

March 18, 2002

Room 158 Norman Hall

Members Present: Dick Allington, Phil Clark, Vivian Correa, Bridget Franks, David Honeyman, Hazel Jones, Max Parker, Tina Smith-Bonahue, Stephen Smith (Chair), Jane Townsend

Members Absent: Joe Wittmer

Others Present: Rod Webb, John Kranzler

Stephen Smith called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

Action Items

1. Approval of the agenda for March 18, 2002

Allington moved and Jones seconded to approve the agenda as submitted by Smith. The FPC unanimously approved the agenda as submitted.

2. Approval of the Minutes of February 18, 2002

Modifications to the minutes were discussed: (a) Page 2, Section 5. "Article li" should read "Article II". (b) Page 3, #4a. this should read, "...the graduate school and (not land)". It was recommended that if a FPC member asked an alternate member to attend the FPC meeting, the FPC member who not be recorded as being absent. Instead, the alternate would be named as substituting for the FPC member. A notation was made that Lamont Flowers had attended as an alternate for David Honeyman at the February 18th meeting; therefore David Honeyman would not be recorded as being absent.

Clark moved and Honeyman seconded to approve the minutes of February 18, 2002 as modified. The FPC unanimously voted to approve the minutes as modified.

Discussion Item

1. Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee

Smith reported that recommendations regarding the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee were emailed to all faculty. The department chairs were to respond to Smith on behalf of their departments. At this point, three departments have met with their faculty. The departments of Special Education and Educational

Leadership, along with the School of Teaching and Learning are in general agreement of the proposed policy.

Smith opened the floor for discussion regarding the admissions item. Smith distributed a handout discussing the current admissions requirements of the UF Graduate School and current COE procedures. Considerations would include:

- Departments might need to develop additional administrative procedures related to admissions (e.g., sending materials to the Graduate School).
- 10% of all admissions may have one or both exceptions.
- Departments can make "Masters Only Admissions." In other cases, departments may admit students conditionally (e.g., no grades of "Incomplete," maintaining a GPA of 3.0 or above over the first two semesters of coursework).

Honeyman suggested that we not only consider the M.Ed. issue in the discussion, but also admissions for the Ed.S. degree. Clark questioned the purpose of the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee. Was the committee a checks and balances system for the COE, an artifact of an old COE policy, or a system put in place because there was a lack of trust towards departmental admissions? Webb noted that it might be necessary to consider how the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee could be improved to function better as a college committee.

Kranzler explained the differences between the two types of exemptions. Currently, the college committee reviews both single and double exceptions. Single exceptions (those students with GPAs between 2.5 and 2.9 or GREs between 950 to 1000) are admitted by the College. Double exceptions (those students with both GPAs below 3.0 and GREs below 1000) must be forwarded to the Graduate school for final admission. Some small colleges at UF do not have an college-level Admissions and Petitions committees, but most of the colleges across the campus that are the size of the COE do have a college level checks and balances admissions' system.

Two issues are at hand. (1) Should the Admissions and Petitions Committee exist as it currently does? and (2) Should the GRE requirement be discontinued in the cases of master's or education specialists' degrees only?

Kranzler stated that one problem with the departments admitting students is that the departments do not currently have access to a Dean's graduate admissions NERDC screen. **All** departments in the college would have to agree to take sole

responsibility for admitting graduate students in order for a new procedure to work properly. Each department would need to follow the university's Graduate Policy Manual steps for admission. To transfer the Dean's screen to the departments would not be a problem, however, the departments would have to assume the responsibility of admitting single exceptions and providing the Graduate School with the necessary information regarding double exceptions and any "conditional" admissions requirements.

Webb stated that it is important to consider the College rankings (e.g., *U. S. News and World Report*). Many of the rankings in the national publications are based on GRE scores, GPAs, and where our graduates choose employment.

Kranzler reported that master's degree data were not incorporated in the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. He stated that he has data regarding GRE scores and COE rankings. He also stated that the Admissions and Petitions Committee does currently serve as a quality control committee.

Smith-Bonahue reported the current system adds another layer to the admissions' process. Some faculty have to take extra time to write letters of justification to the college's committee and students are often required to appear in front of both department and college committees to plead their case. The process may disenfranchise both students and faculty. Furthermore, the process could take the onus of responsibility away from the department, especially in cases where the department is willing to admit a student and the college committee does not support the petition. Some FPC members felt that the college committee assists the department in denying students who were not of high quality. Other FPC members felt that the responsibility of denying student admissions should be on the departments not the college committee. Clark requested that the FPC discuss the possibility of the Admissions and Petitions Committee becoming solely a "due process" or appeals committee at the next meeting.

Smith stated that this issue would be a discussion item at the FPC's next meeting on April 1, 2002. Following this discussion, the issue will become an action item and the FPC may be able to vote on the item.

Adjournment

Allington moved and Clark seconded to adjourn the meeting. The FPC voted unanimously to adjourn at 11:04 a.m.