

Minutes
Graduate Academic Affairs Committee
November 18, 2016

Members in Attendance: R. Wood, A. Miller, A. Kent, A. Kaikati, A. Relegert, A. Trees, C. Werner, D. Hall, D. Roby, D. Linhorst, H. Ardizzone, J. Barber, J. Fu, J. Nichols, L. McLaughlin, D. Rush (for L. Willoughby), M. Mancini, S. Jayaram, S. Winton.

Guests in Attendance: J. Haugen, N. Fearn

Call to Order: R. Wood called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Approval of Minutes from the September 16, 2016 meeting: Motion was made to approve the September 16, 2016 meeting minutes - unanimous approval.

New Business:

- A. Program Change Report from the School of Social Work: Criminology and Criminal Justice: This report consists of some minor tweaks to the program. The biggest change is the change in the name of the program. There are a couple name changes to core courses; simplifying names. Also, one core class was added so the fifteen credit hours for each concentration was lowered to twelve. Since this is an information item no voting was necessary. This Program change will now be given to the registrar's office for a catalog update.
- B. Program Change Report from the College of Arts and Sciences: Sociology and Anthropology, MA program in Sociology: This is a reduction in credit hours from thirty-three to thirty. No opposition.
- C. Program Change Report from the College of Arts and Sciences: Master of Public Administration in Political Science: This is a course substitution. Urban Political and Social Theory is replacing Economics of the Public Sector. There is no change in credit hours. No one opposed the change.

All three Program Change Reports will be forwarded to J. Haugen in the Registrar's office.

D. Zero Credit Hour Courses:

The Committee was provided a report on Zero Credit Hour Courses for informational purposes. The matter was discussed at length. Members were told to continue to send in their lists of zero credit hour courses. They are to be sent in to A. Rellergert and copy J. Haugen and R. Wood.

E. Policy on Cross-Listing and Dual-Listing Courses:

J. Haugen explained the first draft of this new policy to the group. Cross listed courses are the same course. Dual listed courses are different courses with different outcomes. Jay is requesting the group take this information back to their colleagues. He is very interested in the feedback from the group. There will be another iteration of this policy before a vote is taken.

F. New Academic Program Proposals:

There is a new precedence for program approval that was developed by the Provost's office. The only real change is that a pre-proposal process is being proposed. The individual will develop a brief draft describing the program. The endorsement is still needed from the dean but then the proposal goes straight to the provost for an evaluation. This new step is a briefer pre-proposal which is shorter than the full blown UAAC/GAAC former proposal process but contains some of the same elements. Once it arrives on Dr. Brickhouse's desk, it will either get approved or turned down. If approved, it will be returned to the department and they can then do the full blown proposal which will then come through UAAC/GAAC for full consideration and approval.

So, step one is this new academic program concept feasibility study. The Provost would like to look at all of these things at the same time so that she can make some strategic decisions. We are proposing submission of March 15th.

The provost would get back to the departments by April 15th. The proposal then goes through a normal submission process.

This would allow the provost office to look at the reality of the program, i.e. what is it going to cost, what resources do we have, what is the market. It allows us to make strategic decisions about how we are going to invest the limited resources that we have. It also allows the provost to look at whether this is a duplication of an already existing effort that may be packaged under another heading.

One of the consequences of this new process is that when it goes back to the program, they have a reasonable assurance. The program seems reasonable. Even after GAAC and UAAC approval of the process, the provost can still say no just like the current process. The deans and directors can also vote it down as well. Therefore, it is not really changing anything about governance.

Concern was expressed and after a lengthy discussion it was decided that the committee should read through this draft policy and submit any concerns or suggestions to Rob.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.