

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
OCTOBER 23, 1997

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Karen Holbrook, Chair, Dr. Patricia Ashton, Dr. Barbara Barletta, Dr. William Chamberlin, Dr. Christine Chase, Dr. Joseph Delfino, Dr. Pauline Lawrence, Dr. Frank Nordlie, Dr. Michael Perfit, Dr. Hugh Popenoe, Dr. Ann Progulske-Fox, Mr. Clay Scherer, Dr. Richard Yost

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Frederick Gregory

GCAC REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT: Dr. Douglas Dankel

GUESTS PRESENT: Dr. Patrick Byrne, Dr. Myrna Courage, Dr. Michael Crary, Dr. Robert Frank, Dr. Thomas Gallant, Dr. Kenneth Gerhardt, Dr. Stephanie Hanson, Dr. Willard Harrison, Dr. Elizabeth Langland, Dr. Ronald Randles, Dr. Michael Scicchitano, Dr. Rachel Shireman, Dr. Thomas Spreen, Ms. Trish Ventura, Dr. Craig Wood

STAFF PRESENT: Dr. Richard Lutz, Ms. Lisa Hogan, Ms. Dorothy Long, Ms. Helen Martin, Ms. Phyl Schmidt, Ms. Julie Shih

STAFF ABSENT: Ms. Bernice Thornton

The Graduate Council meeting was called to order at 1:32 by Dr. Karen Holbrook.

I. ACTION ITEMS

1. The minutes of the Graduate Council meeting of September 18, 1997, were approved unanimously with no corrections.
2. Dean Robert Frank, Dean Willard Harrison, Dr. Michael Crary and Dr. Kenneth Gerhardt presented the proposal to establish a Doctor of Audiology degree to be administered jointly by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Health Professions. Dr. Crary stated that all parties recognize that it is a professional program, but they also agree that it should be a graduate degree. Dean Harrison stated that it is a very strong program with good faculty, and that it should be a graduate degree. Dr. Gerhardt emphasized that the two colleges had collaborated closely in a long process of development.

The Council raised a question about whether there are enough faculty FTE available to support the program. Dr. Gerhardt responded that it is not problematic at this point. As

the program grows, there will be growth in the faculty. Both deans endorsed that approach.

In response to a question about the research component of the degree, Dr. Gerhardt explained that it will be of high quality, but not of the magnitude of a dissertation. The program is designed to get students involved in research very early. A more general question was raised about the Au.D. becoming the first doctoral degree without a dissertation and whether this opens the door to other non-dissertation doctorates such as the Doctor of Psychology. Dean Frank responded that the Au.D. is a new form of degree that is beginning to emerge. He opined that the Graduate School needs to evolve to accommodate this form of innovation. The Council expressed its enthusiasm for new programs in response to market demand.

In response to a question of possible competition between the Au.D. and the Ph.D. degree, Dr. Gerhardt stated the Au.D. is not designed to compete with the Ph.D. The Au.D. is intended to be at the forefront of practice and is not intended to lead to positions in higher education. It is in somewhat of a gray area, between a traditional graduate degree and a typical professional degree. It has been mandated as the profession's entry level degree by 2007; master's degrees will be phased out over the next decade. The proposal was approved unanimously.

3. Dr. Elizabeth Langland and Dr. Ronald Randles presented a proposal to establish a Ph.D. Co-Major program. It is similar to programs at several other schools. The desire is to offer students more flexibility in their degree programs. The program proposal is a model for Co-Ph.D.s for any combination of disciplines. The Council discussed the need for a third department to be represented by the outside committee member.

Essentially, the request is that the Co-Ph.D. be approved as a general model. Graduate Council approval would be needed for any two departments wishing to collaborate. Thus, approval of the current proposal would be for the general approach and the Co-Ph.D. curriculum for Statistics.

The department admitting and supporting the student would receive credit for the degree, but it may become more complex, e.g., if a student applies to both programs simultaneously. It was noted that under the UF Bank, departments now have to care about who gets degree credit. The program needs to help students without damaging the sponsoring colleges.

The issue of how these students will count administratively was felt to be an important one for all interdisciplinary programs that should be discussed at the Provost's level. Perhaps a Graduate School task force on interdisciplinary programs should be asked to recommend policy.

The real advantage of a Co-Ph.D. is that it is more than a minor, in that the actual dissertation must reflect both disciplines. Thus, more than simply taking a few courses, it represents a much stronger impact on the student's program.

The Council recommended that a set of explicit criteria be developed for determining which department gets the credit, in order to protect students from being caught in a tug of war.

The supervisory committee will have at least two members from each department, with a chair from one department and co-chair from the other. The Council recommended that the external member be from a third department.

The current proposal is for a broad rubric, not the precise elements of any one co-major. The Council was hesitant to approve a broad template without input from other colleges. For instance, Agriculture has expressed enthusiasm for the concept.

Structurally, it makes most sense to think of a subordinate and superordinate department; the two cannot be true co-equals. Students are seldom equally attractive to both departments. If a student drops out of the Co-Ph.D. program, s/he would return to the superordinate department.

It was moved to approve the proposal for Statistics only. However, the motion was not seconded. Instead, a motion was made for approval of the Co-Ph.D. concept in principle. The Council encouraged that a specific proposal involving two departments be brought back to Council, while also addressing the concerns raised. It was approved unanimously.

4. Dr. Thomas Gallant presented the proposal to establish a new 3/2 program in History. Dr. Gallant provided the context - a desire to serve students who wish more advanced study but not the Ph.D. - for positions in government service, industry, etc. Many job opportunities specify the master's as the credential for entry-level positions. Thus, this is a student-driven program.

Financial aid is not a concern, for three reasons: (1) University of Florida undergraduates tend to be on their own funds already, (2) History MA students are not currently funded, and (3) competing schools do not offer financial aid to MA students.

The Council noted that a 3.0 GPA for admission seems low, but Dr. Gallant pointed out that it was no guarantee of admission. The Council specified that the minimum GPA be 3.25, and the program proposal, as amended, passed unanimously.

5. Dr. Tom Spreen and Dr. Patrick Byrne presented the request to change the name of the Master of Agricultural Management and Resource Development (MAMRD) degree to the Master of Agribusiness (MAB). The program has eroded over time and private sector demand has grown substantially. The intent is to convert the degree from an economics degree with a specialization to a true agribusiness degree. Dr. Spreen indicated that the College of Business Administration has examined the program and has no problem with it.

A question was raised as to why the degree is limited to Food and Resource Economics and is not a college-wide degree. In response, Dr. Spreen indicated that other departments in the College of Agriculture tend to emphasize production rather than marketing and finance, which FRE emphasizes.

The proposal was approved unanimously, subject to receipt of a signoff from the College of Business Administration.

6. Dr. Myrna Courage presented the request from the College of Nursing for an accelerated Master's of Science in Nursing degree. There is a national need for baccalaureate and master's trained RNs. Since the program is similar to a 3/2 program, the Council raised a question regarding the proposed 2.8 minimum GPA. Dr. Courage explained that this is a much different student population; they are very good students, older but highly motivated. They are also better prepared than regular baccalaureate students to accelerate (due to their clinical experience and judgment). The GPA reflects admissions standards in the college in general.

The Council asked Dr. Courage to submit a revised proposal that includes the rationale regarding the quality of student group (as above) and a minimum GPA of 3.0.

7. Dr. Craig Wood presented the J.D./Ph.D. program between the College of Education and College of Law. The Council expressed concern about the small numbers of anticipated students (no more than 6 students at a time) relative to Board of Regents guidelines. Dr. Wood explained that the students will be housed in Educational Leadership, and will not be broken out separately. Therefore, he does not anticipate a BOR problem.

The Council also expressed concerns about degree concurrency. It is intended that the degrees will be awarded simultaneously. Experience with other joint J.D./graduate programs has shown that dissertation should be done, or nearly so, before the J.D. is granted, or students tend not to complete the graduate portion of the degree. The Council advised specifying degree concurrency more explicitly.

The Council requested a sample curriculum as well as incorporation of the content of Dr. Wood's October 13 letter into a revised proposal to be reconsidered at the next meeting.

8. Dr. Michael Scicchitano presented the proposal from Political Science requesting two changes related to its Certificate Program in Public Administration: (1) changing the name from **Public Administration** to **Public Affairs** and (2) increasing the number of credit hours. The current program requires 36 credit hours of course work plus 3 hours of internship. Under the revised curriculum, 39 hours of course work plus 3 hours of internship will be required. The Graduate Council approved the changes unanimously.
9. The proposal from the Graduate Coordinators' Advisory Council to establish a **Fresh Start** policy regarding the computation of graduate students' GPAs was tabled. The Council requested a peer analysis of similar policies at other institutions, similar to that provided for the Period of Concentrated Study discussion item, which also was tabled.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:49 p.m.