

Oakland University

GRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES

Wednesday, December 12, 2012 – Meeting #7

Location: 100 KL
Meeting Time: 2:00-4:00 pm
Approved: 01/23/2013

Present: Gary Barber, Bhushan Bhatt, Roman Dembinski, Tamara Hew-Butler, Shawn Lombardo (*Ex Officio*), Robert Noiva, Claire Rammel (*Ex Officio*), Darlene Schott-Baer (Chair), Meir Shillor, Carol Swift

Guest: Patricia Wren

Absent: Donna Free (excused), Linda Pavonetti (excused), and Cheryl Riley-Doucet (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

Meir Shillor made the motion to approve the minutes of the November 28, 2012, Graduate Committee Meeting Minutes as written. Bhushan Bhatt seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

II. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

No report

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Outstanding Graduate Student Mentor Award Update

Ms. Schott-Baer stated that Claire Rammel does have the guidelines ready for the Outstanding Graduate Student Mentor Award but, after speaking with Susan Aubrey, decided to hold them until January. Ms. Schott-Baer said that Ms. Aubrey would prefer to have the first round of the award presented next academic year, allowing for more budget and preparatory planning time.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

a. Minimum Enrollment for Master's Students

Continue to carry forward until more complete information is available for the Council to consider. Ms. Schott-Baer said that the data is pretty much together and should be ready to present to the Council in January for a final vote.

b. Master Of Public Health (new program)—Presented by Bob Noiva and Linda Pavonetti

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

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

Ms. Schott-Baer said that the department had forwarded comments in response to the council's questions about the proposal as well as the revised proposal, minus the appendices, and that the council members should have received those items. Patricia Wren is present to answer questions about the proposal.

Bob Noiva noted that there are questions about the proposal that need to be addressed pertaining to clarification and budgeting. Mr. Noiva's questions and Ms. Wren's responses were as follows:

Q: In the clinical internships, will affiliation agreements be used? Will there be reimbursement for supervision of students?

A: Most of the work anticipated that students will be doing in their practicum are more community based participatory health, ending up in nonprofit settings and small community development organizations, which do not involve clinical care and clinical services as you may more commonly see in nursing or the medical school. Lots of these placements have already been lined up and informative conversations with the partners have been had. Formal legal affiliation agreements are not anticipated and it is intended to follow the model which is used at Michigan State, Kansas State, John Hopkins, and other programs that use letters of agreement. It is a triangular agreement between the agency preceptor/supervisor, the faculty advisor, and the student. The agreement includes a set of expectations for each of the three party's individually and also corporate expectations for how the relationship will work for meeting curricular student outcome and learning.

Q: How will the liability of the students be handled?

A: In many cases students will become part-time employees of the agency, therefore, they will be covered as any other employee of the agency. In other cases, the students' own personal liability coverage will cover them. In third cases, on an as needed and more irregular basis, there are companies that help professional services provide personal liability at a low cost for students doing clinical experiences.

Q: Sometimes students are from outside of the local area, such as out of state, and they want to go back to their home area and work with an agency that Oakland University School of Health Sciences does not have a relationship with. How would these situations be handled?

A: A relationship between the university and the agency is not necessary. It is the student that must have the relationship with the agency. It is very common in Public Health for the students to do their clinical internship out of the school area and closer to where they reside.

Q: Accreditation standards require both a cumulative exam to test competency and a capstone project. Both are mentioned in the proposal, but seems to be mentioned as either or. Will both be required?

A: The syllabus has been revised, based on the Graduate Council's feedback, in order to clarify this issue.

Q: Will there be some money available for students to apply for so that they have the opportunity for monetary support of their research projects?

A: There is a strong tradition in the Health Sciences Program of applying for and receiving Provost funding to support student research. It is anticipated being aggressive in using that mechanism.

Q: There is a concern whether or not the additional faculty requested in the proposal will be enough to meet the accreditation required ratio of student to faculty, 10:1.

A: It is going to be tight but it is believed that meeting the accreditation's faculty requirements will be possible as stated in the proposal.

Q: The future possibility of offering part-time status in the program was mentioned in the proposal. What effect could this have on the full-time students? Will this force them into taking evening and weekend courses?

A: It is believed that the program, as it stands, is cohort driven. There are a number of different means by which the program could be modified to include an evening program; executive-style education, and other novel delivery systems has been discussed. The program cannot be driven on a part-time population, but additional part-time students could be absorbed into the program at no additional cost.

Q: Accreditation documents talk about commitment to the community and a large emphasis is put on diversity. The proposal contained a lot of information pertaining to community but not very much was mentioned pertaining to diversity.

A: The travel money in the proposal is strictly for student recruitment. Travel money will be used to attend American Public Health meetings and other such meetings for the purpose of recruitment. Public health work and research involves a great deal of work with vulnerable and underserved populations, which largely include people of color and people who are poor.

Q: When clinical practicums are required, will background checks be required and will that be instituted through the admissions process?

A: The program is not seeking to require students to have background checks, in part, because a lot of the agencies that the program will be working with hire and sometimes seek to hire people representative of the populations they serve, which may include hiring those with criminal records.

With no further questions, Ms. Wren thanked the Council for their helpful feedback and excused herself from the group.

Ms. Schott-Baer asked for all those in favor in supporting the new Master of Public Health Program Proposal. The Council voted unanimously in favor of the proposal.

c. **Graduate Certificate in Oncology Rehabilitation (modification)--**

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.

This will be a completely on-line program.

Ms. Schott-Baer asked for all those in favor in supporting the Graduate Certificate in Oncology Rehabilitation Modification. The Council voted unanimously in favor of the modification.

V. NEW BUSINESS

No new business

VI. GOOD AND WELFARE

No good and welfare

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 PM.