

Graduate Council Meeting No. 518 November 19, 2018 Minutes

Council Members Present: Mark Comerford (left at 3:20 pm), Theresa Deeney (left at 3:15 pm), Michael Greenfield, Peter Larsen (left at 3:30 pm) , Ingrid Lofgren, Diane Martins, Colleen Mouw, Peter Paton, Miriam Reumann, Daniel Sheinin, Gary Stoner

Council Members Absent: Nick Constant, Lauren Mandel, Scott McWilliams, Mehmet Gokhan Yalcin

Graduate School Present: Nasser Zawia, Andrea Rusnock, Alycia Mosley Austin, Cara Mitnick, Jessica Martinez

I. Call to order

➤ Time: 2:02 pm

II. Approval of Minutes of Meeting Number 517, 22 October 2018 (please see attachments)

★ *Approved: All approved*

★ *Abstained: 1 council member (absent from previous meeting)*

○ Comments:

1. Bullet 2.2 from meeting No. 516 minutes have been revised to state 'Graduate faculty are a subset of general faculty.'

III. Announcements

A. EGRAs

1. Check in with Sedrik Salah for missing EGRA scores that were actually submitted.
2. Council would like to see High EGRA scores to establish norms.
 - a. If there are any discrepancies between Reviewer 1 and Reviewer 2 scores, the Graduate School often assigns a senior member of the Graduate School to review the proposal. The average of all three scores is used.
3. Rubric should be reviewed
 - a. Currently two separate rubrics. Can be rewritten in a way to be used for both enhancement of research or dissemination of research.
 - b. Concerned with the focus on grammar.
 - i. For some applicants English is not their first language.
 - ii. Within the EGRA Announcement for next year we can advise students to attend the Graduate Writing Center for assistance with their writing.

- iii. The way the rubrics are written, we should grade to the rubric.
 - iv. Will revisit the rubrics and possibly add a third one.
- 4. Some proposals were very technical.
 - a. Suggestion: Have the student submit one or two paragraphs in everyday language to tell us about their proposal without using scientific terms.
 - i. NIH follows this process.
 - ii. This is exactly what we want our students to be able to do. To be able to tell anyone in the public what they are doing and why it is significant.
- 5. Is it possible to share the list of recipients with the Council?
 - a. Yes, we will share with the Council and possibly post it on our website as well.
- 6. Do the instructions state anything about submitting extra documentation? One applicant submitted over 20 pages.
 - a. Instructions and checklist will be revised.

B. Professional Development upcoming events

- 1. On December 5th there will be a program on de-stressing/managing your stress.
- 2. Spring programs will include interviewing, time management, individual development plans, CV resume, grant writing, and personality assessments.
- 3. Bridgewater State will be contacted to host a shadow day for our students as done a couple years ago.
- 4. On December 11th there will be a Graduate Writing Committee meeting at 9:00 am at the Graduate School, Quinn Hall Room 207. This meeting will devise ways that we can continue the Graduate Writing Center after its one year pilot program. Graduate Council is invited to attend.

C. Recent appointments to the Graduate Faculty since those listed on the agenda for 22 October 2018 meeting

Katherine Lacasse	Marine Affairs	10/19/2018
Jason McNamee	FAVS	10/31/2018
Christopher F. Deacutis	FAVS	10/31/2018
Najih Lazar	FAVS	10/31/2018
(comm. Member only; cannot serve as MP or co MP; only has MS)		
Mingxi Zhou	GSO	11/13/2018

IV. New Programs

A. PMHNP from Nursing

- 1. In October 2017, the Graduate Council approved a new concentration in Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner within their MS Nursing program. Today, Nursing is proposing a Post Master's certificate in this program.
- 2. Post Master's certificates are capped at 18 credits.
- 3. In the past, the Graduate Council has made an exception to the Post Master's Certificate Adult Gerontological Primary Care Nurse Practitioner Post Master's Certificate that is 21 credits.
 - a. An exception was made once, do we give another exception and what is the rationale or if an exception is continuously requested, do we revisit the credit cap?

- b. Are there other similar certificates in other institutions with similar credits?
4. The original proposal asked for 29 credits for one track and 23 credits for another track.
 - a. The proposal was revised since it was over the cap; the revised proposals lists 20 credits.
5. The request is coming from the College of Nursing, but it's based on state regulations for licensure and the number of hours and credits needed to sit for a state license as a Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner.
 - a. The reason the credits and credit hours are high is because of licensing demands. Even though they might have been a nurse practitioner under another program or a clinical specialist in another program and already have a master's degree, they need to learn the entire lifespan of psychiatric issues, from children to older adults. They also need to learn how to prescribe psychiatric meds and how to do psychiatric differential diagnosis using psychiatric tools.
6. Is it possible to pair certificates together to count for one?
 - a. Behavioral health and opioid issues in the state right now, they are looking more for people who have specialties in Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner roles. In order to produce practice providers in this specialty, the College of Nursing have really been pushed to create this post master's certificate. Some nurses already have a Master's degree in Psych Nursing but do not have the license to diagnose and prescribe.
7. Concern about the number of credits accumulated reaching to or more than a doctoral student while the student only has a master's degree.
 - a. This program is in high demand. Many students have gone to other states to obtain this certificate.
8. Should we amend our regular legislation that caps this certificate at 18 credits and build in an exception for health programs? Or do we keep doing exceptions?
 - a. Clinical requirements are much greater than other programs. Do we hold them to the same standard as a research based program?
9. Financially, the number of credits can become a burden for students.
10. The certificate serves as proof for obtaining a license.
11. Students can apply and go through the Master's program as a pipeline and switch to the certificate program once it becomes available.
12. Seems that this program and others that are certificate programs are being designed for employability that are often times guided by regulations that don't come from academia but guidelines that come from the Department of Health or Department of Education or somewhere else. There is a bit of mismatch between our 18 credit certificate idea and the notion of other credits.
 - a. Suggestion: Going forward this Council should consider if the certificate program should be more flexible and should we explore other degree and program options that we don't currently have but do exist elsewhere.

★ *Motion: Table approval until further details and data are received.*

- *No second motion received. Motion discontinued.*

★ *Motion: Make an exception and approve proposal. Review the certificate credit legislation at a later time.*

- *Approved: All approved*

B. ABM in Cybersecurity

1. URI does not have an IT as an undergraduate degree. The Computer Science Degree that is offered is more of a programming degree.
2. This ABM program will allow students to have a computer science degree as an undergrad and then get an additional professional degree, a Master's in Cyber Security which is much more specialized.
3. Double counting will make it more efficient.
 - a. Students are given an opportunity to double count one third of the credits.
 - b. Must finish within 2 years of being coded as an ABM, 5 years total.
 - c. If a student does not finish within the time allowed, there are repercussions.
 - i. Very infrequently exceptions are granted for students who have passed their time-to-degree period.
 - d. Comments:
 - i. The amount of leeway should be based on Graduate Credit program. For example, moving into a 30 credit program gives students more leeway than a 42 credit program. Giving the same deadlines is unfair to students.
 1. It is addressed in appendix K 1.3 - an additional year for programs that are more than 30 credits may be allowed with the permission of the Graduate School.
 - ii. It is unfair to those who are not in the accelerated format who are taking it individually, fulfilling all the credits and not benefiting from it financially for one third of the credit. Should there be repercussions?
 - iii. Is there a point in which the student is coded as a graduate student?
 1. Once all the legislation and governances are resolved, there will be a separate code for those students.
 2. The code will distinguish if they are graduate and undergraduate. That code will be used at the admissions stage to identify them and the counting of the time to degree will begin then.
 - iv. Will each program have their own ABM code?
 1. Yes. That is how it will be identified at the application stage and the code will follow the student.
 - e. One of the issues for smaller programs is that they do not offer the requisite number of courses in a single year. It is harder for them to meet the one year deadline.
 - f. The process of getting these approved should be revised. Notice of change versus a modified proposal.
4. Concerns that not all Council members reviewed the proposal.
 - a. The financial section of the form needs more clarification.
 - i. The program proposal does not need additional funding.
 - b. The Google drive format is the new process of sharing proposals.
 - i. Going forward, the Council will be notified once new documents are uploaded for all to review.
5. There are no changes to the proposal and it has already been approved by the designated undergraduate Curriculum and Standards committee

- a. Proposals submission process - proposals are submitted to the Faculty Senate office to distribute to review bodies. The Faculty Senate office has sent this proposal to the Graduate Council to act as a review body and make a recommendation. The Graduate Council's recommendation will then return to the Faculty Senate where the final decisions will be made.
6. The proposal is pairing both a B.A with a Cyber Security and a B.S with Cyber Security. There are two proposals in the system that are identical. The only difference is the credits.

