

## Graduate Council

February 23, 2018

### Minutes

*Voting members present:* Sourabh Apte, Bill Bogley, Jim Coakley, Ryan Contreras, Cass Dykeman (via phone), Theresa Filtz (via phone), Lisa Ganio, Claire Gibbons, Lisa Price (via phone)

*Voting members absent:* Pat Chappell, Marie Harvey, George Waldbusser

*Ex-officio members present:* Graduate School – Jennifer Brown (via phone), OSU Cascades – Julie Gess-Newsome (via phone)

*Guest:* Rosemary Garagnani

### Review of Draft Minutes

- [January 19, 2018](#)

- [January 26, 2018](#)

*Action: Bill moved to approve the January 19 and January 26 minutes as distributed; motion seconded and approved with no dissenting votes or discussion.*

### **Expedited Category I Review Policy** – Jennifer Brown

- Policy for an expedited review process for an existing program that will be delivered in a new location using a different mode of on-line instruction (hybrid) – [Initial draft version](#)
- Policy for an expedited review process for an existing program that will be delivered in a new location using a different mode of on-line instruction (hybrid) – Mark-up version and clean version as revised by the Curriculum Council on [February 23, 2018](#).
- The [New Program Proposal Workflow Chart](#) shows the non-expedited review process.

In light of some of the strategic initiatives, a proposal to expedite approvals is moving forward to generate revenue for the academic colleges (Portland initiative). The proposal is to expedite Category I proposals for programs that exist, but need to change where they are delivered, as well as modality (site-based versus hybrid).

- The proposal originated with the Portland area, but could be extended to other areas if it is an existing program. Jennifer indicated that three colleges are ready to submit proposals for the Portland area – it would just be a modality change; she hopes that the Graduate and Curriculum Councils will agree.
- One questioned in #3 how can there not be alignment with degree program Learning Outcomes and, in #5, how can it not be aligned with the program? Jennifer suggested that the Council request clarification. One felt that someone needs to ensure that expedited proposals are compared to and consistent with the online catalog.
- Regarding the assessment plan, if the modality changes, the plan may also change.
- Because a budget review is not mentioned, what is meant by, “Demonstration of adequate budget resources”? Vickie noted that Susana Rivera-Mills informed the Curriculum Council that the Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee will not review expedited proposals, but the Provost will ensure that the budget is adequate.
- Jennifer noted the, if the program is already offered in Portland, it would not need to go through the expedited process – this process is intended for an entirely new location. Most of what was discussed was the Portland area and the ability to provide programming. Vickie noted that the intent of Curriculum Council revisions to the policy was to include all other potential locations, not just Portland.
- One observed that the Graduate Council was omitted from the process of reviewing expedited graduate programs. Jennifer indicated that this was an opportunity to insert the Graduate Council as a review step; she felt it was appropriate to add the Graduate Council as a numbered step.
- One noted that, if an existing program moves to a wholly online Ecampus program, it does not go through the Graduate Council but, if it is not wholly online, it does go through the Council.
- When moving faculty to a new location, there are faculty welfare issues that arise, such as: what is the responsibility of the home unit to support tenure, etc.? Another stated

that there is a faculty section on the HECC new location form. There was support for those types of issues being reviewed by Faculty Senate groups.

