



## Minutes of the Graduate Board

*Thursday, October 22, 2009*

**Executive Conference Room  
Student Faculty Center  
Health Sciences Center Campus  
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.**

---

### **Members Present:**

William Aaronson, Daniel J. Canney, Joseph DuCette, Deborah Howe, Daniel Kern, Dan A. Liebermann, Roberta Newton, Jeffrey Rush, Dennis Silage

### **Ex-Officio Member:**

Richard M. Englert, Interim Dean, Graduate School

### **Graduate School Staff:**

Cheryl Jackson, Assistant to the Dean  
Kathryn Petrich-LaFevre, Director of Graduate Information

### **Guest:**

Dolores Zygmunt, Department of Nursing

### **Approval of the Minutes:**

Daniel Kern motioned to approve the minutes of September 23, 2009. Roberta Newton seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously passed.

Dan Kern also motioned to approve the minutes of the special interim session of October 7, 2009. Deborah Howe seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes was unanimously passed.

### **Business:**

The first order of business was academic programs. The Interim Dean introduced Dolores Zygmunt, who spoke about the proposed Doctor of Nursing Practice. She explained that the D.N.P. will be needed by 2015 in accordance with the guidelines of the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE), Nursing's accrediting agency. The D.N.P. is designed to broaden the focus for all advanced practice nurses from disease management and health education to understanding trends in population, environmental factors, and policy. She noted that all peer and aspirant institutions have or will develop a D.N.P. The proposed Temple degree requires 62 credits post-BSN and is part of the curricular plan from undergraduate to graduate. The majority (98%) of students is expected to enroll part-time, although two courses – whether taken in class or online – will be required per semester to ensure their finishing on time. Most faculty are doctorally prepared, but the department does not have the research faculty at this time to support a Ph.D. in Nursing. William Aaronson motioned to approve the D.N.P., and Dan Liebermann seconded the motion. The vote was 9 for, 0 against, and 0 abstaining.

The next item on the agenda was a change in the graduate application, both the electronic ApplyYourself version and the online downloadable paper version. Questions have been added pertaining to (a) past disciplinary action at a college or university for academic or behavioral misconduct, and (b) a felony conviction. If responding in the affirmative to either question, the applicant is to provide details about the incident, including dates and terms of resolution. This

change now brings in line all applications, from undergraduate to graduate to professional, including dental, law, medicine, pharmacy, and podiatry. The Board inquired if a background check of applicants is planned. The Interim Dean responded that falsification of information on the application would lead to a myriad of problems for the individual.

The Graduate Board was next presented with a timeline for completion grants and fellowships. Members were advised that nominations for the dissertation and project completion grants were closed for Spring 2010. Consequently, they would soon receive said information for their consideration.

The Interim Dean then provided the Graduate Board with information on the new federal classifications for doctoral programs. Beginning with Fall 2009, the “first professional” category ceases to exist, thereby affecting the classification of degree programs in dentistry, law, medicine, and podiatry. Three classifications can now be utilized for doctoral degrees: Research/Scholarship, which requires advanced work resulting in a dissertation or original artistic project; Professional Practice, which requires gaining knowledge and skills for professional practice; and Other, which offers a category for those not represented by the other two. An example of a degree that might fit the “Other” category is a D.B.A. The University is charged with classifying its programs. The Interim Dean advised that the deans will each receive a letter and a list of the doctoral programs in their schools and colleges. Their classifications will then be reviewed for consistency across the University before submission of the information to the federal government.

In old business, the Interim Dean presented the Graduate Board with a handout for defining and distributing graduate assistantships. He suggested that the Board focus on defining assistantships and that distribution of assistantships await the appointment of the Senior Vice Provost for Research Administration and Graduate Education.

*Board Response:*

It was suggested by a member of the Graduate Board that the Zemsky report focuses on doctoral programs. The Interim Dean advised that it does not exclude master’s programs, but that certainly a determination needs to be made about which should be supported. Another member noted that in many cases master’s programs are viewed as “money makers” since they are offered without financial support to students.

“Is employee tuition remission included in Zemsky’s data?” asked a Board member. This, he noted would skew the numbers.

Another member charged the group with avoiding the trap of minutiae. He recommended looking to the University’s Academic Compass for priorities. The Interim Dean suggested the issues be laid out on the table. What is the function of a Teaching Assistant? He noted the Board’s earlier concerns about introducing TAs to the classroom before they are prepared and as instructors of record. Another member agreed it is an issue of timing: preparation for the classroom is certainly necessary for a TA, but it is also extremely beneficial for them to have taught independently as they progress through their educational career. It was stated that the College of Engineering follows a strict progression in preparing TAs: they begin in the laboratory setting, move to recitation sections, and then teach. The Interim Dean pointed out that the master’s model with a TA as instructor of record is not the norm – and no rationale exists for utilizing it.

One Board member noted that students should be admitted to a program for their academics, not their teaching skills. It was further suggested that budgetary implications might drive assistantships as it is cheaper to hire an adjunct than a TA. Another member noted that, indeed, the cost of an assistantship does far exceed its stipend.

The Interim Dean noted that movement has been made toward a manageable and predictable model for tuition remission for assistantships. The deans are discussing this matter as tuition is being standardized at the doctoral level.

Finally, new business was raised regarding the streamlining of the structure of the Graduate School. The Interim Dean advised that he and the Associate Dean have been discussing revisions to the current policy document. The new document is expected to be readied shortly and presented to the Policy Committee within weeks for their discussion.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned @ 4:00 p.m.

The next Graduate Board meeting will be held on Main Campus, 3B Conwell Hall, on Wednesday, November 18, 2009, @ 2:30 p.m.