★ *Motion: Table discussion of the ABM Cyber Security proposal until December allowing the Faculty Senate Review committee to review the proposal and appendix K.*

- *Approved: 3 council members*
- *Opposed: 8 council members*
- *Abstained: 2 council members*

★ *Motion: Approve B.A and B.S. to M.S as an ABM for Cyber Security*

- *Approved: 10 Council members*
- *Opposed: 2 Council members*
- *Abstained: 1 Council member*

V. Graduate Curriculum (See Google Drive for Course forms)

Tabled from last Graduate Council meeting:

500-level new courses:

College of Arts and Sciences

Department of Computer Science and Statistics

STA 525 Programming and Data Management in SAS

Catalog description: Data managing and programming in SAS: data input, formatting and labeling, conditional processing iterative processing, numeric and character functions, customized reports, data visualization and basis statistical analysis. Prerequisites: STA 307 or STA 308 or STA 409 or permission from instructor.

★ *Approved: 6 council members*

★ *Abstained: 2 Council Members*

New Course changes:

500 level course changes:

Interdisciplinary Neurosciences

NEU 502 Foundations of Neurobiology

Change in title and number of credits (from 3 to 4 credits)

★ *Approved: All approved*

NEU 503 Introduction to the Neurosciences

Change in total credits from 4 to 3.

★ *Approved: All approved*

NEU 699 Doctoral Dissertation Research

Change total number of possible credits from 6 to 12.

★ *Approved: All approved*

Comments:

1. *NEU 502 is cross listed with BIO. BIO 502 existed before the neuroscience program existed.*
2. *The syllabus has not been changed since the Graduate program was introduced.*
3. *Data was collected to see how students were doing in both 502 and 503. Decided to move things around to make it more of a streamlined introductory full year course.*

VI. New Business

A. ABM

1. Recap:

- a. February's Graduate Council meeting went through the ABM. There was a unanimous vote by the Graduate Council with some changes that Associate Dean Andrea Rusnock updated. This resulted in Appendix K in the Graduate School Manual.
- b. Dean Nasser Zawia attended the Faculty Senate to present ABM.
 - i. There were some concerns on the issue of double counting.
- c. Graduate Council Policy making is not subject to review by the Faculty Senate process came into question.
- d. The new Faculty Senate leadership has formed their own special committee to review the policies that we have made.
- e. The President has formed a committee of six (three from the Faculty Senate and possibly three from the Graduate Council) to see the issue of governance and jurisdiction.
 - i. It will establish guidance on what are the limits of what the Graduate Council can do and what items are reviewable in terms of policies.

2. The Faculty Senate special review committee is made up of four faculty members. It is a co-committee between the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council.

- a. This committee is responsible for reviewing proposals from the Graduate school for the ABM.
- b. Address questions such as double counting credits, time lines, URI students versus other students.
- c. Asked to review appendix K and to compare to past practices and guidelines of the University. After review, the committee will provide recommendations and a report.
- d. Additionally, the Faculty Senate Special Review Committee is reviewing the Computer Science ABM proposal.
 - i. Important to look at the overall concept of the ABM and reach perspective on that before judging an individual program.
 - ii. Based on what the Graduate Council decides today, the proposal will go to the Faculty senate in December.
- e. Referencing February's Graduate Council meeting minutes, it states that ABM and the appendix has not been approved yet and will be revisited once changes are made.

- i. The Graduate School was challenged with minutes due to not having a Graduate Council secretary for February's meeting.
 - 1. Copies were distributed of handwritten notes from February's Graduate Council meeting. Notes state it was approved unanimously, there were no abstentions, and no opposed members. The Council gave the Grad School the power to make final revisions to Appendix K.
- 3. Thomson Board room might be available for the remaining council meetings. Jessica will look into possibly booking the boardroom.
- 4. For the upcoming Fellowship Scholarship Diversity competition, suggestion to look at prior year scores. This will help with the rubric and provide guidelines.
 - a. Provide an example of the high or medium proposal as a reference.
 - i. We can send all the scores to the Council and if you would like to see an example, you may request to see it.
 - b. Do a calibration exercise. Everyone scores one application and then have a discussion on how the scores varied. Hands on activity.

★ *Motion: Amend minutes from the February Graduate Council minutes that was previously adopted.*

- *Approved - All approved*
- *Abstained : 4 council members (due to not being present during the February meeting)*

VII. Adjournment

➤ **Time: 3:44 pm**