

Graduate Council
November 30, 2017
Minutes

Voting members present: Sourabh Apte, Pat Chappell, Ryan Contreras, Theresa Filtz (via phone), Claire Gibbons, Marie Harvey, Lisa Price

Voting members absent: Bill Bogley, Jim Coakley, Rebekah Elliott, Lisa Ganio, George Waldbusser

Ex-officio members present: Graduate School – Jennifer Brown; Graduate Admissions Committee – Un-Ku Moon

Guest: Maureen Childers

Graduate Program Review – Electrical Engineering and Computer Science – Jim Coakley

- [Reviewer's Report](#)
- [2014 Action Plan](#)
- *Site visit: April 3-4, 2013; Reviewers: Jim Coakley, Walt Loveland*
- Not discussed – Jim Coakley absent

Graduate Program Review – History of Science – Ryan Contreras

- [Reviewer's Report](#)
- *Site visit: June 6-8, 2017; Internal reviewers: Ryan Contreras, Rebekah Elliott*
- The overall recommendation was to refocus the program. Recommendations/issues include: more interaction between History and History of Science faculty, and perhaps other units in the School; much of the findings hinged on funding; it's regarded as a program of excellence; the program hinges on three core faculty who do most of the work; very little interaction with History faculty; expand teaching offerings to History faculty; M.A. graduate students, who primarily come from Oregon, are largely satisfied – the unit should recruit more widely; more advanced students struggle with funding issues; there was talk about adjusting curriculum to include more historiography and theory; and the lack of teaching experience among Ph.D. students, who also echoed this concern. The review team was unclear about how to rate the graduate students and whether full support should be provided for the M.A. program or provide full funding for a smaller cadre of Ph.D. students and allow M.A. students to be self-funded. Horning funding is now being held at the dean level.
- Jennifer felt that funding is definitely an issue since the dean informed her that he doesn't control the Horning funding.
 - One Council member noted that the Horning funding was originally given to History of Science through the previous chair, but was not earmarked – it was discretionary.
- Another felt that the Graduate Council, in the interest of graduate students, could recommend that the unit provide X number of years of guaranteed funding.
- Why is History of Science, consisting of five faculty and four students, a separate program and not a subgroup of the History program? It's ranked as a top-15 program in the nation.
 - In the past, there was concern that History of Science would lose their distinction if there was a merger of History with History of Science.

Action Items:

- *Ryan will prepare a draft addendum for Graduate Council review.*
- *Theresa moved to vote on the draft addendum by email; motion seconded and passed.*
- Maureen suggested that there is, perhaps, a need to change the requirement of the unit to submit the action plan within six months of the site visit to six months after the report is accepted by the Graduate Council.

Update on Graduate Student Member

Claire Gibbons was introduced as the new graduate student member.

Update on Additional Reviewers for Program Reviews

- Because several secondary reviewers have come forward, there should be enough for Winter term program reviews.

Graduate Council Review

- From the Faculty Senate President: periodically we should ask if our committee/council, acting on behalf of the Faculty Senate, is still serving a purpose. Is the Graduate Council still a necessary body?
- The Council again opted to allow the Graduate School to approve all graduate faculty members.
- All present were comfortable with the mission and existing Standing Rules.

Graduate Program Review Report Discussion

- Issue: During a recent 10-year program review, internal reviewers were asked to contribute to the external reviewer's program review report – clarification of expectations was requested.
- One preferred that, prior to departure, the external reviewers prepare at least a draft report for the internal reviewers to review and edit.
- Another felt that the external reviewers have a broader view of other programs. A suggestion was made that an honorarium be offered, but not paid until the report is finalized.
- Jennifer questioned how much information internal reviewers provide to external reviewers. External reviewers are explicitly advised that part of their duty is to prepare the report. She suggested thinking about the layout of the site visit – perhaps change interviews so that there is additional time to prepare the report while external reviewers are at OSU. She's been thinking about how reports are prepared – perhaps think about a different way to do the review so all reviewers participate in preparing the report. She also stated that units can't be requested to pay honorariums.
- One suggested using a template for the report; Jennifer agreed that templates could be explored.

Action Items:

- *Maureen noted that the message text indicates that the report will be drafted by all review members; the text will be changed to indicate that the external reviewers are expected to draft the report.*
- Ryan requested a review of the updated process in January.

Minutes recorded by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff