basis for critically evaluating the methodological adequacy of research studies in the areas of descriptive and analytic epidemiology, program evaluation, and health related survey research as well as working knowledge of the research process itself. Emphasis is placed on examining basic health services issues such as measuring quality of care, understanding the role of social factors in the etiology of disease, determining the health status and health needs of populations, and incorporating health services research into organizational policy and decision-making. (Same as HP&M 821.) Prerequisite: PRE 710 or equivalent, HP&M 810 and HP&M 812, or consent of instructor. LEC

(NEW)

**SOC 814 Health Services Research: Epidemiology, Evaluation, and Survey Methods** (3). Students learn the logic, assumptions, designs, and procedures involved in conducting the major types of research found in the health services field. Students develop an informed basis for critically evaluating the methodological adequacy of research studies in the areas of descriptive and analytic epidemiology, program evaluation, and health-related survey research as well as working knowledge of the research process itself. Emphasis is placed on examining basic health services issues such as measuring quality of care, understanding the role of social factors in the etiology of disease, determining the health status and health needs of populations, and incorporating health services research into organizational policy and decision-making. LEC

JUSTIFICATION

No longer the “same as” HP&M 821, therefore we needed to remove the language that indicated so. The prerequisite should also be removed because students should not be required to take classes in a department with which the class is no longer cross listed.

**CHANGE: COURSE DESCRIPTION, PREREQUISITE**

(OLD)

**SOC 824 Health and Social Behavior** (3). This course provides students with an analytic understanding of the organization, professional, and interpersonal behavior that characterizes contemporary health and health care. Emphasis is placed on examination and integration of conceptual frameworks theories, and research findings bearing on basic behavioral/managerial issues such as authority relations in health care settings, models of illness behavior and health services utilization, the impact of organizational structure on employee and client attitudes and behavior, and the culture of professional medicine in relation to patient care. (Same as HP&M
835.) Prerequisite: HP&M 810 and HP&M 830, or consent of instructor. LEC

(NEW)
SOC 824 Health and Social Behavior (3). This course provides students with an analytic understanding of the organization, professional, and interpersonal behavior that characterizes contemporary health and health care. Emphasis is placed on examination and integration of conceptual frameworks theories, and research findings bearing on basic behavioral/managerial issues such as authority relations in health care settings, models of illness behavior and health services utilization, the impact of organizational structure on employee and client attitudes and behavior, and the culture of professional medicine in relation to patient care. LEC

JUSTIFICATION
No longer the “same as” HP&M 835, therefore we needed to remove the language that indicated so.

The prerequisite should also be removed because students should not be required to take classes in a department with which the class is no longer cross listed.

The Curricular Changes Subcommittee presented and recommended approval of the following course deletions to the CGS: PSYC 766, PSYC 779, PSYC 784, PSYC 792, PSYC 797

The CGS approved the following course deletions:

- PSYCHOLOGY: PSYC 766, PSYC 779, PSYC 784, PSYC 792, PSYC 797

CHANGE: DELETION
PSYC 766 Forensic Psychology (3). Applications of psychological concepts and research findings to the courtroom and judicial process. Topics covered include dispute resolution, jury selection, expert witnesses, determination of competency, and criminal profiling. LEC

JUSTIFICATION
This course has not been taught in the past five years. There are no plans to teach this course in the foreseeable future. We want students to have an accurate list of courses that will be taught so they can efficiently plan their program of study.

CHANGE: DELETION
PSYC 779 Physiological Aspects of Health and Disease (3). Provides an overview of physical manifestations of health and disease for the graduate student in health and psychology. Content areas include overview of general anatomy and physiology of each body system, description of how deviations from normal anatomical development and physiological function result in common disorders, methods for distinguishing psychological from organic etiologies, indications and side effects of medications for common disorders, and description of roles of key members of the health care team. Prerequisite: graduate student in psychology, nursing, and health-related fields, or by permission of instructor. LEC

JUSTIFICATION
This course has not been taught in the past five years. There are no plans to teach this course in the foreseeable future. We want students to have an accurate list of courses that will be taught so they can efficiently plan their program of study.
PSYC 784 Proseminar in Communication and Aging (1). A weekly forum for students and faculty to discuss professional issues and interdisciplinary research in communication and aging. May be repeated for credit. (Same as COMS 784.) (Same as SPLH 784.) Prerequisite: consent of instructor. LEC

JUSTIFICATION
This course has not been taught in the past five years. There are no plans to teach this course in the foreseeable future. We want students to have an accurate list of courses that will be taught so they can efficiently plan their program of study.

PSYC 792 Computer Analysis of Psychological Data (3). Application of computers in the analysis of data from descriptive and experimental investigations. Emphasis is on the use of integrated statistical packages such as SPSS and BMDP. Prerequisite: an intermediate course in statistics. LEC

JUSTIFICATION
This course has not been taught in the past five years. There are no plans to teach this course in the foreseeable future. We want students to have an accurate list of courses that will be taught so they can efficiently plan their program of study.

PSYC 797 Advanced Programming Techniques for Psychological Research (3). An advanced course in programming IBM compatible desktop computers using the language “C Plus Plus.” Applications to psychological research will include artificial neural network design, simulation modeling, and real-time stimulus-response management. Familiarity with a high-level structured programming language such as Pascal or “C,” and with the DOS operating system on desktop computers will be helpful. Prerequisite: PSYC 795 or an equivalent course or experience. LEC

JUSTIFICATION
This course has not been taught in the past five years. There are no plans to teach this course in the foreseeable future. We want students to have an accurate list of courses that will be taught so they can efficiently plan their program of study.

- The discussion of the Dean’s Charge for cross-listing courses was tabled due to time constraints of the meeting.

Report of the Petitions & Program Changes Subcommittee
(Reported by William Lindsey)

The Petitions & Program Changes Subcommittee presented a proposal from the Department of Intercampus Program in Communicative Disorders to change an existing graduate degree requirement.

The CGS approved the program changes pending a minor revision to a sentence in the final paragraph of the proposal and the addition of a similar sentence in the “non-thesis” section of the proposal. It currently states, “The vote will be based primarily on the oral defense of the thesis and the oral presentation of the portfolio artifacts.” The CGS suggests that it reads, “The vote will be based on the oral defense of the thesis and the oral presentation and defense of the portfolio artifacts.” Additionally, the
CGS wanted a similar sentence inserted in the “non-thesis” section within this passage: “After all three artifacts have been examined, the student will be excused from the exam so that the committee can discuss the student’s performance and generate a consensus rating on the exam rubric (~10 minutes). [INSERT: “The vote will be based on the oral presentation and defense of the portfolio artifacts.”] The committee will then reconvene with the student to discuss the student’s strengths and weaknesses as well as provide suggestions for continuing education activities during the CFY (~5 minutes).”

- Proposal: We wish to make a change to the final general examination procedure. Currently we require thesis and non-thesis students to pass a national exam (i.e., score of 600 or above on the Praxis exam). Recently our national accreditation body and the test company that administers the Praxis exam have requested that programs NOT use the exam as the university required final general examination. Thus, we must change our procedures to maintain accreditation.

We propose that thesis and non-thesis students will maintain an electronic portfolio of artifacts from clinical, course, and research experiences (specific requirements for artifact archiving by semester are outlined in the attachment). These artifacts will be reviewed by the student’s advisor at the midpoint of degree progress (e.g., approximately the end of year 1 in our 2-year program). For the final general examination, thesis and non-thesis students will present a sample of artifacts to a committee of 3 faculty for discussion and review. For thesis students, one of the artifacts will be the thesis. The final general examination will occur in the last semester of enrollment. Additional details are outlined in the attachment.

- Justification: Currently we require thesis and non-thesis students to pass a national exam (i.e., score of 600 or above on the Praxis exam). Recently our national accreditation body and the test company that administers the Praxis exam have requested that programs NOT use the exam as the university required final general examination. Thus, we must change our procedures to maintain accreditation. Through our participation in the Provost’s Initiative on Documenting Student Learning, we have piloted use of student portfolios and feel that these will provide us with a richer source of learning outcomes to evaluate each individual student as well as our overall program.

