Proposed Name Change for Inquiry Methodology Degrees

Current name: Inquiry Methodology

Proposed name: Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methodology

On 24 September 2020, the faculty of Inquiry Methodology voted unanimously to change the name of the PhD to Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methodology. This change was approved by the faculty of the Counseling and Educational Psychology Department on 4 November 2021.

This change was motivated by three key factors:

1. The new name better aligns with national norms for degree programs in research methods. For example, UIUC’s program is called Quantitative and Qualitative Methodology, Measurement, and Evaluation; UGA’s programs are called Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methodologies and Quantitative Methodology; UCLA’s program is called Social Research Methodology; and University of Texas-Austin calls their program Quantitative Methods.

2. The current name is very difficult for to find using typical web search terms associated with similar programs such as “research methods,” “research methodology,” “qualitative research methods,” and so on. Aligning the degree name with more typical terms should make it much easier for prospective applicants to find using a blind search with the usual terms.

3. Finally, we chose “Methodology” over “Methods” to recognize the historical development of the program and to also respect that the aim of the program is the study of methods as a discipline.
Hi both,

Attached is the proposal, the BOT coversheet, and the ICHE template – all completed except for “II. Implementation” in the BOT coversheet where we are supposed to have number projections. I’ll need help from GSO with that.

I am also attaching the rationale for the program name change. I’ve done the online form for the Y599 (thesis credits) development. The vote on both of those are:

1. Program name change: 23 of 26 voted in favor; 2 on sabbatical, 1 did not vote.
2. Y599: 23 of 26 voted in favor; 2 on sabbatical, 1 did not vote.

Otherwise, please let me know if there are questions.

Thanks!
Leslie
I. Voting Items

A. Review of Minutes
- Lynn moved to accept the minutes.
- Danielle seconded.
- 7 in favor.

B. New Course A676: (Janet Decker)
- Janet explained that the motivation behind creating a new course is so that students, particularly those in the exceptional needs licensure program, may benefit from the distinctive content of both Janet’s and Sandy’s syllabi. Currently taught under A675, Sandy’s version focuses on special education law, and Janet’s version support students becoming special education directors. A new course number would distinguish the course content and allow students to take both courses if interested.
- Lynn asked about the limited number of course sessions, and Janet shared that these are intensive sessions with substantial student work completed in between.
- Leslie moved to accept the new course.
- Marjorie T. seconded.
- 8 in favor.

C. Inquiry Methodology Program Name Change (Leslie Rutkowski)
- Leslie explained that “Inquiry Methodology” is not a commonly used designation for a research methodology, and therefore those School of Education programs are not easily found by prospective students. Leslie stated that the program area also wanted both “qualitative” and “quantitative” interests to be reflected in the name, as well as “methodology” as opposed to “methods” to reflect the institutional history and work of Ginette Delandshere to build an integrated program area. Therefore, the proposed name change is: “Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methodology.”
- Marjorie M. moved to accept the title change.
- Lynn seconded.
- 7 in favor.

D. Y599 & Thesis Credit Course Development (Leslie Rutkowski)
- Leslie explained that the faculty were in favor of creating an optional thesis with associated credits in the form of a 599 course. There would be no syllabus associated with that course, but the thesis would be determined between the advisor and student.
- Matt noted that he had not received the Y599 Carmin document as of yet, but will follow up with CEP to obtain that document.
- Leslie C. asked to confirm that the master’s degree would total 31-34 credits. Leslie R. stated those totals are accurate for the non-thesis option. Other variability would include the Y500 lab
component which would alter those totals by one credit. Leslie C. also asked to confirm that the capstone project is optional as well, and Leslie R. agreed.

Since the Y599 Carmin document was not available at the meeting, GSC will vote by email.

E. New Program: MSEd in Qualitative & Quantitative Research Methodology (Leslie Rutkowski)

Leslie C. asked if students currently in the Inquiry Methodology Learning and Developmental Sciences (LDS) track will transition into this new master’s program or complete their original plan. Leslie R. stated that would be each individual student’s choice.

Matt asked if the department envisioned running both of those programs concurrently, and Leslie R. shared that the department had a preliminary discussion on this topic. The general sense is that the department will eventually retire the LDS master’s track and offer only the new master’s degree proposed here. More departmental discussion is needed.

Leslie C. moved to accept the new program.

Marjorie M. and Marjorie T. seconded.

8 in favor.

