

Oakland University

GRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES

November 28, 2012 – Meeting #6

Location: 100 KL
Meeting Time: 2:00-4:00 pm
Approved: 12/12/2012

Present: Gary Barber, Bhushan Bhatt, Donna Free, Tamara Hew-Butler, Shawn Lombardo (*Ex Officio*), Robert Noiva, Linda Pavonetti, Claire Rammel (*Ex Officio*), Cheryl Riley-Doucet, Darlene Schott-Baer (Chair), Meir Shillor, Carol Swift

Guests: Jacqueline Drouin, Kristine Thompson

Absent: Roman Dembinski (excused)

Staff: Julie Delaney, Lynette Folken (Secretary), Tina Muncy

The meeting was convened by Darlene Schott-Baer, Chair, at 2:05 PM.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. *Tamara Hew-Butler made the motion to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2012, Graduate Committee Meeting Minutes as amended. Meir Shillor seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.*

Amendment: Move Shawn Lombardo from the list of members present to the list of members absent. Ms. Lombardo was also in attendance at the simultaneously scheduled meeting of the Associate Deans and Department Heads.

- b. *Meir Shillor made the motion to approve the minutes of the October 10, 2012, Graduate Committee Meeting Minutes as written. Bhushan Bhatt seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.*
- c. *Carol Swift made the motion to approve the minutes of the April 11, 2012, Graduate Committee Meeting Minutes as written. Cheryl Riley-Doucet seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.*

II. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

No report

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

Ms. Schott-Baer thanked the members for agreeing to move the Wednesday, December 5th, Graduate Council Meeting to Wednesday, December 12th. She noted that both she and Claire Rammel will be attending the Council of Grad Schools Conference next week. Moving the meeting date allows them to be present for the next Graduate Council Meeting and also allows more time to prepare for the Public Health proposal and several other smaller proposals. The Council will meet in the same room, 100 Kresge Library, at 2:00PM on December 12th.

Ms. Schott-Baer also noted that Kristine Thompson will be joining the meeting today at 3:00PM to address the questions that arose from the previous Graduate Council Meeting in regard to the Graduate Certificate in Oncology Rehabilitation program proposal. Ms. Schott-Baer suggested that the group skip through the agenda, beginning with the Master of Public Health program proposal, and visit the oncology program proposal upon Ms. Thompson's arrival.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

a. Minimum Enrollment for Master's Students

Ms. Schott-Baer stated that she will leave the minimum enrollment for master's students on the agenda, continuing to carry it forward until more complete information is available for the Council to consider.

b. Graduate Certificate in Oncology Rehabilitation (modification)—presented by Cheryl Riley-Doucet **Motion:** To recommend approval of modifications to the Graduate Certificate in Oncology Rehabilitation program

Second Reading: Debatable, amendable, eligible for final vote at this meeting

Jacqueline Drouin and Kristine Thompson attended the meeting to address questions raised in the first reading of the Graduate Certificate in Oncology Rehabilitation modification proposal.

Ms. Drouin began by explaining that the use of online case studies, examinations, and the filming of case studies will be implemented in the curriculum. She noted that these students will not be junior or novice people. They will be experienced, licensed physical therapists who have all of the basic skills but may not understand how to apply them to a very difficult, complex population. The testing work will be problem-solving. They will have case studies and will need to show how they will problem-solve and take care of the patient, filming it so that it can be critiqued later. Also, students will be required to develop a question based on the complex nature of their patient, use the evidence or literature to prepare a presentation, and create an annotated bibliography or case study that they will share with all of the students. This is work that they can be filmed and critiqued doing, taking place of the hands on lab. Guest lectures will be filmed and recorded through Elluminate to prevent time zone issue. There will be forums available to allow people to communicate online.

Mr. Noiva asked how skills that are non-cognitive would be assessed, such as professionalism and communication skills. Ms. Drouin explained that people from other professions will be brought in to work with the program, such as a social worker, and another colleague that has filmed issues on hospice care and end of life care. Professionals from various disciplines will be brought in to speak in these areas.

Ms. Schott-Baer noted to Ms. Drouin and Ms. Thompson that if further explanation was added in the document, the proposal should be okay.

c. Master of Arts in Teaching in Reading and Language Arts (modification)—presented by Donna Free

Motion: to recommend approval of modifications to the Master of Arts in Teaching in Reading and Language Arts program

Second Reading: Debatable, amendable, eligible for final vote at this meeting

Linda Pavonetti stated that she had sent a revised version of the Master of Arts in Teaching in Reading and Language Arts proposal of modifications, which included revisions and modifications from the first reading. Ms. Rammel mentioned that the last two pages were to have been dropped. Ms. Pavonetti agreed and withdrew the last two pages of the proposal.

Ms. Pavonetti said the major changes that had been made after the last meeting were as follows:

- 1) On the front page, the MAT in Reading with BT, with BR, and BX has been removed. Carol Swift had asked, with the concentrations, why were they removed? Ms. Pavonetti explained that they are not really concentrations, they are just state endorsements.