- Effective date: We propose that the changes apply to student who entered our program in Summer 2009 forward. These students are currently creating electronic portfolios so they will have the necessary artifacts for the final examination upon program completion (approximately Spring 2011).

- Attachment to proposal:

  Intercampus Program in Communicative Disorders  
  MA Speech-Language Pathology  
  Proposed Change to Final General Examination

XI. FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Formative assessment will occur through course grades and evaluations by practicum supervisors. In addition, beginning Summer 2009, all entering MA SLP students will be required to maintain an electronic portfolio on the KU Keep Toolkit to document their acquisition of knowledge and skills in diagnosing and treating communication disorders in at least 6 of the 9 content areas identified by ASHA (articulation/phonology; resonance; fluency; receptive/expressive language; hearing; dysphagia; cognition; social; modalities). The portfolio will be formally reviewed by the student’s academic advisor midway through the student’s program (i.e., formative assessment) and will be formally reviewed by a committee of three faculty during the final semester of the student’s program (i.e., summative assessment, see next section). This final committee review meets the KU requirement of a final general examination for an MA degree, and thus requires reporting to the University via a “progress to degree” form (previously called “do-all” form). A mandatory portfolio orientation meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 8, 7:00-8:00 pm, Dole 3049, Lawrence campus.
Below are the portfolio requirements for a student beginning the program in the Fall semester. Alternative scenarios for different program entry points appear at the end of this section.

**1st Semester in Program (Fall)**
Students must upload **one clinical artifact** and **two coursework artifacts** to their KU Keep Toolkit portfolio. Each artifact must be accompanied by an Artifact Description Sheet. Artifacts must be uploaded by the second full week of class of the following semester (e.g., Spring).

**2nd Semester in Program (Spring)**
Students must upload **one clinical artifact** and **two coursework artifacts** to their KU Keep Toolkit portfolio. Each artifact must be accompanied by an Artifact Description Sheet. Artifacts must be uploaded by the second full week of class of the following semester (e.g., Summer).

At the end of the 2nd semester, students should have at least one artifact related to evaluation and one artifact related to treatment. In addition, the 6 total artifacts should relate to at least 3 of the 9 areas identified by ASHA (i.e., articulation/phonology; resonance; fluency; receptive/expressive language; hearing; dysphagia; cognition; social; modalities).

**3rd Semester in Program (Summer): Mid-Program Review**
During the third week of classes of the 3rd semester, the student must upload mid-program review materials to their KU Keep Toolkit portfolio. The mid-program review materials include:
1. completed self-evaluation of her/his diagnostic and treatment skills using the IPCD rubrics (i.e., 2 separate rubrics);
2. completed preliminary plan of action, setting her/his own goals for the second year of the program;
3. share portfolio with advisor. Once these materials have been completed and uploaded and the portfolio has been shared with the advisor, the student should contact the advisor via e-mail to set a meeting time for the mid-program review. **Any student who fails to complete and share his/her portfolio AND e-mail his/her advisor for a mid-program review appointment by the end of the fourth week of class will be referred to the Advising Committee for disciplinary action.** At the meeting, the advisor will review the portfolio, the self-evaluation, and plan. The advisor will help the student further develop the plan for the remainder of the student’s program. This is considered the “official” formative assessment. The advisor will e-mail a copy of the final action plan to the student to upload to his/her KU Keep Toolkit portfolio and will print a copy for the student’s departmental file. The mid-program review must be completed by the last day of class for the semester.

Students must upload **one clinical artifact** and **one coursework artifact** to their KU Keep Toolkit portfolio. Each artifact must be accompanied by an Artifact Description Sheet. Artifacts must be uploaded by the second full week of class of the following semester (e.g., Fall).

