

AGENDA
For
UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COUNCIL

Wednesday, Nov. 5, 2014

8:00 – 9:25 a.m.

ABB 138

Opening – 8:05 a.m.

Approval of Minutes – Oct. 22, 2014

Announcements

- Information on active versus inactive graduate committee status (Brown)
- 3-minute video and student profiles (Hoo)
- Revised forms; Graduation Application and Change in Graduate Status

Old Business

- Curriculum Committee (Miles, LeCain, Lipfert, Babbitt)
Draft of procedures to review Level II proposals
- Doctoral 12 credit requirement beyond master's degree, policy proposal (Cerretti)
- Exam-Degree Completion, policy proposal (Cerretti)
- Level II PhD in Psychology revised proposal – Dr. Keith Hutchison, Dept. Chair
- Grad faculty status of NTT, affiliate faculty on graduate committees (Hoo)

New Business

- Age of Courses, policy proposal (Cerretti)
- Minimum grade on a Program of Study (Cerretti)

Policy and Procedures Committee (Borkowski, Bangert, Shreffler-Grant,)

- Ph.D. Enhancement Award

Governance Committee (Dyer, Codd, Christensen)

- By-laws modification

End: 9:25 a.m.

Next scheduled meeting – Wednesday, Nov. 19, 2014 8:00 – 9:25 in SUB 235

University Graduate Council
Curriculum Committee Sub-Group

Dear University Graduate Council,

Thank you for your very helpful review of our Ph.D. proposal in Psychological Science. We greatly appreciate the constructive feedback and believe it strengthened this proposal and improved its likelihood of acceptance by other levels of administration. As you will see, we have incorporated the suggested changes into the revision. In some cases, this meant clarifying vague terminology or missing or incorrect information from the previous version.

We will discuss how we addressed each of the *concerns/suggestions* in greater detail below in order. In addition, we highlighted the areas within the proposal that specifically address these concerns. We've also included three appendices, described below, that help address these concerns and a fourth appendix illustrating the broad support for our proposed program among MSU faculty campus-wide.

We feel this version is much improved and we hope you agree. We look forward to your decision.

Sincerely,



--Keith Hutchison, Psychology Department Chair

1. Differentiate in the proposal both the pedagogic and structural differences between the current M.S. degree and the proposed Ph.D. program. It is unclear on section 3B, (p.4 of 13) and 4B, (p.5 of 13) if the M.S. program will remain a robust stand-alone degree program or will essentially be subsumed into the proposed Ph.D. program.

Thank you for pointing this out. Yes, the language in the previous version was incorrect and we can certainly see where the confusion arose, because we had said in section 4B that the M.S. program will continue. That was never our intention. We have been very careful in the revision to explicitly state that the Ph.D. program will replace the current M.S. program (Section 4B). As stated in this section, our previous M.S. program was modelled after the first two years of a Ph.D. program so the coursework, procedures, and goals are already in place. One potential reason for the confusion is the anticipated transition year from the M.S. program to Ph.D. program. This is now described in detail in section 5B. Specifically, we anticipate accepting 6 students into our M.S. program during spring 2015 and 5 students into our Ph.D. program spring 2016. Thus, the two programs will co-exist for one year. This is necessary to avoid losing the necessary GTA support for our courses. We do not anticipate any problem with the 1-year overlap, because, as we stated above, our M.S. program is already modeled after the first two years of a Ph.D. program. As a side note, there was also a typo in the previous version that 3% of our M.S. students apply to Ph.D. programs upon graduation. The actual number is nearly 70%, not 3%.

2. Consider Broadening the reach of the program by taking advantage of the interdisciplinary resources available on campus. Of concern is the lack of new coursework that has been developed for the Ph.D. program. One suggestion would be to take advantage of EDLD 530 – College Teaching in lieu of the

proposed PSYX 505 course. In this way, 505 could be restructured to contain a greater degree of discipline specific material. Other areas within the University, including the biosciences, should be considered as course opportunities for the program. The committee believes that this interdisciplinarity will aid in advancing the area of 'Integration' contained within the strategic plan of Montana State University.

