

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE GRADUATE ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (GAPP) COMMITTEE  
September 18, 2017  
Approved by GAPP on October 23, 2017**

The Graduate AP&P Committee (GAPP) met on Monday, September 18, 2017 at 3:00 pm in the Room 224 of I.G. Greer Hall.

**Members Present:** Jeff Bates, Mark Bradbury, Will Canu, Scott Collier, Patty Dale, Audrey Dentith, James Douthit, Dru Henson, Marie Hoepfl, Alecia Jackson, Victor Mansure, William Pollard, Max Poole, Debbie Race, Rob Sanders, David Shows, Tracy Smith, Susan Staub, Sandra Vannoy, Ray Williams, and Ben Powell

**Administrative Staff and Guests:** Stephanie Hickey (Assistant Coordinator GAPP), Laura Padgett (Coordinator GAPP), Ashley Goodman (Athletic Training Faculty), Jennifer Howard (Athletic Training Faculty), Kurt Michael (Psychology Faculty), Rosemary Webb (Psychology Faculty), Lisa Curtin (Psychology Faculty),

**Excused:** Kim McCullough, John Abbott, Ece Karatan (Ray Williams is Dr. Karatan's substitute for Fall semester)

**Absent:** Karen Fletcher, Nickolas Jordan, Phyllis Kloda, Gary McCullough, Dontrell Parson, Terry Rawls

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

At 3:00 pm, Dean Max Poole called the meeting to order as the Chairperson for the 2017-2018 year had not been elected.

**2. INTRODUCTIONS**

The attendees introduced themselves and were referred to a handout of the membership roster. Laura Padgett and Stephanie Hickey were introduced as the new coordinators of the GAPP committee. Max Poole explained that Ray Williams (Biology) will substitute for Ece Karatan, who is away for the fall semester.

Dean Poole provided the group with a brief history and the role of GAPP. He then read the charge and role of the GAPP from the Faculty Senate Handbook. The GAPP Committee's areas of responsibility are graduate curriculum; policies affecting graduate programs; appeals concerning academic matters coming from graduate programs in any school, department, or program; matters raised by graduate faculty and graduate students; and matters referred to the GAPP by the Provost or Chancellor. The GAPP is also a sounding board for Dean Poole. He explained that there are two subcommittees: Policies and Curriculum.

Dr. Poole also requested that the GAPP members serve as resource people for the faculty in their respective schools/colleges in matters pertaining to the GAPP.

**3. ELECTION of 2017-2018 Committee Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson**

- A. Dr. Poole asked for nominations for Committee Chairperson.

**MOTION 1:** Nominations were opened for the position of GAPP Chairperson. Dr. Marie Hoepfl was nominated (Smith) and seconded (Bradbury). No further nominations were made. Motion was made (Mansure) and seconded (Shows) that the nominations be closed. Vote was held. Dr. Marie Hoepfl was elected as GAPP Chairperson for 2017-2018 – **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

- B. Chairperson Hoepfl took over the meeting and began with the election of the Deputy Chairperson. Chairperson Hoepfl explained that current Deputy Chairperson Bradbury had decided not to serve another term.

**MOTION 2:** Nominations were opened for the position of GAPP Deputy Chairperson. Dr. Victor Mansure was nominated (Bradbury) and seconded (Smith) and a motion was made (Collier) and seconded (Jackson) that the nominations be closed and that a vote be taken. Dr. Victor Mansure was elected a GAPP Deputy Chairperson for 2017-2018 – **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. **MOTION 3:** It was moved (Bradbury) and seconded (Mansure) that the minutes of the April 24, 2017 GAPP meeting be approved – **PASSED.**

**Procedural note:** Chairperson Hoepfl explained that once the minutes are approved they are sent to the Office of the Provost for final approval. Once they are approved by the Provost they are then posted as approved minutes on the AP&P Web site and on the AsULearn site.

#### 5. ANNOUNCEMENTS/FIOS

No announcements were made at this time.

#### 6. NEW BUSINESS

Curriculum Proposals: Chairperson Hoepfl explained to the group that two “Request to Establish a New Degree Program” are to be considered today. Chairperson Hoepfl turned the floor over to Dean Poole to lead the discussion of the two proposals. Dean Poole highlighted parts of the information from the earlier email (see attached) he sent to explain the approval process and the evaluation rubric (also attached) used for each proposal. Poole then asked for feedback from the GAPP members using the rating criteria found on the rubric. He explained that the rubric was chosen as a means of making the review process more efficient.

##### A. Beaver College of Health Sciences

##### **G\_HS\_HES\_2017\_1 To Establish the Master of Science in Athletic Training (MS-AT)**

Dr. Ashley Goodman introduced the proposal and explained the need and circumstances for establishing the MS-AT program. These included 1) their national accrediting body now requires a Master’s degree to be the entry level degree for Athletic Trainers; 2) the need to maintain the ASU

Athletic Training as the 40 year-old flagship program for NC by staying abreast of the current trends; 3) the program has already started to teach out the Bachelor's degree students due to the required degree changes, and the last baccalaureate student has been admitted; and 4) four other UNC institutions (UNCW, UNCC, UNCP, WCU) are also upgrading their Athletic Programs to the Masters' level.

The results of the rubric were:

**Criterion 1: Alignment to University's Mission**, Met with Strength (12); Met (1); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 2: Societal Need & Student Demand**, Met with Strength (8); Met (4); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 3: Duplication of Other UNC System Programs**, Met with Strength (3); Met (6); Met with Weakness (2); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: There is duplication but also appears to be adequate societal demand for the programs; it is unclear how ASU's program will continue to be the flagship program with unique features to set it apart from the others and how that translates to sufficient demand.

**Criterion 4: Course of Study/Accreditation**, Met with Strength (7); Met (4); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: Concern about the number of prerequisites and how these will be met; question about the 40 hours of observation required for admission; concern for the allowance of three "C" grades within the program.

**Criterion 5: Preparedness of Unit Offering Program**, Met with Strength (8); Met (2); Met with Weakness (1); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: Concern that there are several places in the proposal where it states "we are asking for," and concerned that they are stretched too thin; a check box on page 77 that needs to be checked "needs new faculty;" concern about the addition of DE courses or the need to change the nomenclature to reflect the main campus nature of the courses.

**Criterion 6: Learning Objectives and Assessment**, Met with Strength (0); Met (9); Met with Weakness (1); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 7: Other Resources**, Met with Strength (7); Met (4); Met with Weakness (1); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: Concern about the money needed for graduate assistantships.

**Criterion 8: Budget and Budget Justification**, Met with Strength (0); Met (12); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 9: Support Documentation**, Met with Strength (2); Met (11); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Dean Poole noted that the greatest concern was in Criterion #3 and thus recommended the proposal be updated before submission to the General Administration. Dr. Goodman agreed to make the suggested revisions.

**Motion 4:** Chairperson Hoepfl asked for a motion to approve the request to establish. Motion (Mansure). Seconded (Collier). **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B. College of Arts and Sciences

**G\_CAS\_PSY\_2017\_01                    1) To Establish the Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) program**

Dr. Lisa Curtin introduced this proposal and explained the need for the Psy.D. program including 1) North Carolina has a number of PhD programs but ASU and WCU (ASU is collaborating with WCU) would be the only two PsyD programs; 2) High demand for services in rural areas but a workforce shortage in rural areas; 3) In N.C., Master's level clinicians cannot practice without a doctoral-level supervisor 4) Master's level licensure is threatened and will eventually disappear in N.C.; 5) Currently, ASU has a strong Master's level program that serves rural N.C., but more and more of our students are going to doctoral programs because of the expanded options available to them afterward; 6) Would like to build on their current Masters' program and are hiring of a full-time director.

**Criterion 1: Alignment to University's Mission;** Met with Strength (8); Met (3); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 2: Societal Need & Student Demand:** Met with Strength (10); Met (1); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: Question about how many students will be admitted to the program, and will the students be teaching while they are here?

**Criterion 3: Duplication of Other UNC System Programs;** Met with Strength (7); Met (4); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 4: Course of Study/Accreditation:** Met with Strength (7); Met (5); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: Question about the requirement of only one internship placement in a rural setting.

**Criterion 5: Preparedness of Unit Offering Program;** Met with Strength (8); Met (3); Met with Weakness (1); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: How will current number of faculty be able to handle the additional load?

**Criterion 6: Learning Objectives and Assessment:** Met with Strength (7); Met (5); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 7: Other Resources:** Met with Strength (4); Met (4); Met with Weakness (3); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

Comments: Concern about the space issue and how it would be resolved.

**Criterion 8: Budget and Budget Justification:** Met with Strength (5); Met (7); Met with Weakness (0); Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**Criterion 9: Support Documentation:** Met with Strength (10); Met (1); Met with Weakness (0) Unmet (0); Cannot Evaluate (0)

**MOTION 5:** Chairperson Hoepfl asked for a motion to approve (Mansure) the PsyD proposal. Seconded (Canu). There were many praises from the members for the proposal and for their determination and persistence. **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**Procedural Note:** Chairperson Hoepfl explained that it is very helpful to use the AsU Learn site as a discussion forum about proposals coming before the committee. The curriculum subcommittee also goes through its own review process prior to the entire committee seeing the proposals. The link to the GAPP website is also on AsU Learn.

#### 7. **POLICY PROPOSALS: Deans Council**

- A. Dean Poole reported that there are several policy proposals that will go to the Policy Subcommittee this year for discussion including: 1) The transcript policy that was started last year needs to be continued. 2) The definition of a "concentration" in a program? 3) Better definition of dual-listed courses and how to track them. 4) Should 3000 level courses be dual-listed with 5000 levels?

#### 8. **OLD BUSINESS**

No old business at this time.

#### 9. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- A. Program Directors Orientation/Workshop next Monday, September 25. New directors in the morning and all in the afternoon.
- B. Dr. Sanders reported that an email with many updates went out this past Friday. He will send out to all Program Directors and Chairs a survey on graduate assistantship allocations. He also reports that there will be information at the next meeting on training for the new proposal system.
- C. Dr. Staub raised a concern about the new Thesis/Dissertation deadlines.
- D. Dr. Bradbury raised a question about the overlap of Slate and AdmissionPros.
- E. Chairperson Hoepfl asked Dr. Collier (Policy Committee) and Dr. Bradbury (Curriculum Committee) to meet with those who want to be on each committee and determine a chairperson for each one.

#### 10. **ADJOURNMENT**

- A. **MOTION 6:** It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 4:45 pm so that members could break into subcommittees to plan meetings and elect subcommittee chairs.

**Curriculum Subcommittee**

Mark Bradbury  
William Canu  
Audrey Dentith (chair)  
David Shows  
Kim McCullough  
Victor Mansure  
John Abbott  
Debbie Race

**Policy Subcommittee**

Susan Staub (chair)  
Ece Karatan (Ray Williams substitute for fall semester)  
Alecia Jackson  
Tracy Smith  
William Pollard  
Marie Hoepfl  
Scott Collier  
Jeff Bates  
Debbie Race

**Awards and Recognition Subcommittee (Ad hoc Subcommittee: Formed when needed)**

**Graduate AP&P Standing Subcommittees 2017-18**

**APPENDIX I: Email from Max Poole to GAPP Members Explaining the New Degree Proposal Process**

*I hope that your semester is off to a good start. We are now into our third year as the GAPP and our first meeting is scheduled for September 18 at 3 pm in 224 IG Greer.*

*The current agenda and the minutes from our last meeting in April are attached for your convenience, but please note that in the future they will be on the GAPP ASULearn website to which you now have access. Also the AP&P/GAPP university website will have the agenda, meeting dates, membership and subcommittee lists, and other information pertaining to GAPP. <https://app.appstate.edu/meeting-dates-and-deadlines>*

*Please join me in welcoming our new voting members representing their respective colleges: Will Canu (Psychology), Ece Karatan (Biology), Alecia Jackson (Leadership & Educ Studies), and John Mackall (GSAS). And we welcome several new Administrative, non-voting members: James Douthit (Dean of the School of Music) and Ray Williams (Faculty Senate Representative). Also I am pleased to introduce Laura Padgett (Director of Graduate Student Enrolled Services and Development) who will be the GAPP coordinator for posting proposals, taking minutes, etc. See the full membership roster at the AP&P/GAPP website above.*

*At the next meeting you will elect the Chairperson and Deputy-Chairperson. Furthermore you will have an opportunity to designate the subcommittee on which you would like to serve (Graduate Curriculum OR Graduate Policies). **BUT OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE**, you will also be asked to present your reviews of two new degree proposals that **MUST** go to the UNC SYSTEM General Administration (GA) by October 1. These are for the Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) and the MS in Athletic Training.*

### **BACKGROUND**

*The UNC System uses a two-step approval process for new degrees. First, a Request to Plan document is submitted to GA for permission to even plan a new degree program. ASU requires that the Request to Plan be presented to the GAPP as a FYI document since there is always a possibility that permission may not be granted by GA. Both of these programs submitted their Request to Plan documents almost a year ago and after much back-and-forward with GA were finally given permission in the spring to submit a Request to Establish. Both programs then prepared their Requests to Establish documents but were too late to be considered at the April GAPP meeting before the summer break. Since ASU requires that the Request to Establish be reviewed by the GAPP, both Requests to Establish documents were delayed until now and are attached for your review. (Please note that each Request to Establish also includes the earlier Request to Plan and a variety of Appendices as per GA guidelines).*

### **PROCESS OF GAPP REVIEW**

*In the last three years, the Graduate Council and later the GAPP Curriculum Subcommittee received several Requests to Establish documents for new graduate programs. However, the committee members were always confused about exactly what they were being asked to review. Fortunately, this summer I ran across a Review Rubric that is being used by several graduate councils in other states that I thought would work well for our review of Requests to Establish. I modified the rubric to better fit the typical areas of concern expressed by the UNC System and ran an earlier version by Mark Bradbury (the Chairperson of the Curriculum Subcommittee). We agreed to use the rubric as a systematic means of reviewing the Requests to Establish by the entire GAPP voting membership. Please note that both programs will still submit their new courses (syllabi, descriptions, etc.) to the GAPP Curriculum Subcommittee once the Subcommittee is officially constituted for this term, but a curriculum review is not necessary for the Requests to Establish to move forward to GA.*

*Therefore, attached is the Review Rubric for Requests to Establish. The rubric emphasizes the areas of concern that GA, the UNC Graduate Dean's Council, and ultimately the Board of Governors typically discuss in evaluating new degree proposals. **We are asking you to evaluate nine areas of the proposal in advance of our Sept 18 meeting. Please use the assessment scale on the rubric to give your opinion about whether that area of concern was met with strength or not. And make notes if you identify points that may be weak in addressing that area.** At the upcoming meeting, we will quantify your responses for each area and more closely examine any area that receives multiple weak responses. This process will better focus your review and provide a benefit to our proposals since it is far better to receive constructive review from our colleagues than allowing it to go to GA and the BOG with glaring weaknesses.*

*I suggest that we allow up to 30 minutes for each proposal although in my opinion both appear extremely well written and should take far less time. Representatives from each program will be present to hear your responses and answer questions.*

*Well, that's it for now. Please do not forget to review the proposals using the rubric and we will see how it goes. **AND THANK YOU ALL** for your commitment to graduate education at ASU.*