**4th Semester in Program (Fall)**
Students must upload **one clinical artifact** and **two coursework artifacts** to their KU Keep Toolkit portfolio. Each artifact must be accompanied by an Artifact Description Sheet. Artifacts must be uploaded by the second full week of class of the following semester (e.g., Spring).

**5th and Final Semester in Program (Spring): Summative Assessment**
No new artifacts are required for this semester. By this semester, students should have at least two artifacts related to evaluation and two artifacts related to treatment. In addition, the 11 total artifacts should relate to at least 6 of the 9 areas identified by ASHA (i.e., articulation/phonology; resonance; fluency; receptive/expressive language; hearing; dysphagia; cognition; social; modalities). Refer to next section for details of the Summative Assessment.

**NOTE:** Coursework artifacts must be taken from different courses. That is, the two coursework artifacts in a given semester can NOT be from the same course. In addition, research practica, thesis projects, and independent studies are considered coursework.

**NOTE:** Students have the option of substituting an “outside” artifact (e.g., an artifact from a research, training, volunteer, etc. experience) for ONE of the 11 artifacts described above.
Alternatives

The above set of guidelines is based on a “standard” program with entry in the fall semester, a clinical placement every semester, and approximately 4 courses completed every semester (except summer). Students who do not follow this “standard” program (e.g., start in summer or spring semester; delay start of clinical work, etc.) will require some adjustment to the schedule outlined above. Some potential options for different program start dates are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Start* (6 semester program)</th>
<th>Summer Start** (5 semester program)</th>
<th>Spring Start (6 semester program)</th>
<th>Spring Start (5 semester program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1 = 1 clinical OR 1 coursework</td>
<td>Fall 1 = 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
<td>Spring 1 = 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
<td>Fall 1 = 1 clinical + 1 coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1 = 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
<td>Spring 1 = Mid-program evaluation; 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
<td>Summer 1 = 1 clinical OR 1 coursework</td>
<td>Fall 1 = Mid-program evaluation; 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1 = 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
<td>Summer 2 = 1 clinical + 1 coursework</td>
<td>Spring 2 = Mid-program evaluation; 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
<td>Fall 2 = final exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2 = Mid-program evaluation; 1 clinical OR 1 coursework</td>
<td>Fall 2 = 1 coursework (1st 8 weeks) final exam (2nd 8 wks)**</td>
<td>Summer 2 = 1 clinical OR 1 coursework</td>
<td>Fall 2 = final exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2 = 1 clinical + 2 coursework</td>
<td>Spring 2 = final exam</td>
<td>Summer 2 = final exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2 = final exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Portfolio: 4 clinical + 7 coursework

*Summer Start (6 semester program) alternative: could archive 0 artifacts during first summer and then follow the original schedule for a Fall Start.

**Summer Start (5 semester program) alternative: Clinical and coursework artifacts for Summer 2 and Fall 2 could be re-arranged depending on plan for field study (i.e., 2 coursework artifacts in Summer 2 and 1 clinical artifact in Fall 2 (1st 8 weeks) OR 1 clinical artifact in Summer 2 and 2 coursework artifacts in Fall 2 (1st 8 weeks)).

Alternatives to any of the schedules listed to this point are possible. However, ANY alternative schedule should be outlined with the advisor during the first semester of the student’s program, with a copy of the schedule placed in the student’s departmental file. The alternative plan must result in a final portfolio consisting of 4 clinical artifacts and 7 coursework artifacts for a total of 11 artifacts. Evaluation, treatment, and ASHA areas must be represented as outlined above. Mid-program and final evaluations must be completed as outlined above. The timing of these evaluations should be similar as outlined above in terms of the number of artifacts available in the portfolio (i.e., mid-program evaluation should occur after 2 clinical and ~4 coursework artifacts have been archived in the portfolio; final evaluation should occur after all required artifacts have been archived in the portfolio).

Because of the pivotal role that advisors will play in monitoring the student’s program progress via the portfolio, any request to change advisors should occur as early as possible in the student’s program, ideally before the mid-program portfolio review.