- The original version of the policy stated that the Executive summary included the academic home, but the Curriculum Council removed that bullet and replaced it with 'Dean's signature from the academic home' – who is responsible for the faculty in the program?
  - One noted that tenure resides in department, for colleges that have units.
- Jim state that, after 'academic unit' he revised the policy by inserting 'College dean approval' (the unit builds the proposal and the dean signs off).
- A Council member noted instances of circumstances where courses with a designator were listed and staffed, but the academic home was not aware of the course being offered. Jennifer questioned what could be put in proposal to ensure accountability.
- How will the program be assessed? It will be evaluated simultaneously with the existing on-campus program. If a degree program, the location doesn't matter – all locations are assessed at the same time. Additionally, all assessment plans should be the same regardless of the location.
- Suggested policy revisions:
  - Adjust bullet #2 to read: Executive summary containing alignment of Learning Outcomes, catalog description and assessment plan
  - Separate out academic home and responsible party
  - Insert step 2.5 to include Graduate Council review if it's a graduate program
  - #1 – academic proposal submission and approval
  - The Executive Summary will include alignment with degree program learning outcomes and the OSU catalog will identify the academic home, i.e., program coordinator or director. Add Graduate Council review and approval as the new #3.
  - One would like the scope more clearly defined.
  - One questioned whether the policy should indicate, "any existing program taught in a new location unless it's totally online".
  - One member would like to see the review and approval process at the Ecampus, Graduate Council and Curriculum Council steps.
  - The Graduate Council members agreed with Ryan's review of the edits.

*Action: Ryan will forward proposed revisions to John Bailey to be incorporated into the Curriculum Council's revised document.*

- One didn't feel that what is being described in the policy is an expedited process. Another questioned what is being expedited and what part of the process will be faster. Jennifer's sense is that the identified steps are ones that don't tend to linger – she will determine responses and communicate back to the Graduate Council.
- If the process is offering an existing online program it at a different location, what would be objectionable to the Graduate Council? A disconnect with Learning Outcomes would be an example.
- One wanted Ecampus to validate that the Learning Outcomes can be achieved with a different modality.
- The current policy for Ecampus review of programs is that, once programs have been reviewed by Ecampus and Academic Programs and Assessment, the Curriculum Council then reviews and accepts the proposal.

*Action: At some point, Ryan would like to take up the issue of Ecampus proposals that currently don't receive Graduate Council review.*

## **Changes to Major and Option requirements to the MPH (Masters of Public Health) #100872**

- [Proposal](#)
- [Background and Justification for Proposals to Change Requirements for the MPH degree and Options](#) (February 9, 2018)

*Discussion postponed due to Marie Harvey's absence.*

## **MS in Business**

*Continue the discussion from the February 16 meeting with additional College of Business input.*

- [Graduate Learning Outcomes for Master of Science in Business](#)
- [The Demise of the Full-Time MBA](#)
- Jim Coakley will address the Graduate Learning Outcomes and add a summative assessment to the proposal. He indicated that two academic faculty will listen to the oral exam.
- The Financial Planning proposal is a series of 1-credit modules since a 1-credit module cannot be taught in a three-week period at OSU, so three 1-credit modules were combined for a 3-credit course. Additionally, an industry representative who is a qualified faculty member will be involved. There will also be an external industry representative, so there will always be more than two people present for oral exams and presentations.
- What is the reason for not completing the oral exam form? Jim responded that, since most exams will be done in Portland, would be difficulty in obtaining signatures. The form infers that a two-hour exam was completed, but that doesn't actually occur.
- For next year, there are six enrolled in Supply Chain Analytics and two enrolled in Financial Planning; 15-20 per year are anticipated.
- It seems that all students will complete the same capstone project – is this correct? Jim responded that, for Supply Chain Analytics, three teams will participate on an industry project. The project is not unique, but the solutions will be unique to the teams of 2-3 students. Each team writes one report, and each student has an individual component, but each student must be knowledgeable enough with the project to respond to all questions for each component. If one student fails, the team fails. Students on a team judge others on the team.

*Action: Cass moved to approve the MS in Business based on updated summative learning assessments and methods used by the College of Business; motion seconded and passed with one abstention.*

- One questioned why the Graduate Council is starting to review certificates. Because not every certificate is tied to a program. Per Steph, Ryan said there are only 13 current certificates – the information is not onerous.
- If the Council is assessing a program, what happens to certificates that are not attached to a program review? The individual did not want to assess a standalone certificate.
- Clarification of what is to be assessed and reviewed was requested. It was noted that Steph was going to describe what will be assessed every two years; this will be discussed when Steph comes forward with the description.

*Minutes prepared by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff*