MINUTES
UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COMMITTEE
January 15, 2014

Members Present: Michael Amundson (History), Karen Applequist (Educational Specialties), Emily Babcock (Physician Assistant Studies), Steven Barger (Psychology), Pam Bosch (Sub – Physical Therapy), Colleen Byron (Administration), Michael Costelloe (Criminology and Criminal Justice), Patrick Deegan (Ex-officio: Extended Campuses), Gary Emanuel (Educational Leadership), Crystal Ewen (Graduate Student Government), Amy Hughes (Ex-officio: Cline Library), Stephanie Hurst (Chemistry), Steven Hempleman (Biological Sciences), April Brown Judd (Mathematics and Statistics), Tom Kolb (Forestry), Alan Lew (Geography, Planning, and Recreation), Sherry Markel (Teaching and Learning), John Masserini (Ex-officio: Graduate College), Ramona Mellott (Ex-officio: Graduate Dean), Marcia Metcalf (College of Business), Patricia Peterson (Faculty Senate Representative), Brant Short (School of Communication), Anna Sosa (Chair, Communication Sciences and Disorders), Todd Sullivan (Music), Barbara Tomlinson (School of Nursing), and Niranjan Venkatraman (Engineering).

Members Absent: Yuly Asencion-Delaney (Modern Languages), Joe Collentine (Modern Language), William Crawford (English), Kim Curtis (Sustainable Communities), Michelle Harris (Sociology), Mary McLellan (Educational Psychology), Jim Sample (School of Earth Sciences and Environmental Sustainability), Carol Thompson (Politics and International Affairs), Kerry Thompson (Anthropology), and David Trilling (Physics and Astronomy).

Guests: Bob Booth (Educational Leadership), Scott Galland (Curriculum and Assessment), Larry Gould (Master of Administration), Kurt Lancaster (School of Communication), Norm Medoff (School of Communication), Mark Neumann (School of Communication), Cindy Scott (Master of Administration), Jenny Scott (Extended Campuses), Lisa Williams (Registrar), Alex Steenstra (Master of Administration), Pam Torbico (Master of Administration), Melinda Treml (OCLDAA), and Lisa Wischmeier (Extended Campuses).

Graduate College: Kirsten Slaughter-Rice

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 by Anna Sosa. Dr. Sosa introduced April Brown Judd as the newest member of the Review Subcommittee. Dr. Judd will replace Dr. McAllister while she is on sabbatical.

I. Welcome, Announcements, and Brief Reports
   A. Approval of the Minutes from the November 20, 2013, Meeting – Anna Sosa

   The minutes were approved by all present.

   B. Graduate Student Government Report – Crystal Ewen

   Crystal Ewen stated the Graduate Student Government (GSG) has not met yet this semester. They plan on becoming familiar with the new continuation and dismissal policy. College reps will be hosting constituency meeting.
Dean Mellott reminded the committee that GSG Travel Awards now have a rolling monthly deadline and asked the committee to remind their students who plan on submitting travel award applications.

C. Associate Dean’s Remarks – John Masserini
Dr. Masserini stated that he was excited to be in his new position as the Associate Dean. He noted the Associate Dean’s Council is revising the policy statements that go at the end of every syllabus. He will keep the committee informed of the progress.

D. Dean’s Remarks – Ramona Mellott
Dean Mellott welcomed everyone back. She noted the new Academic Continuation and Dismissal Policy is already in use and the benefits of a step-by-step process for developing the remediation plan. Dean Mellott spoke about two upcoming events, the 3MRP and the visit from Sheila Tobias.

Abstracts for the 3 Minute Research Project (3MRP) are due on January 31, 2014. John Masserini, David Spivey, and Ramona Mellott are currently visiting different classes to promote the 3MRP. The Graduate College will provide training to students participating in the competition. The feedback from the mini-sessions has been very positive, as this is a professional development opportunity for graduate students. Dean Mellott asked the committee to encourage any of students who are doing research to submit an abstract.

