The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Dr. Randy Pembrook who asked everyone to introduce themselves and their connection to the Committee meeting.

Those present included:
- Randy Pembrook
- Nancy Tate
- Monica Scheibmeir
- Steve Spyres
- Kimberly Harrison
- Pat Munzer*
- Taylor McGown
- Bob Boncella
- Dean Corwin
- Judith McConnell-Farmer
- Michael Rettig*
- Gloria Dye*
- Gordon McQuere
- Shirley Dinkel
- Cindy Turk
- Catherine Hunt
- Gary Bayens
- Susie Pryor
- Willie Dunlap
- Kayla Waters*
- Rick Ellis*
- Brian Ogawa*
- Karen Fernengel*
- Vickie Kelly*

*Designates Presenter/guests

Those committee members absent included:
- David Sollars
- Phyllis Berry
- Dave Provorse
- Sarah Cook**
- Courtney Sullivan**

**Submitted absentee votes.

The Graduate Committee had five (5) agenda items to discuss:
1. Proposal from the School of Nursing: Doctorate of Nursing Practice
2. Proposals from the School of Applied Studies:
   - Masters of Health Science; Master of Arts, Human Services
3. Proposal from the Education Department: Master of Education
4. Administrative issue from AY 2010-2011
   a. Course Numbering System
5. Discussion regarding the modification of the Committee membership

1. An overview of the doctorate program proposal was provided by Monica Scheibmeir. Highlights of that discussion included:
   a. No additional faculty will be needed from the School of Business involvement.
   b. One new full time Nursing faculty member in FY 12; two more added in FY13.
   c. This program could potentially be available for enrollment Fall 2012.
   d. There will need to be updating of some syllabi included in the current proposal.
   e. There will be involvement by KBOR, Legislative body and HLC.

The committee passed the motion to recommend this Doctorate program.
2. An overview of the **Master of Health Sciences** proposal was provided by Pat Munzer. Highlights of that discussion included:
   a. The program is online with site educators within the communities providing clinical instruction.
   b. The courses would be available to only those in the program at this time. Over time, there may be an opportunity to expand to allow other majors’ students into the classes.
   c. Qualifications would need to be looked at for the new proposed faculty.

   The committee passed the motion to recommend this Master program.

3. An overview of the **Master of Arts, Human Services** proposal was provided by Brian Ogawa. Highlights of that discussion included:
   a. The expected enrollment date is Fall 2012.
   b. One full time faculty for the Master program (starting in 2012-2013) and 4 adjuncts for undergraduate courses would be needed.
   c. The degree of Master of Arts caused some discussion. There was a question regarding whether this should be a Master of Arts (Human Services), a Master of Arts—Human Services, or a Master of Arts. The question arose regarding how this would be reflected on the diploma. The discussion evolved to voting on the practical issues and working through the philosophical issue at the next meeting.

   The committee passed the motion to recommend this Master program with one dissenting vote.

4. An overview of the **Master of Education proposal** was provided by Judith McConnell-Farmer. Highlights of that discussion included:
   a. There are common core courses between the 2 master programs. Two courses might be the same with students being able to transfer six hours from previously earned Master of Education degree.
   b. There was a concern expressed about having two Master of Education programs. There needs to be some way to show differentiation. It was decided this was a naming/descriptive issue with a need for clarification from the education department.

   The committee agreed to endorse the notion of additional areas of study leading to additional Masters degrees in the Education department. The motion passed by the Committee and the Education department faculty was asked to provide additional information regarding the need to make the master programs with different names.

5. The **course numbering system** was discussed by Nancy Tate who explained the reason this was in the Graduate Committee agenda. Highlights of the discussion that followed included:
   a. There is a need to create a numbering system that is logical to the Bachelor, Master and Doctorate levels.
b. There isn't a historical perspective as to why we established 900 level numbers.

c. Several current courses would have to be renumbered. Should there be cross referencing or should corresponding numbers between programs be matched? How will the numbers be translated into the Banner system?

The committee determined this agenda item should be tabled for the next meeting. There will be discussion with the various committee members and their stakeholders for possible issues, modifications or other suggestions.

6. The committee membership was discussed by Randy Pembrook. He asked the committee members 1) is there a logical reason to have this committee be so large, 2) is there a need to have every graduate program represented or could one or two representatives come from the school/college, 3) what should be the role of the committee members?

a. Other discussion involved the creation of a Graduate School which would allow one body of faculty to govern the consistency of the University graduate programs.

b. A few years ago, Executive (sub) committee of the Graduate Committee was established to resolve issues within proposals prior to the graduate committee reviewing the vetted program proposals.

c. There is a need to have an introductory Graduate catalog section.

The committee determined this agenda item should be tabled for the next meeting. There will be discussion with the various committee members and their stakeholders for suggestions and means to reduce the number on the committee.

Requests to Committee members:

1. Discuss numbering system with stakeholders.
2. Discuss committee membership with stakeholders.