

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

November 17, 2004

100 KRESGE LIBRARY

Approved: January 19, 2005

Present: Lisa Hawley, Vincent Khapoya, Mildred Merz, Sherri Oden, Mohinder Parkash, Claire Rammel, Darlene Schott-Baer, Meir Shillor, Lorenzo Smith, Kris Thompson.

Absent: Krzystof Kobus, Ron Sudol

Staff: Lynette Folken

Call to Order

This meeting was convened at 2:10 p.m. by Darlene Schott-Baer, vice chair of Graduate Council.

I. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Darlene Schott-Baer summarized the new process for program proposal review. Under the new process, program proposals will be assigned to a 3-person review team. The teams will be rotated with each new proposal, preventing any one review team from being overburdened. The review team will be responsible for completing a comprehensive evaluation of the proposal, including one member focusing on budget and one member focusing on faculty resources. The third team member will be identified as the primary reviewer. This person will be responsible for presenting to Graduate Council a written summary of the team findings and an outline of potential questions, concerns and/or supplemental documents deemed essential to comprehending the proposal. Before inviting department representation to Graduate Council for the first reading, the review team will present their findings and lead members through discussion. During discussion, Graduate Council will agree on final outline of potential questions, concerns and/or supplemental documents. The outline will be submitted to the department representative prior to the first reading for action. The process is designed to enhance the review process. All members of Graduate Council are expected to ask questions based on their own assessment of the proposal.

Kris Thompson suggested that department representatives should be present at the first meeting, so that they would be able to gain an understanding of the questions or concerns posed by the presenters. Ms. Schott-Baer suggested departments be reminded to write program proposals using a writing style that allows all readers, not just those associated with the discipline, to understand and comprehend. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that council membership would benefit from the opportunity to discuss proposals at length and formulate questions prior to the attendance of the department representatives.

II. NEW BUSINESS

a) Introduction of Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

b) Proposal Review Team: Vince Khapoya (primary reviewer), Mohinder Parkash (budget), Meir Shillor (faculty resources)

Mr. Khapoya will outline findings at the January 19 Graduate Council meeting.

Mr. Parkash queried University intention of the budget proforma template. He pointed out to council the current form shows only incremental revenue and expenses not income and suggested that the current budget proforma template should be reformatted. In reply, Darlene Schott-Baer suggested that Mr. Parkash submit a draft for a new form, along with written explanations of the suggested changes. With support of Graduate Council, the draft could be forwarded to Provost.

Mr. Parkash was prepared to present his review of the DNP budget. He questioned whether one faculty would be enough to absorb the extra credits generated by the new program. He suggested the following:

- Request one full-time faculty member for the first year and add part-time faculty in years two, three and four,
- Recalculate general service fee entry.

He noted that Kresge Library had suggested a library budget of at least \$15,000 but the proposal submitted by the School of Nursing requested only \$5,000.

Mr. Shillor was also concerned whether one additional faculty would be adequate to absorb the extra credits, especially the 8-credit research component. Mr. Parkash noted that the proposal included positions for a lab assistant and statistical support. Ms. Schott-Baer responded that the current part-time lab support would have to be increased to full time, possibly including weekends, and outlined explained purpose of statistical support. Mr. Shillor offered to work one-on-one with Ms. Schott-Baer to re-evaluate formula used to calculate faculty/staff resources and express those measures clearly in the proposal.

III. GOOD AND WELFARE

Claire Rammel indicated she has been asked by several faculty and department administrators to provide a list of OU course types with a definition. Example: Independent Study (course type) with a definition (what is an independent study). She distributed the best sample of university course types and their descriptions found through researching other sources. She suggested members review the document in preparation for further discussion at a future meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The December meeting is cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 19, 2005.

**OAKLAND UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

November 17, 2004

100 KRESGE LIBRARY

Approved: January 19, 2005

Present: Lisa Hawley, Vincent Khapoya, Mildred Merz, Sherri Oden, Mohinder Parkash, Claire Rammel, Darlene Schott-Baer, Meir Shillor, Lorenzo Smith, Kris Thompson.

Absent: Krzystof Kobus, Ron Sudol

Staff: Lynette Folken

Call to Order

This meeting was convened at 2:10 p.m. by Darlene Schott-Baer, vice chair of Graduate Council.

I. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Darlene Schott-Baer summarized the new process for program proposal review. Under the new process, program proposals will be assigned to a 3-person review team. The teams will be rotated with each new proposal, preventing any one review team from being overburdened. The review team will be responsible for completing a comprehensive evaluation of the proposal, including one member focusing on budget and one member focusing on faculty resources. The third team member will be identified as the primary reviewer. This person will be responsible for presenting to Graduate Council a written summary of the team findings and an outline of potential questions, concerns and/or supplemental documents deemed essential to comprehending the proposal. Before inviting department representation to Graduate Council for the first reading, the review team will present their findings and lead members through discussion. During discussion, Graduate Council will agree on final outline of potential questions, concerns and/or supplemental documents. The outline will be submitted to the department representative prior to the first reading for action. The process is designed to enhance the review process. All members of Graduate Council are expected to ask questions based on their own assessment of the proposal.

Kris Thompson suggested that department representatives should be present at the first meeting, so that they would be able to gain an understanding of the questions or concerns posed by the presenters. Ms. Schott-Baer suggested departments be reminded to write program proposals using a writing style that allows all readers, not just those associated with the discipline, to understand and comprehend. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that council membership would benefit from the opportunity to discuss proposals at length and formulate questions prior to the attendance of the department representatives.

II. NEW BUSINESS

a) Introduction of Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

b) Proposal Review Team: Vince Khapoya (primary reviewer), Mohinder Parkash (budget), Meir Shillor (faculty resources)

Mr. Khapoya will outline findings at the January 19 Graduate Council meeting.

Mr. Parkash queried University intention of the budget proforma template. He pointed out to council the current form shows only incremental revenue and expenses not income and suggested that the current budget proforma template should be reformatted. In reply, Darlene Schott-Baer suggested that Mr. Parkash submit a draft for a new form, along with written explanations of the suggested changes. With support of Graduate Council, the draft could be forwarded to Provost.

Mr. Parkash was prepared to present his review of the DNP budget. He questioned whether one faculty would be enough to absorb the extra credits generated by the new program. He suggested the following:

- Request one full-time faculty member for the first year and add part-time faculty in years two, three and four,
- Recalculate general service fee entry.

He noted that Kresge Library had suggested a library budget of at least \$15,000 but the proposal submitted by the School of Nursing requested only \$5,000.

Mr. Shillor was also concerned whether one additional faculty would be adequate to absorb the extra credits, especially the 8-credit research component. Mr. Parkash noted that the proposal included positions for a lab assistant and statistical support. Ms. Schott-Baer responded that the current part-time lab support would have to be increased to full time, possibly including weekends, and outlined explained purpose of statistical support. Mr. Shillor offered to work one-on-one with Ms. Schott-Baer to re-evaluate formula used to calculate faculty/staff resources and express those measures clearly in the proposal.

III. GOOD AND WELFARE

Claire Rammel indicated she has been asked by several faculty and department administrators to provide a list of OU course types with a definition. Example: Independent Study (course type) with a definition (what is an independent study). She distributed the best sample of university course types and their descriptions found through researching other sources. She suggested members review the document in preparation for further discussion at a future meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The December meeting is cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 19, 2005.