Dr. Sheila Tobias is coming to campus on February 10-11, 2014, as part of the Provost’s Speaker Series. Dr. Tobias is a famous author who will speak about retention in the STEM fields and her involvement with the Professional Science Master’s Program. The Graduate College is planning workshops for faculty and students, and there will be an open forum and plenary on Tuesday, February 11. The UGC members will receive information about all events related to Dr. Tobias’ visit.

Dean Mellott provided an update on the Program Learning Outcomes, noting that only three programs of the 90+ programs have not submitted their outcomes. These three programs will submit their outcomes soon.

Dean Mellott also noted that Geeta Chowdhry, chair of the Department of Politics and International Affairs, passed away in India on Sunday. She was a strong contributor to graduate education at NAU.

II. Curricular Changes – Consent Items.
There were no Curricular Changes or Consent Items.

III. Action Items
A. College of Education
1. Educational Leadership
   a. Educational Leadership – School Leadership; MEd, Fall 2014 – Major Requirements-Course(s) Deleted, Unit Change

Bob Booth, Assistant Chair in the Department of Educational Leadership, explained the changes to the School Leadership emphasis of the Educational Leadership degree as a re-vamping of the previous degree. The degree is for those in search of educational leadership positions who do not want to be principals. The number of credits for the degree will decrease from 36-credit hours to 30-credit hours. The changes to the degree will focus on instructional leadership. Students will be able to explore their
areas of interest or specialization with 9-credit hours, instead of the previous 3-credit hours. The courses that were deleted from the program of study were not deleted from the Academic Catalog as they are part of other EDL programs.

The motion was approved for the plan changes.

B. College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
   1. School of Communication
      a. Applied Communication; MA, Fall 2014 – Admission Requirements, Major Requirements-Course(s) Added, Course(s) Deleted, Name Change, New Subplan, Subplan Requirements-Course(s) Added, Text within Plan
      b. COM 535, “Documentary Skills and Storytelling Practicum,” Fall 2014 – New Course
      d. COM 603, “Qualitative Research Methods,” Fall 2014 – New Course
      e. COM 604, “Quantitative Research Methods in Communication,” Fall 2014 – New Course
      f. COM 605, “Introduction to Documentary Issues, Theories, and Methods,” Fall 2014 – New Course

Norm Medoff, Director, and Kurt Lancaster, Associate Professor, in the School of Communication discussed the changes to the Applied Communication degree to solidify the core courses and the two emphasis areas, Documentary Studies and Communication Studies. Changing the title to “MA in Communication” more accurately reflects the degree offered and the type of experience students need to pursue careers in communications.

In response to a question on the availability of similar programs in the U.S., Dr. Lancaster stated there are currently no other programs in the southwest that offer a Documentary Studies emphasis. The degree will expose students to different mediums they may not have been exposed to in their earlier career. Documentary film making is inexpensive and will attract mid-career journalists who want to learn more about multimedia. Dr. Medoff explained ethics will be covered in the courses, including the historical framework of ethics practiced in journalism.

Dr. Masserini asked if students will likely pursue the thesis or project option. Dr. Lancaster responded that students only had one option with the Applied Communications degree. Students who want to pursue a PhD will likely take the more traditional thesis option, while students who want a more practical application will likely choose the project.

Dean Mellott asked for clarification regarding the COM 535 prerequisite or instructor approval for COM 550. Dr. Lancaster responded that if a student comes into the program with a strong background in multimedia, the student may not need to take COM 535. The requirements are not necessarily waived, and he thinks very few people will not need to take COM 535. Dr. Sosa asked if students will still be able to graduate if they do not take a core requirement is listed on the program of study, since COM 535 is a core requirement course. Dean Mellott suggested they change the language to “COM 535 or some other course with instructor approval,” so students will have enough courses to graduate.

Another member noted that the first citation under the reading list on COM 604 was incorrect. The department will correct it.
The motion was approved for the plan changes and the new courses.

C. Graduate College/Extended Campuses

1. Administration – Justice Studies

a. Administration – Justice Studies Emphasis; Master of Administration, Fall 2014 – New Subplan, Subplan Requirements-Course(s) Added, Course(s) Deleted
b. JUS 510, “Seminar in Criminal Justice Theories,” Fall 2014 – New Course
c. JUS 530, “Counterterrorism and Intelligence,” Fall 2014 – New Course
e. JUS 610, “Criminal Justice Ethics,” Fall 2014 – New Course
g. JUS 630, “Executive Leadership for Criminal Justice Professionals,” Fall 2014 – New Course

Cindy Scott, Associate Clinical Professor for NAU Yuma, introduced the new emphasis. The six proposed courses will meet the needs of practitioners in the field, as most fields require or encourage a Master’s degree for promotion. The emphasis combines leadership with trends in theory to prepare students to succeed in the field. Dr. Scott explained that both California and Arizona are encouraging leaders in criminal justice to have a Master’s degree. She also noted their collaboration with the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department, and they would like to propose the following changes to the course titles:

- JUS 510 will change to Theories in Criminality
- JUS 540 will change to Applied Statistics in Justice Administration
- JUS 610 will change to Justice in Ethics Administration

Dr. Costelloe from the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice stated that his department has worked with Dr. Scott, and they have no objections to the new emphasis. Drs. Sosa and Venkatraman added the Review Subcommittee did have concerns with overlap between the programs, and Dr. Costelloe noted that the programs are serving different populations. Dean Mellott explained there is no University policy prohibiting overlap of courses, but we do want to reduce overlap if possible.

Dr. Sosa noted that in Item 8, which is the Academic Catalog text, the Career Tab, this is existing text. If the program wanted to change this, that change goes through the Academic Catalog and does not need to come before the UGC.

A motion was approved for the new emphasis and new courses, pending changes to the course titles.

2. Administration – Small Business Emphasis

a. Administration – Small Business Emphasis; Master of Administration, Fall 2014 – New Subplan, Subplan Requirements-Course(s) Added, Course(s) Deleted
b. ADM 500, “Management Information Systems for Administrators,” Fall 2014 – New Course
d. ADM 550, “Marketing for Administrators,” Fall 2014 – New Course
e. ADM 660, “Business Law Administration,” Fall 2014 – New Course
Colleen Byron, Assistant Clinical Professor for NAU-Yuma, introduced the new emphasis. Half of Arizona’s employment comes from small business, and thirty-three percent of small businesses fail within the first two years and fifty percent in the first five years. The degree will serve small business owners and provide them with the tools to succeed. Dr. Byron explained that they will seek Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) accreditation in conjunction with the Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) program, which already has ACBSP accreditation. The courses and assessments are designed to meet and exceed the standards of the accreditation body.

Dr. Sosa asked how the accreditation would be different from the Franke College of Business (FCB) accreditation. Dr. Byron responded that the program would be accredited separately because this program falls under the Department of Business and Administration in Extended Campuses. There is not a specific timeframe for the accreditation, but the program will be independently accredited. In response to a question, Dr. Byron stated that they program will have 36-credit hours.

A member asked how the courses will differ from those offered in the FCB Master of Business Administration (MBA) program. Dr. Byron answered that the Small Business Emphasis had different courses with different prefixes and content. Another member asked if there had been any contact with FCB. Dr. Byron noted that the Master of Administration has been in active dialogue with FCB regarding the courses and their website development.

One member asked if potential students will see the differentiation between the two degrees and if they might think that will get an MBA with this program. Dr. Byron responded that students are told they will not receive a MBA, and if they want an MBA, they should consider an MBA program. If the MBA is mentioned, they like to receive in writing from the student that the student understands this program will not grant them a MBA.

A motion was approved for the new emphasis and new courses.

IV. Informational Items
   A. January 15, 2014 FAST TRACK Report

Item was reviewed with no comment by representatives.

