



USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee:
Graduate Council: Meetings

USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee:
Graduate and Undergraduate Council

11-17-2011

Graduate Council Meeting : 2011 : 11 : 17

Graduate Council

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fac_senate_grad_council_meetings

Scholar Commons Citation

Graduate Council, "Graduate Council Meeting : 2011 : 11 : 17" (2011). *USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: Graduate Council: Meetings*. 26.

https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fac_senate_grad_council_meetings/26

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: Graduate and Undergraduate Council at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: Graduate Council: Meetings by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Minutes
Graduate Council USFSP
Thursday, November 17, 2011
Meeting called to order at 2:03pm

Members Present: Tina Neville – Chair, Kim Stoddard, Lisa Starks-Estes, Katherine Barker, Donna Knudsen (Ex-officio), Veronica Carroll (Graduate student member)

Members Absent: none

- I. Overview of Agenda Items
 - A. Approval of meeting minutes (see attached file and please note the addendum covering the email vote conducted after the last meeting). Thanks to Kate for keeping the minutes for us last time.
 - B. Discussion and vote on the Master's in Psychology
- II. Agenda Items
 - A. The minutes from the October 13, 2011 meeting were reviewed. The addendum to the minutes was discussed explaining the email vote conducted on October 25. Tina Neville moved that the meetings be accepted with the addendum. Lisa Starks-Estes seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.
 - B. The members discussed approval of the MA in Psychology proposal as a whole and the approval of each course to clarify the procedure.

There was discussion of the GRE score requirement and changes in the GRE tests.

The members found typos/noticed discrepancies/expressed questions regarding specific pages and tables listed below. Consider changing or adjusting the following points:

1. Page 1: "Academic Specialty or Field" is blank- should be filled in
2. Table 1-b: is there a discrepancy in the numbers?
3. Page 1: "Total E and G Funding" – the numbers are \$1 off – should be "99,725" not "99,724"
4. Page after Table 4: change the number to reflect the \$1 change
5. The members would like to see a letter from the Dean approving the budget
6. Page 8: fix the spelling of "existing" in "to replace existing faculty's"
7. Table 2: regarding the reallocated base on year 1 – reallocated from where? What does the 50,000 for a new lab include? Members would like to see an itemized list.
8. Page 2: in list "A..B..." change the copyright sign to a "C"
9. Page 7 and 8: the pages look almost the same
10. The proposal is much expanded from the earlier version and the evidence is convincing. Could have more letters of support, but the existing letters are very good.
11. Page 6: There was discussion about the 3-2, 4-1 options students can choose – all agreed the procedure does not have to be spelled out in the proposal.

Do the other FL universities who offer an MA in Psychology have a 3-2, 4-1 option?

Paragraph C: clarify “he contacted them to verify” – was there actually verification? Change verbiage to reflect.

Bottom of page: regarding headcount, FTE projections – if the number of students doubles annually, will the faculty be able to handle the numbers?

There was discussion of verbiage on page 6 “Applicants” will double. A letter from the Dean is important.

12. Page 9: last sentence of last paragraph – “enumerated above” – is it? Consider changing verbiage (Refer to page 1).
Middle of second paragraph – “Area agencies have welcomed” – list the agencies again or refer back to 1d
“In development of this program, we received strong encouragement” – list where the encouragement came from
13. Page 14: regarding the curriculum – some learning outcomes are vague.
Should not use the word “understanding”
ALC’s set up with knowledge-based/critical thinking/civic engagement –there should be SLO’s in each area. SLO’s in civic engagement are no longer necessary – now they want “capstone experience”. Consider having SLO’s formatted and set-up with categories the way they have to be presented – this is a recommendation, not a requirement.
14. Page 15: There was discussion about the 1,000 word admission essay
15. Page 16: There was discussion about the 3.5 GPA. Consider changing the wording to “Preference given to 3.5 GPA”
16. Page 18: There was concern regarding the “summer semester following graduation” –how many students are required for the class to make? Is there concern about offering summer courses? It was agreed that this is up to the Dean and a letter from the Dean would be important.
17. Page 21: more clarification needed – “Examining the possibility of future supervised internships” – add more information
18. Page 25: “Currently, the department does not maintain research offices for graduate students” – are there any plans for that? maybe this statement explains why a lab is needed? Please explain/clarify and consider adding verbiage like “Thus the need for physiological psychology laboratory”
19. Page 26: Clarify plans to seek sites for internship
20. Table 4: “PY” Year 1 doesn’t add to .656, adds to .658
Faculty code A: “existing” – typo
“PY” Year 5 doesn’t add to 1.125, should be 1.127 – the numbers should be changed and reflected in Table 2
21. Grant writing is listed as a skill but there is no grant writing class – should be removed from the list on page 2 if it will not be an offered course
22. There was a concern that Teaching of Psychology is not a course offered
23. Course graph should have a heading
24. No faculty is listed for “Families with Infants and Toddlers”
25. The certificate should be checked to make sure everything is coordinated so all classes are covered

The members will continue reviewing the proposal and discuss at the next meeting which was moved up to allow time for changes.

Next Meeting: December 1, 2:00pm

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm