

The Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC)

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Regular Members Present:

Jim Decker (Chair)
Bob Thompson (Vice-Chair)
Carol Brown
Hamid Fonooni
Will Forsythe
Linda Mayne
Ravi Paul

Regular Members Excused:

Rich Franklin

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Linner Griffin and Meaghan Johnson

Ex-Officio Members Absent/Excused:

None

Academic Program Planning and Development:

Kimberly Nicholson
Karen Summey

Guests:

Paul Gemperline (Dean of the Graduate School)
Sylvia Brown, Bobby Lowery, Jennifer Muir, and Mary Ann Rose

Actions of Committee:

I. Call to Order

1. Report on Graduate Council (GC) Actions

The GC has not met as a full committee since the last GCC meeting, however the Graduate Council Executive Committee has met five times throughout the summer. At Monday's meeting the GC will consider adding the chair of the GCC to the GC membership and review GC leadership.

2. The 04-25-12 GCC minutes were approved electronically by the GCC and the Graduate Council Executive Committee.

II. Introduction by Dean Gemperline

Dean Gemperline thanked all of the members for their commitment to serve on one of the hardest working committees on campus. He shared the GCC is thorough, discusses and debates issues surrounding curriculum and program development packages, and brings to light important items when briefing the GC. The design of graduate curriculum is a faculty driven process at ECU and the GCC and GC are committed to this process. The passing along of key points, as they pertain to packages, by the GCC chair to the GC builds transparency and trust

by the faculty in this process. The new program development process from UNC General Administration (GA) is driving the on campus process. Special thanks to all of the committees for their efforts to ensure the DNP package makes it through the required on campus steps and to GA by the October 1st deadline. The GCC, GC, and EPPC have made special concessions in their meeting schedules to make sure this package is ready in time for the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year.

Discussion took place regarding the DNP package and the new program development timeline. Dr. Griffin shared that in the new process there is no longer a notification of intent to plan (NIP) step. All programs will request authorization to plan (RAP). Once authorization is granted by GA there is a four month window in which the program planners are required to submit their request for authorization to establish (RAE) to GA. Our university has responded to this new timeline by developing three new phases, the third of which will include the curriculum building steps. The past process allowed one to two years, depending on the degree level (bachelors, masters, or doctoral), in order to submit the RAE. GA plans to respond to units within six months of receipt of their submission. Units will begin constructing the curriculum for their programs as soon as the RAE is completed in anticipation of the GA response.

Discussion took place regarding enrollment projections, program accountability, and timeline for course availability within the new process.

III. Opening Comments by Chair Decker

Chair Decker welcomed the committee, applauded Ravi Paul on his excellent presentation at faculty convocation, and acknowledged Kimberly Nicholson, Diane Coltraine, and Karen Summey for their work in finalizing the *2012-2013 Graduate Curriculum and Program Development Manual* over the summer.

IV. GCC Membership

- 1. Rich Franklin, Brody School of Medicine**
- 2. Linda Mayne, College of Nursing**
- 3. TBD, College of Allied Health Sciences**
- 4. TBD, College of Fine Arts and Communication**

V. College of Nursing

Appendix C Request for Authorization to Establish a New Degree Program: Doctor of Nursing Practice

Linda Mayne abstained from the vote. Approved to move forward in the academic program development process with the following recommendations:

- (1.) Resubmit revised Appendix C to the GCC, to include insertion of a new enrollment plan/budget explanation on pg. 18
- (2.) When moving forward in the process, correct the budget template to include the missing cell in the computation

- (3.) Following implementation of the recommended revision to the budget template, revise the impacted data in the corresponding table found in Appendix C
- (4.) Discussion regarding the number of students versus the number of faculty as it pertained to the scholarly outcome and the capstone project
- (5.) Discussion regarding the need for a committee review, versus a single faculty member review, of the capstone project
- (6.) Discussed the depth of responsibility required of the faculty member guiding the students through the four courses culminating in the capstone project
- (7.) Discussed the level of involvement expected from the preceptors/clinical sites in regard to mentoring
- (8.) Discussed concern regarding the need for increased clinical hour placement as a result of the DNP requirements and the fact that there will potentially be five new DNP programs, all with increased clinical placement needs
- (9.) Questions regarding the faculty involvement versus the preceptor involvement
- (10.) Discussed attrition rates and recommended unit consider incorporating at least 10% attrition for post-masters students and 20% attrition for post-baccalaureate students in order to set a more realistic starting point for the post approval assessments
- (11.) Raised questions regarding tracking out of area students
- (12.) Discussed how the unit will address the additional 1000 clinical hours for post-baccalaureate and post-masters level students
- (13.) Discussed that there was no need for placement or qualifying examinations due to the clinical/applied nature of the program (acceptable in field)
- (14.) Discussed consideration of proctoring
- (15.) Unit confirmed that many of the questions will be addressed when the curriculum is presented
- (16.) Discussed collaboration with other institutions
- (17.) Recommended future consideration of shared courses (DNP and PhD)
- (18.) Unit confirmed that space for new faculty will not be an issue
- (19.) Discussed additional \$100.00 per credit hour fee for students
- (20.) Package would benefit from a more detailed explanation of how committees will be used in mentoring the students and how the quality of mentorship will be maintained
- (21.) Discussed need to more clearly identify the structure of the committees that will be working with the students (faculty, preceptors, graduate faculty status, etc.)

VI. Old Business

1. 2011-2012 GCC Annual Report

Dr. Decker shared the annual report was submitted to the GC, reviewed by Dean Gemperline, and posted to the GCC Web site. The following actions/processes will carry into this academic year:

Maintain work split with increased responsibility by lead faculty in guiding package review during the meetings. All committee members will still review all packages while paying special attention to the packages they are assigned. More experienced committee members will take the lead role during the meetings.

2. Graduate Council recommendations regarding the plus/minus grading scale

When discussed by the GC, there was an even split of those for/against this grading scale, as it would apply to graduate students in graduate-level courses. A small committee will be formed to address this further. No action was taken.

According to Angela Anderson, the university registrar, undergraduate students taking graduate-level courses will be graded under the plus/minus grading scale.

Discussion took place regarding the need for units presenting or revising a 5000-level course to include both the graduate and undergraduate grading scales in the course proposal form if it is anticipated the course will be populated by some undergraduate students.

3. Implementation of initial catalog cleanup of *Active Courses Not Offered in 10 years Action Plan*

Chair Decker will touch base with Dean Gemperline regarding implementation of this action by the committee. The action plan was approved in the spring of 2012 by both the GCC and the GC.

VII. New Business

1. Proposed Definitions of Instructional Formats

Chair Decker provided for information. This set of definitions was generated by the federal government. There are indications that as these definitions change there may be impacts on GCC forms/processes in the future. Proposers may at some point be required to articulate the instructional format they plan to use for their courses and/or programs.

2. GCC Resource Person Orientation, August 29, 2012

Dr. Griffin shared that although faculty are highly encourages to utilize their appointed resource persons, it is not mandatory. The GCC has seen a marked difference in the quality of packages submitted with the assistance of active resource persons. This orientation is an opportunity to introduce new resource persons to the curriculum development process and welcome returning resource persons. Committee members are encouraged to attend.

3. Academic Program Development Workshop, September 7, 2012

Dr. Griffin shared that ECU has a five year academic program plan. In order for units to get a new program on the plan, they are required to submit a proposal, which is reviewed in a set of hearings. This workshop is open to units with programs on the plan, or to those faculty interested in getting a program on the plan. Key topics for this workshop include changes in GA and ECU processes from 2011, initiating collaborative discussions with other institutions, and developing contingency-ready budgets.

4. Curriculum Development Workshop, September 14, 2012

Marketing handout provided. Dr. Griffin shared this annual event is a collaboration between the GCC, University Curriculum Committee (UCC), and Office for Faculty Excellence (OFE), and the Office of Academic Program Planning and Development. Diane Coltraine will be contacting committee members to request assistance in facilitating the breakout sessions that will take place in the later part of the program.

5. Request for Inclusion Workshop, September 21, 2012

This workshop is open to units interested in adding a program to the academic program plan. The workshop will provide instruction in how to plan, prepare, and develop a program proposal.