II. Discussion Items

A. Student fellowships: Increase minimum recruitment fellowships to more than $500 (Sarah Lubienski)

Sarah shared that there are issues with recruitment fellowship amounts, as low amounts are typically not significant enough to sway students’ enrollment decisions. Sarah recommended that there be a minimum recruitment fellowship amount of $1000.

Matt added that because the $500 awards were not significant enough to sway student decisions, the awards have often been reoffered throughout the summer and into the fall semester.

B. Faculty Fellowships: Sarah explained that our recruitment fellowship amounts have not increased in almost a decade, and she would like to gradually increase these amounts over the next few years to be more competitive. Sarah is exploring the idea of increasing the Faculty Fellowship (now 17K/yr) and the SoE Fellowship (now 19K) recruitment fellowships by $1000 each (Sarah Lubienski)

Lynn asked if the fee remission amount would be revisited as well, as part of the fellowship packages. Sarah said no, and Jodi confirmed that these fellowship recipients are already at 24 credits per year, and UGS fellowship recipients are at 30 per year.

Marjorie T. recommended that there be a percentage increase periodically to omit the need for future discussions. Sarah agreed that it could be beneficial to raise them a small amount over multiple years, noting that significant increases could undermine current students’ perceptions of their fellowship awards.

C. Article Dissertation Guidelines (Sarah Lubienski)

Relevant links:


Sarah mentioned that she occasionally receives requests for more guidance about expectations for multi-article dissertations. UGS has dissertation guidelines, but they deal more with document formatting rather than the specifics of dissertation content. The UGS Bulletin does note that multi-article dissertations are acceptable, but must show coherence as a whole. This topic is a continuation of the discussions that Associate Dean Y. Barry Chung initiated in the 2017-18 academic year.

Lynn shared that Counseling Psychology has already been using a two-chapter dissertation organization, using an integrated literature review and an empirical piece, which has been accepted by UGS. Lynn noted that the program has a short set of guidelines to explain that format to students, so there is precedence in the School for dissertation guidelines.
Lucy L. noted it would be useful to have guidelines to create parameters within what UGS will accept, so that faculty can more explicitly advise students at the outset of their process. Lynn shared the Counseling Psychology guidelines document and confirmed that at least 10 dissertations have been accepted using this format. Sarah mentioned that those guidelines do not have an introduction and conclusion listed, which would be helpful to have included, given that UGS notes in the bulletin that a multi-article dissertation must have coherence. Lynn recommended that these guidelines be updated to include those as required components. Lucy L. recommended that the School have a working document that could be provided to departments for feedback.

Sarah brought up the issue of authorship. Lynn shared that most often students are solo author, but some dissertation chapters have been book chapters with the student listed as first author, which may not be ideal. Marjorie M. shared that their students always use sole-author work and added that multiple author work in a dissertation seems to suggest a lack of generosity of the faculty part – that faculty contributing to student work is still the students’ own work. Hannah noted that faculty contributions can be quite heavy, however. Sarah confirmed that often in grant-funded fields, the advisor has gone through years of design revision and grant acquisition, and students do a dissertation in that pre-existing setting. Sarah shared that she believes the student should be first or sole author on every chapter of the dissertation. It would be helpful to have the contributions of each author explained in the dissertation.

Sarah confirmed that she would draft a set of guidelines and bring them back for feedback from GSC.

D. Admission Update (Matt Boots)

Matt gave a brief update about student applications up to this point. He shared that admission seemed about 100 applications behind last year’s totals, but that number likely isn’t entirely accurate because of program deadlines the previous day and Gems needing a few days to process those application before they are visible to the Admissions Office. He estimated that the final numbers will probably be a little off from last year’s totals but better than two years ago.

E. GSC Charges (Sarah Lubienski)

Sarah reminded GSC that the committee needs to review the charges to ensure those items are completed during the academic year and reported to Policy Council.

i. Charge 1: Consider the impact of policies and practices implemented this year, including annual review and early priority funding deadline for Ph.D. students.
   ➢ [scheduled for March]

ii. Charge 2: Follow up on graduate student leave of absence policy (currently on hold at campus’ request, given potential discussion of a campus-wide LOA policy.)
   ➢ [on hold, waiting for campus-wide policy]

iii. Charge 3: Given the growing number of online programs, engage in big-picture discussions about enrollment trends, sustainability, and the appropriate balance of various program types in our SoE (e.g., online vs. face-to-face, Ed.D. vs. Ph.D., etc.)
   ➢ [should be addressed in spring]

iv. Charge 4: Explore ways to help educate the faculty at large about what OCAP actually is and how it affects us.
   ➢ [Sarah presented at the Fall Faculty meeting about this.]