- 2) Line was added about students graduating prior to Fall Semester 2013 must adhere to requirements for catalogs from when they were admitted or later.
- 3) Pages five, six, and seven, which were just informational and not intended to be part of the proposal, have been removed.

Ms. Schott-Baer stated that there is already a motion on the floor and asked for all those in favor of supporting the revisions to the MAT in Reading proposal. *Motion passed unanimously.*

d. Master of Public Health (new program)—presented by Bob Noiva and Linda Pavonetti

Motion: To recommend approval of the Master of Public Health program

First Reading: Debatable, amendable, but not eligible for final vote at this meeting

Ms. Schott-Baer gave the floor to Bob Noiva and Ms. Pavonetti to present the new Master of Public Health program proposal.

Mr. Noiva commented on how beautifully written the program proposal was. The proposal provided a careful analysis for the need of the program and also provided a comparison to other degree programs in the area, and which of those are accredited. The proposal also provided curricula of other similar programs to ensure that Oakland has similar courses available.

Mr. Noiva stated that the department had listed their major goal as receiving accreditation for this program. He believes the success of the program is dependent on receiving accreditation. With that in mind, he carefully compared the accreditation requirements with the resources listed in the proposal. He also noted that the program would be self-funded.

In his review of the proposal, Mr. Noiva had the following concerns:

- 1) Accreditation requires a certain student to faculty ratio. The proposal requests no new faculty the first year, because there will not be a large number of students, then begins bringing in a new faculty member each year following as the tuition levels increase.
- 2) Accreditation requires that identified faculty must be dedicated to the program, with at least .5 FTE to be program identified. Although the existing faculty identified in the proposal are highly qualified, they teach in other programs as well.
- 3) Students are required to do practicums and internships. Affiliation agreements are required to be established to make understood if there is money exchanging hands, to specify how supervision will occur, who handles liability, etc. None of these items are identified in the proposal.
- 4) Will there be enough identified, fully supported practicums/internships to place students in areas of public health that an individual student may be interested in?
- 5) If a student is from, for example, California, can an internship be set up in California for them? If so, how will the supervision take place?
- 6) Mr. Noiva stated that liability is a big concern for him.
- 7) Nothing is mentioned in the proposal about background checks. Many of the university's affiliations require background checks. Background checks should be done as part of the admission requirement so that a student does not get into a year or two of study and find out that they are not able to pass a background check.
- 8) Proposal includes a goal to eventually have a part-time program. Usually part-time programs involve evening and weekend classes. Mr. Noiva had some concern whether or not that would be fair to the full-time students.
- 9) Accreditation requirements require both a cumulative exam test of competency and a capstone project. Both are mentioned in the proposal, but mentioned as either or.
- 10) Will money be available to support research projects?
- 11) Who will be able to serve as a mentor? Only Oakland University faculty, or someone from one of the affiliates as well?
- 12) Is money available to support research projects?
- 13) Has the Office of Research signed off on this proposal?

14) Accreditation is very specific about commitment to the community and commitment to diversity. Diversity was not mentioned in the proposal. Maybe show money earmarked for travel to some of the recruiting fairs or to setup a pipeline program for students at the undergraduate level to enter into the program.

Mr. Noiva stated that none of these concerns are limiting to starting the program but are important in gaining accreditation.

Bhushan Bhatt asked if it was known what kind of enrollment was expected the first year. Linda Pavonetti answered with ten the first year, two additional the second year, and then increase up to a total of twenty.

Mr. Noiva mentioned the lack of articulation with the other schools. Ms. Pavonetti disagreed pointing out that in the proposal it mentions elective courses in business administration, health sciences, nursing, chemistry, biomedical, and math statistics.

Ms. Pavonetti stated that she noted a few typos and the need to reword a couple of sentences but a major adjustment needed is the ordering of the appendixes.

Ms. Schott-Baer said that she will forward concerns and questions to Patricia Wren and invite her to attend the next meeting.

e. Outstanding Graduate Student Mentor Award Process

Ms. Rammel stated that she had been working on a mockup of a nominating and selection process for the Outstanding Graduate Student Mentor Award Process, beginning with developing a sub-committee of the Graduate Council. She thought that there should first be a nomination form and asked the Graduate Council Committee what type of materials that they would like to see from the nominees. She also noted that she felt that the nominations should come from graduate students only.

The committee discussed requesting from the nominated professors, a vitae and a one page statement on their philosophy. The committee also discussed handling the award process similar to that of the University's Faculty Advisor Award. An announcement for nominations on the website, letter of recommendation from a student or students, and a vita and a one page statement of philosophy from the nominee. The committee agreed that both current students and alumni should be allowed to make nominations. There will be one recipient per year.

The award includes \$2,000 for student travel and \$1000 for the faculty.

Ms. Rammel said that she will prepare something for the committee members to look at in advance, and a subcommittee will be decided at the next meeting.

Ms. Schott-Baer stated that she is still waiting to hear from the Provost whether funding for the award will begin this year or next. The award luncheon is held in April.

V. NEW BUSINESS

No new business

VI. GOOD AND WELFARE

No good and welfare

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM.