Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC)
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, January 18, 2012

Regular Members Present:
Rose Allen (Chair)
Jim Decker (Vice-Chair)
Carol Brown
Hamid Fonooni
Will Forsythe
Ravi Paul
Bob Thompson

Regular Members Absent/Excused:
None

Ex-Officio Members Present:
Linner Griffin
Marc Stevens

Ex-Officio Members Absent/Excused:
None

Academic Program Planning and Development:
Kimberly Nicholson

Guests:
Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences: Dale Knickerbocker, Javier Lorenzo, Heather Ries, and Alan White

Actions of Committee:

I. Call to Order

1. **Report on Graduate Council Actions**
   Chair Allen reported that Appendix F has been revised to include new language pertaining to the GCC. This item will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate on 01-24-12. If approved, the GCC will be expanded to include three new members and the membership recruiting process will change and be initiated by the Graduate Council.

2. **The 12-07-11 GCC minutes were approved electronically and forwarded to the Graduate Council for agenda placement.**
   The 12-07-11 GCC minutes were approved at the 01-09-12 Graduate Council meeting.

II. Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

Notification of Intent to Plan: Master of Arts in Hispanic Studies

GCC recommends this package to move forward in the academic program development process. Below are recommendations made to the unit regarding the NIP and supporting documents.

(1.) If the unit arranges placement opportunities for students, it should be identified if the placement is a paid position. It was noted that just because a placement is considered "engagement" does not mean that it cannot also be a source of external funding.
(2.) Consider evaluation of the curriculum model as a possible source of funding.
(3.) Consider showing an attempt at institutional collaboration (see pg. 5 of Appendix A).
(4.) Consider exploring external funding options through other entities such as the School of Dental Medicine, Brody School of Medicine, and/or Pitt County Memorial Hospital.
(5.) Attempt to establish external ties, as this could be a strong program that can be appreciated both internally and externally.
(6.) Consider replacing […] on pg. 4 of Appendix A with an APA reference.
(7.) The use of students for teaching assistants referenced on pg. 16 of the assessing readiness document is not identified in the budget template.
(8.) Unit identified possibility of paid student positions through grants awarded to other units. They were encouraged to identify this possibility in their budget template and Appendix A as external funding.
(9.) When hearing the presentation and comparing the information to the budget template, it appears the unit has undercut themselves. Examine FT, PT and total student figures in the *State Funding Matrix* section of the budget template.
(10.) Recommend revisiting the *Faculty Salaries* section of the budget template, as only one faculty member is currently identified. Can append a note to address how the new position is funded and "other parts" such as FTE and split time.
(11.) Recommend adjusting *Projected Revenues* table in the *Other Income* section of the budget template to include the course sections the TAs will teach. This will result in the program projecting a positive net figure.
(12.) Currently DE students do not qualify for assistantship funding. The unit is advised to find a way to work through the funding technicalities.
(13.) Unit was advised there is a process to initiate a DE program, in addition to the process required for the initiation of a new program. Appendix F is required following Appendix A and must be in place for one year. Appendix G is required following the RAE. Ms. Karen Summey and Dr. John Connelly can assist in navigating the timeline and DE components.
(14.) Dates cited on pg. 1 of Appendix A will need to be revised.
(15.) It was confirmed that letters of support from organizations planning to offer internships will strengthen the proposal.
(16.) Unit should consider the (SL) designation for some of their courses when they create their curriculum.

(17.) The narrative for budget template and the template itself need to be consistent in regard to the number of assistantships. All numbers in the package should be consistent throughout.
(18.) Revisions of package documents will need to be submitted to the GCC mailbox (gcc@ecu.edu) by close of business Thursday, 02-02-12 in order to be forwarded to the Graduate Council in time for their Executive Committee meeting on 02-06-12.
(19.) Dr. Thompson offered to assist with the budget template and the GCC strongly recommended the unit take advantage of his offer.

III. Old Business

1. **Implement any actions recommended by the Graduate Council relative to 5000-level courses.**
The 5000-level course issue was discussed at the 01-09-12 Graduate Council meeting. A document titled *5000-level Best Practices* was distributed. Additional review of this topic, and best practices document, has been tasked to specific Graduate Council Members and the GCC.

Recommendations to the Graduate Council regarding 5000-level courses:

(1) The GCC requests that the GC revise the statement to read "policy" instead of "best practices".
(2) The GCC requests clarification regarding the intent of the "best practices" statement and would like to know if the GCC would be able to approve proposals for new and revised 5000 level courses.
(3) The GCC supports statements #1, #2, and #3 which read:
(1) The GCC and GC recommend that use of 5000 level courses is appropriate for advanced undergraduates and graduate students in as much as graduate program rigor (3.6.1) is assessed at the program level, not at the individual course level.
(2) There should be differentiated learning outcomes for undergrad and grad students enrolled in 5000 level courses.
(3) 5000 level courses could be used as electives for advanced undergrads in undergrad majors, but should not be used as a required course in any undergraduate major (this would necessitate a change in some programs).

(4) The GCC recommends the following change to item #4 of the GC Best practices statement:

(4) In <u>existing</u> 5000 level courses where the enrollment is predominately undergraduates, the unit offering the course <u>is required</u> to split the course into a 4000/6000 pairing that could be offered simultaneously.

2. **Review Graduate Courses Not Offered in 10 Years spreadsheet.**
   A few of the courses in the initial report were identified as being taught in the past 10 years, so a new report was generated. There have been challenges in regard to capturing information regarding cross-listed courses. It is the intent of the committee to retain any course cross-listed with another course that has been taught in the past 10 years. At the next meeting, a recommendation will be made for deletion of the courses identified in the report.

3. **Send forward a motion to the Graduate Council for a policy on deleting courses that have not been offered or had no enrollment for a specific time period.**
   Postponed to next meeting.

4. **Vice Chair Decker recommended the GCC continue their work with the Graduate Working Group on 3.6.2 Graduate Curriculum.**
   No discussion.

5. **Develop training modules utilizing Mediasite technology with topics to include: Pieces in a Curriculum Development Package, Completion of the Course Proposal Form, and Tips for Certificate Planners. Recordings will be posted on the GCC Web site.**
   No discussion.

6. **SACS Principle 4.9 – awaiting definition of credit hour from GA.**
   Nothing to report.

VI. New Business

None