Members Present: Rosemary Closson, Zorka Karanxha (alt) for Valerie Janesick, Jeffrey Kromrey, Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill, Barbara Loeding, Marcus Kilpatrick, Jennifer Mariano, Liz Larkin, and Jane Applegate

Members Absent: Jennifer Baggerly

Ex-Officios Present: Harold Keller, Diane Briscoe

Others Present: Miranda Sloan, Pat Wilson, Lora Crider

1. Call to Order/Welcome ............................................................. Jeannie Kleinhammer-Tramill, Chair
   a. Introductions and Welcome

2. Review Minutes from 04/11/2008 – Motion to approve meeting minutes was made by Jeffrey Kromrey and seconded by Jane Applegate. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. GPC Orientation and Faculty Course Submission Training Workshop (Outcomes)
   A handout was given to the committee with the various comments made from those who attended the GPC Orientation on September 5. Based on the list of issues identified during the training workshop, the committee discussed the following:
   
a. The committee discussed strategies for streamlining the timelines and process for GPC to review proposals.
      • The Committee decided to pilot a new process in which proposals that have been reviewed and revised as needed would be placed on a Consent Agenda.
      • The Committee will grant any request for a full discussion of any course or program proposal.
      • Individual review teams should provide feedback within 2 weeks or receiving the proposal; depending on response to feedback, course and program changes can be included in the next GPC agenda.

b. It was suggested that Carol Hines-Cobb might address the GPC on various issues including the process and timelines for proposals after they go to the Graduate Office.

c. The committee discussed the State Online Course Numbering system and the need for additional information to understand the implications for individual faculty.

c. The committee discussed summer qualifying exams, dissertation proposals, and dissertation defenses.
   • The number of students who take qualifying exams, defend proposals, or defend dissertations appears to have increased; however, with budget cuts, there may be no way to compensate faculty for supervising these activities.
• Diane Briscoe reminded the committee of GPC’s current position that individual doctoral committees have discretion in scheduling qualifying exams and dissertation defenses so long as they are within the established College timelines.
• The committee discussed the need to find a solution to the issue of faculty involvement without compensation that is equitable for both faculty and students.
• The committee requested trend data on the number of students who take qualifying exams or who are enrolled in dissertation hours during the summer and the impact summer enrollment might have on students’ rate of completion.
• The committee recommended gathering information on how AAU handles the issue of summer and faculty.

f. The Graduate Council has openings for two faculty members. GPC members should encourage faculty to volunteer for these roles.

g. The University has convened several committee to examine issues related to faculty roles, responsibilities; budget priorities; interdisciplinary collaboration; and global initiatives. Individual COEDU faculty and COEDU committees have opportunities to provide input to these committees through their representatives. Harold Keller suggested it would be helpful to gather a list of College of Education faculty members who serve on committees and task forces and distribute to the GPC.

4. New Business
a. Begin a discussion on all graduate content courses for 3 credits: rationale, purposes and student benefit
b. Review GPC procedures, as needed, to determine whether they are based on existing policy or tradition.
c. Review data and continue discussion of summer doctoral student supervision.

5. For the good of the Order.
a. Reminder to include the COEDU framework in syllabi and new course applications
b. The need to put back in place a College Paper Form for Course Submissions.
c. It was suggested that courses be reviewed and if no discussion is necessary they be put on a “consent” agenda for the GPC meeting rather than taking up time to present each course. The new procedure will be:
   1. **Sub-committee will review the proposal and provide feedback and upon getting response to their feedback they will recommend that the course either be discussed further at a meeting or say it is good to go as is.**
   2. **The subcommittee will notify Lora the status of the course as in does it need further discussion or can be placed on the consent agenda. Lora will send an email to the committee announcing the decision of the subcommittee and will have one week to respond to the decision of the subcommittee.**
   3. **The faculty sponsor will be notified of the Proposal will either be on the GPC Agenda or the GPC Consent Agenda. They are not asked to attend if it is on the Consent Agenda.**
   4. **The proposal will then be placed on the next Agenda or next Consent Agenda.**
c. The Committee asked for a timeline to be created showing the process of the course proposal with possible dates.
d. Fall catalog copy is due the preceding December.

6. Adjournment