



CONGRESS

**Monday, November 12, 2018
University Hall Room 215
3:00 pm**

Minutes

Present: Kandace Hinton, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Ryan Donlan, Larry Tinnerman, Amy French, Eric Hampton, Carrie Ball, Chris MacDonald, Shawn Huisinga, Carol Wetherell, Jenna Ford, Kelsey Bogard, Chris Drew, Linda Sperry, Josh Powers

Meeting called to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. Approval of minutes for October 8, 2018 (Donlan/Tinnerman, 7-0-0)
2. New Business: Deaf/Hard of Hearing Licensure Program

C. Wetherell explained that this 6-semester, 7-course licensure program is being proposed in response to a request by the Indiana Department of Education. SPED 661 will have one face-to-face meeting, typically in Indianapolis. Other course requirements will be satisfied online. A practicum will be required. The program was approved (Hampton/Tinnerman, 7-0-0).

3. Old Business - None
4. Faculty Senate Representative Report – None.
5. Dean's Report - None
6. Chair's Report - None
7. Open Discussion
 - a) Dissertation Process - L. Sperry provided a 7-step checklist outlining the dissertation proposal process, from proposal through the point at which a student may begin data collection. The policy is consistent with the procedure outlined by the College of Graduate and Professional Studies (CGPS) and is intended to be supportive of student learning and streamline the review process after the dissertation defense.

1. There continue to be discrepancies in the way committees work prior to and during the proposal stage, and that may impact a student's ability to move through the checklist smoothly. Greater consistency and clarification may be needed to help further streamline the process. There is a CGPS document outlining roles of students, committees, and chairs, which may be helpful.
 2. While everyone is doing what they feel is in the best interest of students, there may not be agreement about what practices are actually in the best interest of students.
 3. Chair leadership is critical, but so is committee involvement. Committee members should be active to support student learning; they may catch things the chair misses and should be free to ask questions.
 4. Clarification: the proposal and proposal approval form should be sent in paper and e-copy versions; IRB approval/exemption forms and Turn-It-In reports may be sent only in e-versions.
 5. This checklist is helpful for dissertation advisors and/or support staff who need to track progress for multiple dissertation.
 6. It may be beneficial to develop a similar checklist for the process following defense.
 7. Students continue to be ignorant about APA style. They need to be taught and held accountable for learning and using it appropriately.
- b) Language for defining committee members – three members, one of whom must be “outside the major area.”
1. There is not universal agreement about what should constitute “outside the major area.” Some people consider it to be someone external to the university (e.g., a practitioner), external to the program (e.g., different area within a department), or external to the department. It may need to be defined differently by each department. It is beneficial to leave it open enough that a content expert can be identified to serve on the committee. If students are completing a degree with a particular specialization, it is unclear whether or not the “outside” member needs to be outside both the degree area and the specialization area.
 2. It may be helpful to have training regarding the existing CGPS policies and procedures.
- c) Idea of a practitioner doctorate – a doctoral degree for individuals who are primarily interested in practitioner roles, rather than scholarly roles.
1. It could right-size the system and meet the needs of many of our students.
 2. Are there other education programs that have something similar? Health fields use a similar model we may be able to draw from.
- d) Merit pay - suggested guidelines to consider for departmental merit pay awards. K. Hinton provided a PowerPoint presentation with a summary of the Faculty Senate guidance and Congress suggestions for an objective point-based system.
1. Can this PowerPoint be shared with Departments to support their efforts?

2. Discussion about the need to consider how instructors/senior instructors and pre-tenure faculty will be incorporated into the model. A two-tiered system that uses a separate process for instructors would be helpful to ensure we do not take advantage of them.
3. There was discussion about how to capture “exceeds” through evidence such as teaching evaluations, and whether dissertation advising could or should count.
4. Can the merit process be optional?
5. Committees will need to identify a process that will work within existing FAD reports to document merit.

Adjournment at 4:06 p.m.

All Congress agendas, meeting dates, minutes, members, and other materials may be viewed at:
<http://www.indstate.edu/education/governance>