In regard to the sentences 1, 4, and 5 in comment # 2, we have followed the UGC's suggestion and identified a list of potential courses outside of the Psychology Department. Students, with approval of their mentoring committee, will have the option of taking grad courses outside of Psychology. A sample of potentially applicable courses is listed at the bottom of Appendix B. The wide range of courses reflects the broad interdisciplinary reach of psychology. Thus, the choice of outside class or classes will depend on the student's particular focus within the program.

In regard to the second sentence in comment # 2, we take full responsibility for this misunderstanding because we did not list all our existing courses in the original proposal. This has been fixed, as our 9 currently offered courses and 2 additional proposed courses are now listed in Appendix B. We believe these 11 graduate courses within psychology exceed of the number of doctoral courses offered by most Ph.D. programs on campus. As described in Section 4B, 8/10 of our current faculty have already taught a graduate course. This is because our entire faculty are heavily invested in both undergraduate and graduate education and are encouraged to teach in both programs. What this means for our current M.S. program is that each cohort of students receives slightly over ½ of our Psychology graduate content courses plus the 2 research methods courses, with many faculty teaching their graduate course every 2nd or 3rd year. The excess of existing courses, the two additional proposed courses, and the available outside courses will be ideal for the Ph.D. program (see Ph.D. curriculum sequence in Section 5A).

Finally, in regard to the third sentence in comment # 2, we believe that EDLD 530 is designed for a different audience of graduate students that are training to be Adult Education professionals. As stated in the catalog, EDLD 530 "*...will study the literature, strategies, and practices involved in delivering post-secondary education at a distance.*" Our proposed Ph.D. program is research focused with a lesser emphasis on instructional practice and issues of distance learning. The proposed 1 credit PSYX 505 course will provide our students with *discipline-specific* training in the teaching of psychology. The PSYX 505 course is designed to support the career advancement for our psychology students planning to pursue academic research positions that may potentially involve some secondary instructional expectation. The differences between the two courses are summarized below.

- Objectives:
 - The PSYX 505 course is designed to provide practical training in selecting, organizing and presenting curricula in Psychological Science. EDLD 530 appears to have broader and more diverse learning objectives, which are not consistent with the research focus of our Psychology Ph.D. program.
- Audience:
 - EDLD 530 is designed for "Higher, Continuing, and Adult Education professionals..." (MSU catalog). Our graduate program in Psychological Science will recruit students that are primarily interested in becoming scientists. Our programs have different foci and goals.

- Availability:
 - The EDLD course is offered “On Demand” and designed as a blended course (in person and online). The future availability of “On Demand” courses is uncertain, making the integration of this course into our required curriculum untenable. According to the Fall 2014 schedule, EDLD 505 meets on Saturdays 9 am – 4 pm and Fridays 5-8 pm, with some parts of the course offered online. This scheduling appears to be designed to accommodate non-traditional working students needing to complete coursework during non-working hours and weekends. The Psychology Ph.D. program is more traditional in how the coursework is delivered. Accommodating this type of non-traditional weekend and distance coursework would represent a scheduling challenge for our program.
- Integration into Planned Curriculum:
 - Requiring our Psychology Ph.D. students to take EDLD 530 would add an additional 3 credits to an already demanding coursework plan. We believe this is unnecessary given the focus of our graduate program. Our review of peer Psychology Ph.D. programs indicated that requiring external Adult Education coursework beyond what is embedded in the departmental offerings is not standard.

Having said this, we acknowledge that EDLD 530 is a helpful class for students training specifically to be Adult Education professionals. For this reason, we plan to make this course optional to our students.

3. Consider specifying an option for students to receive a graduate certificate in college teaching. This would require students to take an additional 6 credits beyond the requirements of the Ph.D. program.