V. Discussion Items
   A. Revised Curriculum and Assessment Proposal/Supplements
      1. Expectations for Degree Program Curriculum & Re-designed Campus Processes
         Powerpoint PDF version
      2. Revised Curriculum and Assessment Proposal (November 6, 2013)
      3. Implications of Voting Yes or No on the Proposal

Dr. Venkatraman explained that the proposal to combine curriculum and assessment has been circulated to different committees on campus for feedback. The main strengths if the proposal was formally adopted include an incorporation of curriculum review, curricular mapping, and assessment into the review process; steps that are required by the University’s accreditation. The areas of concern include the limitations of implementing this so quickly, the increased workload for faculty, and redundancy of reporting documents that may seem like busywork, and the fear that standardization of
curriculum will remove the ownership of the course. Faculty members are concerned about the time involved with learning a new process and the duplication of reporting process, especially for programs that have accreditation. The proposal presented to the committee at the October 2013 meeting has been revised to address these concerns.

Ms. Melinda Treml explained that the proposal integrates the review process into the curriculum and assessment process with a coordinating body, and learning outcomes will actually be reviewed by the same committee that reviews curriculum at the college level.

The revised proposal was presented to the Faculty Senate in November 2013. Additional feedback from colleges and programs included concern about the support for this new process and the additional level of bureaucracy created by this process. Dr. Venkatraman explained the accreditation programs will not need additional support because the same paperwork submitted to their accreditation body can be used for the University review. For non-accredited programs, leaders of the particular college will determine the support for the new process. In response to a question, Ms. Treml added that there is currently no implementation plan, but the additional support could take a variety of forms. With the concern about adding another level of bureaucracy, Dr. Venkatraman noted that this is only a perception because the University-level committee will coordinate the processes that cannot be done at the college-level committees. Colleges have great processes in place, but the processes are all very different.

One member asked how the implementation of the proposal would affect the UGC. Dr. Venkatraman stated that the UGC already does most of what would be required, so little would change. The University-level coordinating committee would determine standards that are additional for the graduate committee, but the committee would continue to review curriculum.

Dean Mellott asked who would approve new course proposals. Ms. Treml explained the process. When a course proposal is submitted, it goes to the college-level committee, which is responsible for reviewing the course proposal. If the college-level committee approves of the course proposal, it would then go to the UGC to at specific components related to graduate education, which is what the UGC already does. The proposal would still go to the Review Subcommittee before going before the full committee for a vote. The curriculum and assessment proposal will bring assessment down to the college-level committee, and the UGC would still have the final approval of the course proposal.

Another member asked if there will someone involved to represent the UGC on the University-level committee (UCAC). Dr. Venkatraman answered the normal operations of the UGC will not change. Within the larger group, the UGC forms, which are the same forms currently used for UCC, may change based on different expectations for graduate programs. The larger University-level committee (UCAC) will coordinate the process and ensure that same expectations are meant across programs, which is mostly for undergraduate programs. One benefit of reviewing course proposals at the college-level is the UGC will receive more polished proposals. The University-level committee will coordinate how proposals go through UCC and UGC. The curricular design elements have the same criteria, and these principles will need to also apply to graduate programs. The committee will work with the UGC to determine what is appropriate for graduate programs. Since most of this is currently done by the UGC, only the curricular design part will change.

Dr. Sosa explained that during the review process, the Review Subcommittee knows what they are looking for, but there is often a gray area, especially in determining how the program learning outcomes match the course. Ms. Treml responded that the new process would explain that program learning
outcomes have certain characteristics, so it would help in the determination of whether or not program learning outcomes are appropriate. The Review Committee would be able to request better program learning outcomes with the new process.

Barbara Tomlinson noted that the explanation provided by Dr. Venkatraman and Ms. Treml was very helpful, but the figure in the proposal was not as clear. The figure will be revised before it goes before the Faculty Senate for a vote.

A member asked about the need to create a University-level committee when there is already an office to assist with this process. Ms. Treml answered that the office is there to assist faculty in the development and design of curriculum but is unable to approve curriculum. The committee will oversee curriculum, design, and assessment, while the office will provide support to the committee.

Committee members can direct questions to Melinda Treml, Laurie Dickson, and Niranjan Venkatraman.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 pm.