

MSEPD Council

Meeting December 16, 2010, WH 1013

Members present: Anne Stinson, Liesl Hohenshell, Ann Ruff, Virginia Pease, Edric Johnson, Steven Albrechtsen, John Zbikowski (Chair), Eileen Schroeder, Matt Vick, Rick Mason, Wallace Sherlock, Ellie Dickmann, and Kelly Witte.

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. and the following notes coincide with the numbering of the Agenda:

1. The agenda was approved on a Stinson/Schroeder motion.
2. Minutes of the meeting on November 18 were approved on a Schroeder/Stinson motion.
3. Specially designed core courses, including EDFOUND 780 for Health, Human Performance, and Recreation and Reading emphases as described in the MSE-PD Program Comparison: Alignment of Core Courses Chart handout was approved on a Ruff/Mason motion. Specifically, it was the understanding of this document that HHPR continue as in the past without a new course being proposed or approved and that reading courses continue as in the past when reading was a separate program and not an emphasis area.

The following comments and questions transpired during the discussion:

Could students who were not in the specific programs for whom the courses were designed participate? YES because there are no restrictions against non-reading or non-HHPR taking the specially designed courses. In addition, it was recommended that the rotations be revisited. Specifically, space for students not in the cohort are available only on a left over basis and this affects how the rotations should be decided.

4. On the issues of the capstone project – its definition, seminar and course sequence a survey was administered to the five students who presented their capstone projects this semester (December 14, 2010) to faculty and other students. A summary of these results indicated that the major problem was in the area of working with the advisors. A suggestion that appeared to garner support was to block the last two classes in the capstone sequence having the same professor teach both and thus shepherd the MSE-PD students through the capstone process and have final responsibility for the grade. Another area of discussion was what the capstone should be. Some of the options seem to be the 5-chapter model, portfolio that consists mostly of three unrelated papers, thesis, journal article submitted, and possibly preparation for the National Board Certification. Although no formal action was taken it was agreed to allow Edric to move forward with his definition of the capstone project, which is based on the Western Michigan model, and stated in his syllabus. It also was noted that the on-line and face to face classes be more similar and continue the emphasis of research, practice and voice as the major components of the capstone using hands-on-data.

- 5 Liesl presented up-dates on the tracking system that she developed and although much appreciation was expressed regarding her work, it was decided not to present it to the faculty at the Spring Retreat as had been suggested earlier. It was felt that the capstone needed to be fully developed prior to initiating the tracking system with faculty. In addition, it was noted that Reading and HHPR were not needed in the tracking system. The discussion concluded with Associate Dean Ellie Dickmann requesting a timeline for the development of these items.
- 6 A discussion of the review procedure for graduate students who elicit concerns was tabled.
- 7 The schedule for next semester will continue the same as fall with meetings occurring on the third Thursday of the month with the next meeting scheduled for January 20, 2011 at 9:00 in WH 1013. The main agenda item will be the timetable for the rest of spring semester.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30