

Graduate Council

January 15, 2016 ~ 3:00-4:30 PM

442 Austin Hall

Agenda

Voting members present: Sourabh Apte, Stephanie Bernell, Jim Coakley, Theresa Filtz, David Finch, Lisa Ganio, Andreas Schmittner, Stacy Semevolos

Voting members absent: Ryan Contreras, Drew Hatlen, Kokmun Ng, Lisa Price

Ex-officio members present: Graduate School Dean (Brenda McComb), Graduate School Associate Dean (Jennifer Dennis),

Guest: Julie Gess-Newsome, Dorthe Wildenschild

Overview of the flow chart for approval of new programs (see [Workflow Chart.pdf](#))

- Why is college curriculum committee so late in the process? Brenda- when program comes to APAA or GS, feedback is provided to the college; after the external review, the college has ... For college curriculum committee to move forward, the dean will need to know costs from library, etc., which may occur after the external review. Jim there is a requirement to not duplicate programs.
- Jim – structured so that everything hangs up in APAA. Brenda- if issues need to be resolved with APAA, contact Brenda. Jim suggested that faculty representatives do more of the work of APAA, i.e., CC, GC. Suggested moving APAA review toward the end, rather than hanging it up at the beginning.

Action: Theresa will forward GC comments to Gary Beach, and copy Brenda.

- Brenda noted that the new CPS is on hold; stepping back to determine what can be done to make the CPS more efficient.
- Andreas questioned whether the chart should be reviewed by the college curriculum committees; Theresa will delay sending comments to Gary until the next meeting so college curriculum committees have an opportunity to review.

A proposal from Applied Anthropology to allow the use of prior experience to count towards internship credits. (see [Anthro Intern Req.pdf](#))

- The difference will be in what time the prior experience occurred; currently the requirements state that the requirements must be accomplished prior to acceptance of an internship.
- Jim noted that students frequently ask to be allowed to do this, but the intent is to take knowledge they have gained and apply it.
- Are consistent learning outcomes established for internships, and how are they assessed? The form doesn't mention learning outcomes
- There are currently two students who are requesting this change, but there are also students in many programs who would be able to take advantage of this requested change.
- Other institutions have a rigorous process
- This creates a philosophical question for the university; if the Graduate Council agrees to approve this request, there should be further discussion with the Graduate C, CC, and other groups – this will set precedence.
- It was noted that Applied Anthropology can waive the requirement, and approval by the Graduate Council would not be required – it would then become an Anthropology internal process without setting precedence.
- IF they wish to pursue competency-based ..., it would require a larger university conversation.

Re-visiting the discussion to allow the College of Liberal Arts to award the EdM degree in the recently relocated CSSA program

- It was previously felt that a unit must be accredited to offer an education degree – it was presumed that Education accreditation would be required to offer an education degree; perhaps this was incorrect.
- Julie – typically accreditation involves licensure, and this degree is not involved with licensure.

- Philosophical concerns – why would one offer an EdM degree rather than another degree? Julie – EdM or MEd signifies advanced preparation beyond initial licensure. As of last November, Oregon no longer requires a Masters – this degree would be for one who has either a Bachelor's or Masters and would appear as a transcriptable add-on degree.
- If there are concerns, Brenda suggested inviting Larry Roper to meet with the Graduate Council.

Action: Either ask Larry Roper or invite him to the Graduate Council to describe what they're planning to require of CSSA students.

Discussion of a request to allow "M.Other" degrees to use an alternative summative assessment process in lieu of an oral exam by committee (*see Sum Assess.docx, Sum Assess.pdf, Sum Assess Table.docx*)

- How does the Graduate Council feel about a blanket allowance for M.Other degrees to have summative assessments – what should composition of the program committee look like when the summative assessment is just a final exam. Would other degrees, such as MS, be allowed to have alternate assessment?
- The challenge is meeting both accreditation and OSU requirements because they are sometimes conflicting; it's not useful to the student. It's an onerous process, and a rigorous project is folded into the oral exam. The spirit is met, but it's not an exam as written by the Graduate School. Some programs consistently oversee students throughout the year, not just on a graduate committee. It's frequently difficult to find committee members.
- What is the purpose of the final oral exam? If students don't do research, what do you do? Some accrediting bodies require individual assessment – does this supersede the oral exam, and is it achieving the same purpose?
- Learning outcomes, competencies, etc., need to have a checkmark whether via education experience or exam, it seems reasonable. Rigor must be present.
- The MEng doesn't do projects at the end it's an entire course.
- How to proceed?
- Julie- liked Brenda's idea gave programs an opportunity – take to FS for non-thesis degrees have flexibility to assure rigor, but allow program to go forward. Put forward a policy to allow after review of every program by the Graduate Council.
- Provide guidance to program of what would & wouldn't be reasonable – what would be needed in a program. Must show individual level of achievement of assessment.
- Assure there is a mechanism to meet Graduate School criteria and on any accreditation requirements – individual programs could add metrics.
- Want a plan for evaluation of students.
- Would need to exempt non-thesis graduate programs; the three Graduate Learning Outcomes would apply to only thesis-based programs. Non-thesis MS would need a capstone project or
- Jim – if a non-thesis MS and want to keep it that way, make it something else. MS implies research.
- Alternatives: M.Other degrees may not require an oral exam, but a program could propose to the Graduate Council an alternative in lieu of the oral exam. The requirement is already in existence. It would be up to the MEng program directors to document within courses what projects were involved in the program and how they contributed to creative work. Sourabh will discuss requirements with the College of Engineering related to the MEng, if the exam is eliminated, what would replace it, and report back to the Graduate Council.
- Determine what the GC wants to do, propose to EC and let the EC recommend where it goes from there.
- Is there any expectation that major professor has veto power over the other three committee members? No.

A three-year follow-up review of the Applied Anthropology graduate program (*see [AAGP 3-yr AP.pdf](#)*)

- Initial concerns related to support. The graduate student support FTE has been increased; however, support from school director has reduced the overall number of

GRAs, likely as a result of their remission budget. There are no plans to expand the program.

Action: Jim moved to support the report; motion seconded and passed via voice vote with no dissenting votes.

A proposal to maintain a state-wide roster of faculty who would be eligible to serve on OSU committees (see [Grad Faculty Collab.pdf](#))

- Grad deans in public institutions in OR meet twice per year. There is interest among publics in having a list of faculty eligible as Graduate committee members at any institution in various programs which would open door to work with faculty across the state. Grad faculty service would need to be approved by the GS; if approved at their home institution, they would not need to be approved at the institution at which they are asked to serve. Need to determine whether UO, PSU, and OSU processes are similar enough for the other institution to accept them without becoming an OSU, etc., graduate faculty member. Advantage is to create more opportunities at other institution; disadvantage is that there may be more exams via Adobe Connect, etc. Students would have ability to peruse the list and select a committee member(s).
- Does this apply only to OSU faculty? Unknown at this time.
- There was concern with having students directly contact faculty at other institutions.
- Faculty would have the ability to opt out of the list. Possible for faculty to opt out via Banner.
- Faculty advisors would need to be an approved faculty member at the respective institutions.
- Brenda would like Graduate Council guidance prior to the February graduate deans meeting.

The next scheduled meeting will be January 29.