*See you on Sept 18.*

*Best wishes,*

*Max*

**GAPP Criteria for New Programs**

Criteria		
1.	<p><b>ALIGNMENT TO UNIVERSITY’S MISSION</b></p> <p>a. The rationale for the program is aligned with the university’s mission and relates to specific institutional strengths and/or Strategic Goals.</p> <p>b. Impacts on and/or overlap with other Appalachian State programs/departments have been addressed.</p>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b></p> <p><b>Met:</b></p> <p><b>Met with Weakness:</b></p> <p><b>Unmet:</b></p> <p><b>Cannot evaluate:</b></p>
2.	<p><b>SOCIETAL NEED &amp; STUDENT DEMAND</b></p> <p>Convincing evidence is provided that there is/are :</p> <p>a. A societal need for a program at this degree level</p> <p>b. Either a regional, statewide, or national workforce demand for program graduates (At which level is the demand most convincing?)</p> <p>c. A source of students interested in the program.</p> <p>d. Admissions requirements appropriate to the nature and level of the program.</p>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b></p> <p><b>Met:</b></p> <p><b>Met with Weakness:</b></p> <p><b>Unmet:</b></p> <p><b>Cannot evaluate</b></p>
3.	<p><b>DUPLICATION OF OTHER UNC SYSTEM PROGRAMS</b></p> <p>Convincing evidence is provided that this program:</p> <p>a. Does not duplicate another similar or related program in the UNC System OR</p> <p>b. Addresses a unique societal need that is not currently met by another UNC System programs.</p> <p>c. Should not directly compete with similar programs for a “market-share” of students.</p>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b></p> <p><b>Met:</b></p> <p><b>Met with Weakness:</b></p> <p><b>Unmet:</b></p> <p><b>Cannot evaluate</b></p>
4.	<p><b>COURSE OF STUDY / ACCREDITATION</b></p> <p>a. The proposal has an appropriate and clearly defined program of study.</p> <p>b. Graduation criteria are clearly specified and appropriate.</p> <p>c. The required credit hours can be completed within a reasonable time to degree.</p> <p>d. In cases of accreditation, the proposal discusses how the accreditation standards will be met.</p> <p>e. Clinical, practicum, research, and/or internship sites/opportunities are provided.</p>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b></p> <p><b>Met:</b></p> <p><b>Met with Weakness:</b></p> <p><b>Unmet:</b></p> <p><b>Cannot evaluate</b></p>



5.	<p><b>PREPAREDNESS OF UNIT OFFERING PROGRAM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A critical mass of faculty members and/or staff is available to offer the program based on estimated enrollments.</li> <li>b. If appropriate, there is a commitment to hire additional faculty members and/or staff</li> <li>c. The faculty associated with this new degree have been productive in teaching and research appropriate to the degree level.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b> <b>Met:</b> <b>Met with Weakness:</b> <b>Unmet:</b> <b>Cannot evaluate:</b></p>
6..	<p><b>LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposal provides learning objectives and methods and means of evaluation.</li> <li>b. Evidence of how the program will be assessed is provided.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b> <b>Met:</b> <b>Met with Weakness:</b> <b>Unmet:</b> <b>Cannot evaluate:</b></p>
7.	<p><b>OTHER RESOURCES</b> As appropriate, evidence is provided that the necessary resources are sufficient and established to initiate the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Library resources</li> <li>b. Computing resources</li> <li>c. Teaching space(s)</li> <li>d. Office space(s)</li> <li>e. Equipment</li> <li>f. Fellowships, scholarships, and graduate assistantships</li> <li>g. Other:</li> </ul>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b> <b>Met:</b> <b>Met with Weakness:</b> <b>Unmet:</b> <b>Cannot evaluate:</b></p>
8.	<p><b>BUDGET AND BUDGET JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposal provides a complete and realistic budget for the program, which reflects the text of the proposal.</li> <li>b. The proposal contains realistic estimates of headcount who will graduate from the proposed program.</li> <li>c. The proposal provides a convincing argument that the output of the program justifies the investment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b> <b>Met:</b> <b>Met with Weakness:</b> <b>Unmet:</b> <b>Cannot evaluate:</b></p>
9.	<p><b>SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposal includes quantitative data that provide evidence for claims made in the proposal.</li> <li>b. The proposal provides letters/memos of support to substantiate the information provided in the proposal.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Met with Strength:</b> <b>Met:</b> <b>Met with Weakness:</b> <b>Unmet:</b> <b>Cannot evaluate:</b></p>