

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

February 9, 2005

100 KRESGE LIBRARY

Approved: February 23, 2005

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

Absent: No absences

Staff: Julie Delaney, Lynette Folken

Call to Order

This meeting was convened at 2:15 p.m. by Ron Sudol, chair of Graduate Council.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The MOTION to approve the minutes of January 19, 2005 as corrected was made, Seconded and Passed, unanimously.

II. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Ron Sudol stated that he would like to implement a change in the way programs are reviewed.

Citing a recent example of an undergraduate program being approved in a “non-standard” pattern, Mr. Sudol suggested that at some early stage—before submission to Graduate Council—the sponsor of the proposed new program should meet with a technical group consisting of the Registrar, the director of Institutional Research, Susan Awbrey, Claire Rammel, Ron Sudol, and perhaps the Dean to go through a check list of rubrics, codes, transfer requirements, prerequisites, and catalog issues, etc.

Claire Rammel indicated this process has been the practice for graduate proposals for many years. Given the plethora of majors and minors, as well as the complexity of general education requirements of undergraduate education, this approach would certainly be beneficial to undergraduate programs.

Mr. Sudol stated that another element of his new program submission proposal was the establishment of review deadlines. After the technical group goes through the checklist, a schedule for the program would be produced with a list of target dates for 1) first reading by Graduate Council, 2) distribution to and return from the Senate Planning Review Committee and the Budget Committee, 3) second reading by Graduate Council, and 4) submission to the Senate.

Mildred Merz asked at what point the proposal review team (primary reader, budget reviewer, and faculty resource reviewer) would get the proposal. In response, Mr. Sudol concurred that the proposal review team would receive the proposal before the scheduled first reading.

A question was posed to Mr. Sudol regarding the performance of the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies program. Mr. Sudol indicated the program is dependent on other departments for their curriculum delivery. This is being handled through cross listed courses, and it has been difficult to get faculty released to teach the courses. Mr. Khapoya reported that he was invited to teach a graduate course that included 300-level students and was “horrified” that graduate students would be sitting through elementary course material required for 300-level students and earning graduate credit. Graduate Council supported Mr. Khapoya’s concerns and agreed problems exist in using 300-level courses to deliver graduate credit, even when some “extra work” is required of graduate students.

Ms. Rammel added many departments are delivering entire graduate programs by cross listing 300-level undergraduate courses with graduate courses. The difference between course requirements for undergraduate and graduate enrollees is the addition of an extra research paper to be accomplished by the graduate students. She has received several complaints from graduate students enrolled in these cross-listed courses. Most student complaints are focused on paying graduate tuition and not believing they are getting a graduate education. Faculty have expressed strong concerns about having to teach toward two populations of students.

Current graduate policy states, “Courses numbered 300 to 499 are advanced courses primarily for undergraduates. A graduate student, with the approval of departmental adviser, may use a maximum of 12 credits of 400-499 courses taken at Oakland University toward a graduate degree. A standard exception will be made for interdisciplinary programs. To assist students in acquiring the requisite background for interdisciplinary degree programs, graduate credit may be granted for up to 12 credits in courses numbered 300-499 that are NOT in the students’ major field of study.” However, a problem exists in the interpretation of the “cross listing” graduate policy. In order to accommodate the “interdisciplinary degree programs” the policy must allow 300-level courses to be cross-listed. This policy needs to be clarified and published.

Requests to cross list courses should go through Graduate Council governance via a course action form; however, these requests are not being routed through any governance process, and cross listing is happening at the time of section scheduling. Graduate Study is trying to enforce the policy that states 300-level courses cannot be cross listed with graduate courses except those courses that are interdisciplinary, but there is no definition of interdisciplinary. Ms. Rammel feels that this issue needs to be addressed by Graduate Council.

III. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

At the request of the Senate Planning Review Committee, Claire Rammel and Susan Awbrey will submit a proposal outlining time limitation parameters for grade changes and appeals.

Thomas M. Cooley Law School and the School of Business Administration are still working on a proposal to offer a joint MBA/JD degree.

The Department of Political Science is working on proposals for two graduate certificates. Two existing concentrations in the MPA program will be expanded into graduate certificates.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

When a new track was approved for the MEd Educational Studies program, concerns were raised by Graduate Council regarding the large number of electives offered. The program offered four required core courses, 29 elective courses, and one collaborative action research course. Consequently, Graduate Council requested a report to be submitted within one year which focused on the elective issue. Claire Rammel distributed an updated list from the department organizing elective courses into categories. She asked whether members would like to discuss these changes with a department representative or if they needed more information. Darlene Schott-Baer noted that more courses had been added to the list and questioned how this would affect the advisement load. Julie Delaney stated she would like to see credit ranges added and questioned whether these were all degree specific courses or courses used in off-site professional development programs.

V. OLD BUSINESS

First Reading: Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

Darlene Schott-Baer submitted a revised proposal which included responses to Graduate Council's questions. Ms. Schott-Baer advised the members that the proposal will be resubmitted to the Graduate Committee on Instruction in the School of Nursing. The Committee needs to support the proposed change – from BSN-DNP to post-MSN-DNP. Ms. Schott-Baer expressed difficulty in getting support letters to bolster the proposal because this is a new program, offered at only one other institution. Vince Khapoya was concerned that it will be hard to market the program without support documentation. Several members suggested groups that Nursing might consider for providing such documentation.

Ms. Schott-Baer stated the current library budget is a concern: \$25,000 for the first year and \$36,600 by year five. Mildred Merz replied that the library budget is complicated by the fact that the program would be delivered so heavily on line, and the minimum acceptable budget would be \$10,000. Ms. Schott-Baer indicated that the library budget would be discussed further.

Ms. Rammel indicated the proposed chart presented by Ms. Schott-Baer seemed to work backwards—should be MSN degree + plus credits, not DNP degree - minus credits. Under the current proposal, prospective students not only have to be MSN prepared, but need to meet other criteria to be eligible for final DNP certification. Therefore, depending on the MSN focus, additional credits may be required for prospective students beyond the MSN degree. She suggested changing the wording in the proposal to clarify the requirements. Mohinder Parkash

pointed out that, if that is true, then the incremental credit hours are 31, and the budget should be modified to account for additional credit delivery.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 23, 2005.