GRADUATE COUNCIL
Minutes
Thursday, January 20, 2022, 3:30 pm
https://uncw.zoom.us/j/82354630227?pwd=djY4UUNaVVZxaHBXV09JQ0NqcWxUQT09

ATTENDANCE:
Council Members: Dr. Barreto, Dr. Ferner, Dr. Hawkes, Ms. Post, Dr. Sackley, Dr. Scott-Pollock, Dr. Shefsiek, Mr. Silva, Dr. Erwin (filling in for Dr. Williard who is on research assignment for reminder of Spring semester)

Non-Voting Members: Dr. Holman, Dr. Newsham, Dr. Ritchie, Dr. Webster

Graduate School Staff: Ms. Byrnes, Ms. Harris, Ms. Phillips, Dr. Donlin Washington

Dean Finelli presided.

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes
   a. December 9, 2021 -- Motion to approve: Dr. Hawkes; Seconded: Dr. Sackley; All in favor? Yes; Opposed: No.

2. Announcements
   a. Graduate School Update – Dr. Scott Nooner, Faculty Fellow, hired for post-doc support program.
   b. Ph.D. Chemistry – Received external reviews, many positive. 2/28 UNC Graduate Council; April BOG; Won’t come back to Grad Council but is moving forward. ** Update: UNC Graduate Council meeting moved to 3/21/22.
   c. Masters, Supply Change Management – Preliminary authorization request approved in Fall. Department will route in Curriculog for possible Grad Council review in February. Needs to be sent to Systems Office by March. Deadline extension could occur.

3. New Business
   a. History of Doctoral Education Programs Document Feedback
      Purpose – Document was driven by conversations with Systems Office. Anticipate more research and doctoral programs going forward. This answers the “why” in re-educating the Systems Office on where UNCW is as an institution. Document has been seen by the College Deans. Seeking Grad Council response before going to Systems Office. Does it make a compelling case to pursue further doctoral programs? Is it effective? Does it fall short?

      Grad Council response:
      - What is the primary intent of the document? State and/or Regional context? How do they work together?
      - How are we going to fund? Does it make sense when the Systems Office is looking at a new funding model?
        Would we grow as extensively if the model changes?
      - If funding is spread out, there might not be an increase in funding for grad students.
      - Non-starter with no tuition waivers.

      Dean’s response: The document was drafted before the BOG meeting this week and doesn’t address some of the resources issues that come up with regard to doctoral programs. UNC System has proposed a new funding model that would fund graduate education at the same per credit rate as undergraduate education. It is a huge shift, not sure of the impact. If we can address the resource issue, what other elements to address to make an effective case?

      Grad Council: What does the program need to be successful? When underfunded, no money to re-allocate?

      Dean: Is this document tone-deaf (given lack of resources)? Trade off – add/grow or properly fund existing programs.
b. **Name Change Proposal for Graduate Liberal Studies**
   The request is to re-define what Graduate Liberal Studies is to make it a sustainable program. The Hanover report recommended more flexibility in offerings – combination of F2F, online and transfers from other institutions. Name change proposed: Interdisciplinary Studies. Multidisciplinary Studies was also suggested. The program would allow students to self-decide, choose their own narrative. The department would like Grad Council’s approval to change for the next curriculum cycle. The Dean will discuss with the Provost as this would need to go to the Systems Office for approval. A name change is easier than introducing a new program.

c. **Curriculum (New this month)**

**Curriculum A (Erwin, Ferner, Hawkes, Post)**
Dr. Hawkes led the discussion. After Curriculum A Committee review, **the initial courses offered for approval are:**

**ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES:**

**ENGLISH:**

**MARINE BIOLOGY:**

**PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:**

*Motion to approve: Curriculum Committee A; Seconded: None required; All in favor? Yes; Opposed: No; Abstained: No.*

*-----------------------------------------------------*

**Points for Discussion -- To be revisited in February:**

Clarification was requested regarding variable credit hours. Dr. Sweeney was not able to attend the meeting. Her input will be necessary before moving these forward.

*-----------------------------------------------------*
4. Old Business (Curriculum revisited from January meeting):

Curriculum Committee A (Erwin, Fener, Hawkes, Post)

**GERONTOLOGY:**

**INFORMATION SYSTEMS:**

*Motion to approve: Curriculum Committee A; Seconded: None required; All in favor? Yes; Opposed: No; Abstained: No.

Curriculum Committee B
Dr. Sackley led the discussion. Two small revisions were requested in course objectives and syllabus.

**ACCOUNTANCY:**

*Motion to approve: Curriculum Committee B; Seconded: None required; All in favor? Yes; Opposed: No; Abstained: No.

5. Other – None

6. Adjournment