We agree that teaching is an important and marketable component of graduate education in psychology, and that students would benefit from teaching experience. However, obtaining an additional graduate certificate in college teaching is not the norm in our field and likely would not position students to be more marketable than they would be with the standard experience they will gain as GTAs and NTT instructors. Although not officially specified as part of our proposed program, interested students can pursue this option.

4. Consider a benchmarking study of the proposed program with other Psychological Science doctoral programs in the United States and Canada. This may be done internally or through consulting an external review panel to assess the need, design, and plans for the program. It is unclear how this program compares with other peer Ph.D. program.

This was a fantastic idea. In fact we did bring in an external review committee that consisted of prominent leaders within our field from Psychology doctorate-granting departments. The stated purpose of the review was to review our existing undergraduate and graduate programs. However, as stated by the review committee, “Because the [department’s] specific goals and objectives are contingent upon the decision to launch (or not launch) a doctoral program, the review team thought it important to devote a major section of our report to this question.” In particular, the report focused on “strengths and fit” of a Psychological Science Ph.D. program for both the department and university and on “resources required” to develop a competitive program. Following the UGC’s advice, we have incorporated this information into Sections 6A and Section 8 of our proposal. In addition, as described in

Section 8, even before the program review, our Ph.D. program idea was structured after our experience with successful Ph.D. programs and investigations into similar Psychological Science programs at Idaho State, Utah State, and the University of North Dakota. Finally, in section 3C we describe acceptance rates and enrollment and in Section 7 we describe assessment outcomes from peer Ph.D. programs.

5. Delineate the degree of support within the department for this proposed program and how resources and faculty will be distributed to both the M.S. and Ph.D. programs. While the level of faculty research is articulated in several locations it is unclear how the department will distribute resources and faculty to the various programs in the department.

The Ph.D. has unanimous support within the Psychology program and all faculty will be actively involved in this program, as they have been in the M.S. program. This is a very good question, as we are aware of some programs with differential faculty involvement in undergraduate and graduate programs. We believe our full faculty commitment is a strength of our program and, as such, should be highlighted in the proposal. We have therefore modified Section 4A to explain both past faculty commitment and participation in the M.S. program and future commitment to the Ph.D. program. The second half of comment # 5 is based upon the misunderstanding, addressed in response to comment # 1, that we will actually be maintaining both the M.S. and Ph.D. program (we are not).

6. Expand on the implementation strategy to achieve the student number goals of the proposal. Specifically, how will the program increase student numbers within the financial support information provided in the proposal? It is unclear in section 5B, (p.9-10 of 13) and 6A&B, (p. 10-12 of 13) if all students will be fully supported and whether these students will be supported through GRA positions and faculty grants or GTA positions through tuition remission funding.

Thank you for pointing out that our implementation strategy was unclear. Our department has spent several meetings discussing our planned implementation strategy. The basic tenet is the understanding that a successful Ph.D. program constantly seeks external funding to support GRAs, rather than relying solely on GTA stipends and tuition remission from its own university. We are indeed committed to growing our program through GRA support and have described this commitment and strategy in section 6B. In addition to traditional NSF/NIH submissions, we will strongly pursue additional sources of funding for doctoral students. We have explored possible alternative sources of funding and have included them in Appendix C. We have also included, in Appendix A, a list of collaborators on campus and we are actively pursuing (or plan to pursue) external funding with many of them. Because the amount of funding is uncertain, the best we could do is outline our anticipated enrollment numbers for each of the first four years of our program and beyond, and describe the proportion of students we anticipate to be funded as GTAs vs. GRAs. We believe this is the type of specificity the UGC was asking for.

7. As clarification, the minimum requirement for a Ph.D. with M.S. is 12 credits of coursework and 18-28 credits of dissertation beyond the Master's degree. Section 5A, (p. 7 of 13) indicates that 10 credits of coursework must be beyond the Master's degree.

Thank you for pointing out our mistake. This has been corrected.