XII SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT (pending University approval)

The final examination (i.e., summative assessment) will occur during the final semester of enrollment. There will be two final exam dates, one during the first 8 weeks and one during the second 8 weeks. ALL
students will take the exam on one of these two dates. There will be no opportunities for re-scheduling! Final exam dates will be posted during the preceding semester and each student will be asked to sign-up for one of the two dates. Faculty will be grouped into exam committees consisting of three faculty. Students will be assigned to the committee that includes his/her academic advisor and randomly assigned to a 45-minute exam slot. Specific exam times and committee composition will be e-mailed to each student. The advisor will serve as the chair of the final exam committee for each student. At least 2 weeks before the scheduled final examination, the student must upload final program review materials to their KU Keep Toolkit portfolio. The final program review materials include: (1) completed self-evaluation of her/his diagnostic and treatment skills using the IPCD rubrics (i.e., 2 separate rubrics); (2) completed preliminary plan of action, setting her/his own goals for continuing education activities post-graduation; (3) share portfolio with advisor. An e-mail should be sent to the advisor as soon as this step has been completed. The advisor will review these materials in detail. Failure to complete these steps at least 2 weeks before the scheduled final examination will result in cancellation of the exam, potentially delaying graduation.

The student also will prepare a CD archive of his/her portfolio. The student should store a copy of every artifact and artifact description sheet on a CD and all program review materials. Standard filenames should be used that correspond to the KU Keep Toolkit (i.e., sem1_course1_artifact1.doc; sem1_course1_art1descr.doc). In addition, the student should print their KU Keep Toolkit Portfolio on one sheet of paper (this will just show the documents that should be on the CD). The CD and printed portfolio must be brought to the final examination. Failure to bring these materials to the final exam will result in cancellation of the exam, potentially delaying graduation.

The student will then prepare a presentation of his/her portfolio for the final exam. During the final exam, the student will present 1 clinical artifact and 2 coursework artifacts. Each artifact should be from a different ASHA area (i.e., articulation/ phonology; resonance; fluency; receptive/expressive language; hearing; dysphagia; cognition; social; modalities). At least one artifact should demonstrate diagnostic skills and at least one artifact should demonstrate treatment skills. The student should determine the order of presentation of each artifact prior to the exam. The student will have two minutes to introduce the first artifact. This introduction should include (1) a description of the artifact; (2) rationale for selecting this artifact; (3) student’s strengths as demonstrated by this artifact; (4) student’s weaknesses as demonstrated by this artifact; (5) what student learned through this experience that will be applied to future situations. The committee will then have eight minutes to ask questions about the artifact. This cycle of two minute student presentation and eight minute committee questioning will be followed for the second and third artifacts. All time limits will be strictly enforced so students should plan presentations accordingly. After all three artifacts have been examined, the student will be excused from the exam so that the committee can discuss the student’s performance and generate a consensus rating on the exam rubric (~10 minutes). The committee will then reconvene with the student to discuss the student’s strengths and weaknesses as well as provide suggestions for continuing education activities during the CFY (~5 minutes). These suggestions will be noted on the final action plan. A copy of the action plan will be given to the student and the original, along with the portfolio CD and the completed final exam rubric, will be placed in the student’s departmental file. At the conclusion of the exam, the progress to degree form will be completed and submitted to the university to report the outcome of the 45-minute exam.

A de-identified copy of the portfolio print-out, final action plan, and final exam rubric also will be placed in a file for the SLP Curriculum Committee. Data from these items will be summarized and discussed annually by the SLP Curriculum Committee, typically at the first fall meeting of the IEC.

XIII ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDENTS COMPLETING A THESIS

Prior to initiation of the primary thesis research, the student will present a prospectus of the thesis study to a committee of at least three faculty members (including the advisor who serves as chair), at least two of which must be members of the IEC. The role of the Prospectus Committee will be to evaluate the study and
provide constructive feedback. Following completion of the thesis, the Committee will reconvene as the Oral Examination Committee.

Students completing a thesis will follow the general formative and summative exam guidelines detailed above. Artifacts from the thesis can be included in the portfolio and typically would count as coursework artifacts. The only departure from the above guidelines for thesis students is in the scheduling and content of the final examination. Thesis students will choose a three person committee based on the content of the thesis and will schedule the final examination at a mutually agreeable time (i.e., outside of the pre-scheduled final exam dates for non-thesis students). This examination will likely be much longer than 45 minutes. The bulk of the thesis final examination will be devoted to presentation and defense of the thesis. Thus, students should be prepared to answer questions related to the thesis. However, the student should still prepare to present 1 clinical and 1 non-thesis coursework artifact from his/her portfolio following the guidelines above (i.e., 2 minute presentation and 8 minutes of questions for each artifact). The committee will still judge the student’s performance on the portfolio section of the exam using the final exam rubric and will still complete an action plan for the student. Majority vote of the Committee will determine Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory performance. The vote will be based primarily on the oral defense of the thesis and the oral presentation of the portfolio artifacts. In the event of satisfactory performance, the thesis committee will further determine whether a designation of Honors is appropriate through an anonymous and unanimous vote of the committee. In the event of an unsatisfactory performance, the Committee will decide whether the student should be allowed to repeat the examination and plan appropriately. After the defense is completed, the advisor shall sign the progress to degree form to the Department and forward it to the Graduate School.

The meeting was adjourned by Dean Mielke at 12:40 PM.

**Upcoming Meetings**

Curricular Changes Subcommittee: Thursday, October 29, 2009, 11:00 AM, 210 Strong Hall

Policies, Procedures and Awards Subcommittee: Thursday, October 29, 2009, 11:00 AM, 315 Strong Hall (International Programs Conference Room)

The next meeting of the Committee on Graduate Studies is Thursday, November 19, 2009, 11:00 AM, 210 Strong Hall

Respectfully submitted by Savanna Trent, COGA
II. Report of the Policies, Procedures and Awards Subcommittee

- Presentation of new “grading” language

Grading
The +/- grading system is used in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; the plus or minus describes intermediate levels of performance between a maximum of A and a minimum of F. Intermediate grades represented by plus or minus are calculated as 0.3 units above or below the corresponding letter grade. The Credit/No Credit system is not used for graduate courses in the College. The P/NP grading system is only available in courses where a student is graded on a project or specific assignment that cannot be completed in one semester (e.g., courses involving public scholarship, service-learning, internship, practicum, etc.); graduate courses seeking this grade menu must receive prior approval from the College such that this grade option is noted in the course description.

Courses that are often repeated over multiple semesters (e.g., research, thesis, dissertation, etc.) while students assemble and analyze data, review literature in their fields of study, or write a graduate thesis or dissertation will use either the A-F or S/U grading systems. For each semester of enrollment in these courses, students are required to devise a plan of study with the faculty member supervising the course and discuss their progress with their instructor/mentor periodically throughout the semester such that s/he can assign a grade for work completed in that semester only; the grade awarded for the examination of a written thesis or dissertation should only be assigned to the relevant enrolled hours in the semester in which the examination takes place. If a student is not in contact with his or her mentor during the semester s/he is enrolled in this course, and/or does not meet the specifications of the plan of study made in collaboration with the faculty member supervising these hours, the student will be given a failing grade and subsequently will not receive credit for this course.

An Incomplete (I) grade may be used in any course to temporarily represent that a student has been unable to complete a portion of the required coursework in a given semester due to circumstances beyond his or her control. Incomplete work must be finished and a permanent grade assigned before a student is eligible to take oral comprehensive exams.

All other grading policies for students enrolled in CLAS graduate courses are outlined in Article II of the University Senate Rules and Regulations (https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/USRR.htm).

Probation and Dismissal Guidelines. To be in good standing, a student must maintain a 3.0 cumulative grade-point average; if the grade-point average falls below 3.0, the department is notified that the student should be placed on probation. This action is followed by a letter to the student confirming the probation and explaining the student’s options.

