May 21, 2012

GRADUATE COUNCIL PROCEDURES MANUAL

The purpose of this document is to provide a brief overview of the types of tasks conducted by the Graduate Council, and the process through which these tasks are completed. It does not set policy, but rather may reflect policies currently in place.

I. POLICY

The Graduate Council oversees policies, procedures, and requirements of graduate education, in consultation with Graduate School. Issues may be presented to the Graduate Council from faculty, GC representatives, or the Graduate School.

II. PROGRAM REVIEWS

a. All graduate programs are reviewed every 10 years (or more frequently if there is evidence of problems which need to be monitored).
b. Reviews are organized by Graduate School who identifies a lead external reviewer (after consultation with department/program chair); Assoc. Dean from Graduate School participates; Grad Council provides in-house reviewer; community reviewers sometimes included. If possible, an alumnus from the Graduate Council may be included; the Executive Committee has responsibility for identifying this person. Writing responsibility is distributed across the reviewers, but external reviewer has overall responsibility.
c. Review is presented to Grad Council; then department/program chair and dean is invited in. Review is revised per Grad Council and department/program chair input and then voted on by Grad Council and sent to Dean of Graduate School as well as program/department chair and Dean of College.
d. An Action Plan is then prepared by department/program chair with input from faculty and Dean of College and submitted to Graduate School and Graduate Council. Presentation to Provost (or designee) with attendance at meeting by Graduate School Dean (or designee), Grad Council representative and Chair. Inclusion of possible metrics which indicate progress on the Action Plan is helpful.
e. A brief three year follow-up is written by original GC representative who served on the review panel. This representative gathers information from the department/program chair (usually a one-hour interview) on progress on Action Plan. This report is presented to Graduate Council by original representative and voted on. Attendance by department/program chair is not required unless Grad Council representative identifies significant problems. Report sent to Graduate

School. In the case of significant problems, additional follow-up reviews and/or an accelerated review timeline may be required.

See http://oregonstate.edu/dept/grad_school/Graduate_Council/Program_Review_Guidelines.pdf.

III. CATEGORY I REVIEWS

There are two types of reviews, Full CAT I and Abbreviated CAT I. Full CAT I is to create new degree program or certificate, administrative unit, or deliver existing program at new location, and requires OUS approval. Abbreviated CAT I is for renaming existing units, merging, splitting, or relocating units. CAT I's are submitted through Curricular Planning System (CPS) to Grad Council Chairs.

See http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/cati.html.

a. Primary reviewer (often from the submitting college) and secondary reviewer are assigned by Grad Council chair.
b. Review draft and attend Academic Planning Committee (APC) meeting; inform Grad Council re potential problems, if any. Focus should be on:
    a. whether there are sufficient graduate faculty to support program;
    b. whether Graduate School requirements are being met (e.g., 50% stand along graduate classes or credit requirements);
    c. If assessment plans are in place;
    d. If appropriate liaisons have been conducted.
c. Review submission (can use attached template) and present to Graduate Council
d. Graduate Council votes and submits to Graduate School. NOTE: can put on hold if serious problem identified or can approve provisionally pending additional information.

IV. CATEGORY II REVIEWS

CAT II reviews are to create new classes or modify existing ones. CAT II's are also submitted through CPS but to reviewers identified by Graduate Council.

a. College representative takes primary responsibility; secondary reviewer is for consultation. Problems can be presented to whole Graduate Council.
b. Reviews should focus on:
    i. If the learning objecties reflect higher level learning such as synthesis, evaluation, and opportunities to apply scholarship.
    ii. Whether OSU syllabus requirements are being met (see http://oregonstate.edu/ap/curriculum/policies/S_syllabus.html;
    iii. If appropriate liaisons have been included to prevent duplication across departments.

iv. For slash classes, if appropriate additional graduate level work is required.

See attached guidelines developed by Assoc. Dean Martin Fisk.

V. AWARDS

Graduate Council representatives work in conjunction with the Graduate School in reviewing applications for awards. These include:

- Laurels Block Graduate Program (2 GC + 3 outside members)
- Oregon Lottery Scholarship (3 members)
- Bayley/Yerex Fellowships (3 members)
- Frolander Outstanding GTA Award (2 members)
- CGS/UMI Dissertation and WAGS/UMI Thesis Awards (2 members)
- Excellence in Graduate Mentoring Award (2 members)

VI. AD HOC COMMITTEES

a. Grievance Committee (2 GC + 1 student members)
b. Distance Education Liaison
c. Others, such as IGERT reviews

GRADUATE COUNCIL CHAIR TASKS

I. Make certain that colleges have representatives (in consultation with Faculty Senate President)
II. Assign representatives to committees and review panels, as appropriate, in consultation with Graduate School
III. Schedule and conduct meetings
IV. Arrange agenda to facilitate timely review processes
V. Edit and distribute minutes
VI. Maintain close liaison with Graduate School concerning program reviews, policy, procedures, and new initiatives.
VII. Maintain liaison with other Faculty Senate committees, as appropriate
VIII. Prepare annual report

Prepared by Carolyn Aldwin, 2012 Graduate Council Chair.