Approval of Certificate Committee Recommendations

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the Certificate Committee’s recommendations as noted in the committee’s November 11, 2000 and March 7, 2001 memos.

From November 11, 2000 memo:

Approval of certificate programs, which desire to appear on transcripts, will follow the same guidelines as other program development and approval.

From March 7, 2001 memo:

Proposed programs with less than twelve hours required hours demonstrate in a clear manner the reason that the program should be considered as an exception to the rule and that the justification has the strong endorsement of the proposing department and college.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Richard L. Carlson
Speaker, The Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Certificate Committee Recommendations

During the APC meeting of April 11, 2001 a revised recommendation from the Certificate Committee was presented. The revised recommendation was to amend the 12 hour suggested minimum requirement and permit the approval of certificate programs with less than 12 hours for state, national, and professional society programs that would not always meet the minimum required 12 hours. These exception certificate programs would be required to be widely known and respected as solid programs.

The Certificate Committee recommendation stated that it would be necessary that proposed certificate programs with fewer than 12 hours demonstrate in a clear manner the reason that the program should be considered as an exception to the rule and that the justification has the strong endorsement of the proposing department and college.

The provision for exceptional programs with fewer than 12 hours has met with the approval of the Academic Operations Committee (AOC), the Graduate Council (GC) and Academic Program Council (APC). During the APC meeting of April 11, 2001 it was agreed that the Certificate Committee recommendations as outlined in the attached November 11, 2000 memo and the March 7, 2001 memo be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for endorsement before the approval process is implemented. Therefore, I ask that you place the topic on an Executive Committee agenda for discussion. If after consideration by the Executive Committee, it is determined that the full Senate should consider this issue, please place it on a Faculty Senate agenda at the earliest possible time.

Ronald G. Douglas
Executive Vice President
and Provost

RGD:dls
Attachments

cc: Dr. Mark H. Weichold
Dr. J. Richard Giardino
7 March 2001

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ronald G. Douglas, Executive Vice President and Provost

SUBJECT: Revised Certificate Committee Recommendations

A discussion at the APC meeting in February regarding the Certificate Committee Recommendations pointed out concerns having to do with there being no minimum number of hours required for a certificate program in order for that program to be designated on a University transcript. There was a general feeling in the discussion that something on the order of a twelve hour minimum would be appropriate.

This feedback was provided to the Certificate Committee and its response, while not unanimous, concurred with the suggestion that a twelve hour minimum would be appropriate. Following the endorsement of the Certificate Committee, the matter was presented to the AOC and to the GC. At the AOC discussion, it was pointed out that there may be widely recognized certificate programs (state, national, professional society, etc.) that would not always meet the minimum required twelve hours. Yet, these certificate programs would be widely known and respected as solid programs. Thus, the suggestion was made to amend the twelve hour minimum requirement and permit the approval of certificate programs with less than twelve hours for programs as those above. It would be necessary that proposed certificate programs with fewer than twelve required hours demonstrate in a clear manner the reason that the program should be considered as an exception to the rule and that the justification has the strong endorsement of the proposing department and college. The provision for exceptional programs with fewer than twelve hours also met with the approval of the GC.

This memo solicits your approval to notify appropriate groups of the approval process outlined in our previous memo of 11 November 2000 with the added provision that the proposed certificate program contain a minimum of twelve hours unless sufficient justification is provided to warrant an exception.

John R. Giardino   Mark H. Weichold
Co-Chair           Co-Chair

cc: Richard E. Ewing
    Certificate Committee:
    Christine Adamson
    Donald D. Carter
    Stephen C. Crouse
    Kenn E. Harding
    Charles F. Herman
    Linda F. Lacey
    David W. Reed
    Elizabeth D. Tebeaux
    Karan L. Watson
    Ward V. Wells
    Matthew P. Wilkins
MEMORANDUM

November 11, 2000

TO: Ronald G. Douglas
Executive Vice President and Provost

SUBJECT: Certificate Committee Recommendations

At your direction we convened a committee to investigate the need for an approval process for certificate programs. We served as co-chairs for the committee (membership attached) to evaluate the need for input/direction for such developments. Texas A&M University has been exploring expanded development of certificate programs at the graduate level; however, increased interest in undergraduate certificates is developing and will be an area of increased activity in the near future. The committee has developed a proposed process for certificate program approval.

Certification at the national level is a growth area for graduate education today and into the future. We also believe that there is an opportunity for the development of undergraduate certification. The certificate committee has held one meeting and it is clear that all in attendance understand the importance of offering such opportunities for our students. It also is apparent that many times students participate in such programs in order to see these certificates listed on their transcripts. Furthermore, there is agreement that it is necessary to ensure standards for certificate programs, which may be noted on a transcript.

It is the opinion of this committee that approval for a certificate programs that wish to be eligible for transcript notation should follow current university processes. That is, for undergraduate programs, the approval process will track from the department/college to the University Curriculum Committee, to the Faculty Senate, and finally to the President. For graduate programs, the process will track from departments/colleges to the Graduate Council, to the Faculty Senate, and finally to the President.

It is the opinion of this committee that following such processes will ensure quality and credibility. The committee also recommends that because of the dynamic structure and discipline specific nature of certificate programs, there is no need to have University-level minimum requirements. It was the belief that the review process would ensure that the programs would be based on quality.

With your approval, we will notify the necessary groups that approval of certificate programs, which desire to appear on transcripts, will follow the same guidelines as other program development and approval.

Please let us know if you need additional information. We thank you for the opportunity to co-chair this committee and look forward to helping implement this important educational aspect for the University.

John R. Giardino
Co-Chair

Mark H. Weichold
Co-Chair

Pc. Richard Ewing

Certificate Committee
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Stephen C. Crouse, Graduate Council Representative
Kenn E. Harding, Faculty Senate Representative
Charles F. Herman, Graduate Council Representative
Linda F. Lacey, Admissions
David W. Reed, Graduate Council Representative
Elizabeth D. Tebeaux, Distance Education
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Ward V. Wells, Graduate Operations Committee Representative
Matthew P. Wilkins, President, Graduate Student Council