Usually a student is placed on probation for one academic semester. If the cumulative grade-point average has not risen to 3.0 at this point, the student can either be dismissed or be allowed to continue on probation, depending on the department’s decision. If a student has a dangerously low grade-point average and is in jeopardy of never graduating, the department must write a letter explaining why the student should be allowed to continue. A graduate student can be dismissed upon recommendation of the student’s department. Academic dismissal should occur before a semester begins; but if a student is dismissed during the semester, the dismissal is effective only at the end of the semester in which the department gives notification of dismissal.

The student is notified of dismissal. Usually a graduate student is dismissed because of a low grade-point average; however, failure of examinations or failure to make satisfactory progress toward the degree are also cause for dismissal.

If a department dismisses a student, he or she cannot be readmitted as a graduate student in any department in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
Presentation of courses affected by new and proposed policies

1. MUSE 799, Professor Marjorie Swann
2. PUAD 831, Professor Raymond Hummert
3. HA 999, Professor Linda Stone-Ferrier

Presentation of post-comprehensive enrollment deliberations to date

**Proposed Changes in Graduate Education Policies and Procedures**

**Goals:**

1. To promote further graduate student engagement with faculty and graduate mentors
2. To increase the number of external sources that fund graduate student work
3. To increase graduate program completion rates
4. To decrease graduate program time to degree
5. To report accurately the time students and faculty commit to post-candidacy work
6. To reduce the administrative time spent monitoring post-comprehensive requirements

**Means for achieving these goals:**

1. Encourage and provide flexibility to graduate programs for structuring their pre- and post-candidacy hours to maximize their students’ early and continued engagement in research with faculty and graduate mentors.

2. Set aside tuition funds for the competitive awarding and cost-sharing of external funds for graduate student work in order to create incentives (e.g., benefits and tuition assistance) for graduate students to write grants and seek pre-doctoral fellowships.

3. Create a tuition structure in which pre-candidacy tuition remains linear up to nine credit hours (i.e., full-time enrollment), while post-candidacy tuition is a greatly reduced flat fee for full-time enrollment (but a fee greater than that required for one credit hour). This would eliminate the five-month rule (i.e., the requirement that students wait five months between their comprehensive, qualifying, or portfolio exam and their doctoral exams) and the 18-hour requirement before students may reduce their enrollments to one credit hour (along with applying hours taken during the semester the exams are passed to count toward the 18 hours).

4a. Encourage graduate programs to advance students to successful Ph.D. candidacy with policies and procedures that promote students’ preparation for candidacy before undertaking a significant portion of their dissertation research (and thus reduce their pre-candidacy tuition).

4b. Encourage graduate programs to advance students to the successful completion of their Ph.D. degrees with policies and procedures that minimize the time they spend completing them (and thus reduce their years of post-candidacy tuition).

5. Create a model that produces more accurate information gathering and statistics regarding how post-candidacy students spend their time completing their degrees (e.g., how much time students and faculty commit to post-candidacy work).
6. Create a model that allows more efficient monitoring of post-comprehensive requirements (e.g., by requiring no minimum number of post-candidacy credit hours students to graduate, administrative time currently spent counting these hours would be eliminated or dramatically reduced).

**These goals and the means for achieving them will be completed with the following specific action:**

Create a University Graduate Task Force comprised of stakeholders in academic departments, financial aid, grants and fellowships, international programs, human resources, and University administration (i.e., Registrar, Payroll, Graduate Studies) to create a comprehensive model to present to the Board of Regents.

**We hope this model can accomplish the following:**

1. Create a revenue neutral tuition structure for the University
2. Stipulate that full-time (year-round) enrollment for graduate students is nine hours each Fall and Spring
3. Ensure that all stakeholders recognize students as full-time (year round) with Fall/Spring (but not summer) enrollment
4. Require summer enrollment only for students who are taking their qualifying exams or completing their degrees that summer
5. Set a reduced tuition for post-candidacy enrollment that still encourages students to finish their degrees
6. Create a fund administered by Research and Graduate Studies for cost-sharing with departments to provide graduate students who garner outside funding with GTA/GRA benefits.

---

**III. Progress on Dean’s Charges to Date**