

GRADUATE COUNCIL
MEETING AGENDA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2016
3:00 P.M. – 4:30 P.M.
CATHEDRAL ROOM - MOUNTAINLAIR

- I. Review minutes from August 25, 2016. **Approved.**
- II. Proposals – Please review the program proposals or changes that you are assigned to listed below. They are all in the CIM Programs system at <https://futurecatalog.wvu.edu/programadmin/>. After signing in, type the key number listed below into the search box to find each proposal.

- A. Program change: Dual Enrollment in Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) and Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and Disorders (Key 733)
1. Reviewers: Megan Dillow, Daniel Panaccione, Michelle Sandrey, Grazyna Szklarz, Steve Urbanski
 2. Note: Dual enrollment in a professional and doctoral degree program is allowed under current catalog rules. This proposal will allow listing of this combination as an approved dual degree program.
Approved pending the changes below. Katherine Karraker will communicate with the author of the proposal and make the changes before approving the proposal.

Make it clearer/more explicit that it's an OPTION not a requirement for students wanting to enroll in one or the other. Be more explicit if they are only expecting students in AudD to enroll in PhD and not so many in the opposite direction (PhD->AudD.)

- B. Program changes: Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering MS and Ph.D. degrees (Keys 495, 509, 504, 515)
1. Reviewers: Eugenia Pena-Yewtukhiw, Adam Komisaruk, Joshua Weishart, Sharon Hayes, Ashish Nimbarte
 2. Note: These changes are all basically the same, and involve reorganization of technical area courses within these related degree programs.
They have kept the 5-member requirement for graduate committees. All other comments were on features of the program that were not up for approval. Approved.

- C. Program change: Industrial Hygiene MS (Key 505).
1. Reviewers: Gerald Blakely, Victor Mucino, Kevin Daly, Robert Brock, Michelle Costas, Matthew Jacobsmeier, Evan McCarthy, Mary Koay
 2. Note: These changes affect both the total credits for the degree and the options available (coursework only vs. thesis) for completing the degree. There are some inconsistencies in the total credits throughout the proposal, so this proposal should be reviewed carefully.
Explanation was still seen as lacking/unclear. Question was raised about including CITI research training in the description - most programs don't. Questions were raised about the different number of credit hours for each proposed track in this degree program [34 with thesis option includes only 28 credits of coursework], and the variability of credit hours depending on whether the students have taken pre-req biology, etc. There was some discussion about the low completion/graduation rate of students in this program

and that this course-work only option is addressing that issue. Questions were raised about whether students must choose a track upon admittance, and if so would this option really address the issue of retention of students who might be attracted to employment options. Can this be clarified? Can students move between tracks if job offer comes along? Does

Office of Graduate Education and Life

249 Mountainlair
PO Box 6897

Morgantown, WV 26506-6897

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

Phone: 304-293-7173

Fax: 304-293-8657

the accreditation organization approve these changes? Changes were not approved. Katherine will send the proposal back to the program for revisions.

III. Review of the Academic and Professional Standards section of the Graduate Catalog.

A. Please read this section of the catalog

(<http://catalog.wvu.edu/graduate/enrollmentandregistration/>) up through the “Appeals” subsection. This material has been substantially revised in the past 2 years, and is being reviewed again by an ad hoc committee including representatives from a wide variety of campus constituencies. The material must meet BOG and various legal requirements, and must apply to undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. Could you please read it and note any sections or details that you think may require revision? Thanks, Katherine.

Some issues were raised about double jeopardy and setting up an opportunity for more appeals than what is intended in this document. There was also concern about the opportunity for penalties to be aggravated at different levels through appeals.