

## Graduate Council

January 12, 2018

### Minutes

*Voting members present:* Sourabh Apte, Bill Bogley, Ryan Contreras, Rebekah Elliott, Marie Harvey, Lisa Price (via phone)

*Voting members absent:* Pat Chappell, Jim Coakley, Theresa Filtz, Lisa Ganio

*Ex-officio members:* Jennifer Brown – Graduate School Dean, Stephanie Bernell – Graduate School Associate Dean

*Guests:* Maureen Childers, Rosemary Garagnani, Dorthe Wildenschild

### Update of Action Items from Fall 2017

- The Program Review Process is ongoing:
  - All winter reviews are fully staffed with primary and secondary reviewers.
  - Ryan will soon be reaching out to determine reviewers for Spring program reviews.
- Laurels Grants – discussion regarding Graduate Council role
  - Steph indicated that there are two representatives each from the Graduate Council and Graduate School (non-voting) and one from each college.
- AY 2017-18 assignments have been posted to the Graduate Council website.
- Epidemiology, Bioinformatics and Fisheries & Wildlife academic program reviews have been accepted; the History of Science will be discussed today.

### Approval of Minutes from Fall 2017

- [October 12](#)
- [October 26](#)

*Action: Marie moved to approve both the October 12 and 26, 2017 minutes; motion seconded and passed via voice vote with no abstentions.*

### History of Science Graduate Program Review Report

- Review date: June 6-8, 2017; Reviewers: Ryan Contreras, Rebekah Elliott
- [Review Report](#) (Revised 12/7/2017 to include a Curriculum Council Addendum)
- This review was discussed on November 30, 2017, an amendment (included in the above report) was suggested, and the Council was to vote by email, but failed to get a quorum.

*Action: Marie moved to accept the History of Science program review report; motion seconded and passed unanimously.*

- Maureen has developed a template related to program reviews that is now being discussed in the Graduate School and, when finalized, it will be forwarded to the Graduate Council for review and approval
- In this review it was apparent that there was tension between the History and History of Science faculty, and this became an issue.
- Not all issues were addressed in the report.

### [Proposal to Change the MEng Degree Assessment Practices](#) – Dorthe Wildenschild

Proposal: To both enhance experience for MEng students and to define an alternative summative assessment for the MEng degree.

- This is an additional opportunity for all MS Engineering students to offer professional development courses to assist students with obtaining jobs. Students will engage in developing a portfolio to serve as a final exam; the portfolio will be graded by two faculty. The process for grading the exam structure is based on the MCoun which also has a portfolio.
  - Ryan – leaving door open if ENGR 550 goes away – Dorthe - 2 one-credit courses; will be able to use existing final exam as well.
  - Q: One questioned whether this applies on a student-by-student basis or program-by-program?
    - A: Dorthe assumed it's by program; she'll make that change in the proposal.
  - Q: Will the portfolio course will be in the last quarter?
    - A: Yes.
  - Q: Will students begin building a portfolio earlier?

- Dorthe responded yes, students will be told up front about the portfolio expectations. This expectation also needs to be communicated in the Graduate Handbook and orientation.
- Q: Will students understand which track they're on?
  - Dorthe noted that this is why it needs to be by program; each program would have one or the other.
- Q: Are there plans to assess?
  - Dorthe explained that assessment will occur through the exit interview and the regular assessment for the course.
- Q: A large proportion of those enrolled are INTO students – is the portfolio valuable when they return to their countries?
  - Dorthe responded that the ability to communicate effectively with employers is helpful.
- Q: In talking with people, what was the discussion related to the written comprehensive integrative exam?
  - Dorthe stated that taking another written exam was not adding a lot to the program; reflecting on future employment seems more appropriate.
- Q: There are a lot of peer and peer aspirational programs that have no assessment. Related to faculty time, will there be one advisor for all MEng students and an additional individual?
  - Dorthe indicated that the staffing is yet to be determined. Lyn Paul in Engineering has offered to assist.
- Q: Is there a college or program rubric?
  - A: Dorthe stated that the rubric will need to be developed.
- Ryan recapped two items that need to be accomplished: 1) insert in the Graduate Handbook and advise up front that students are required to prepare a portfolio, and 2) the program will develop a rubric.

*Action: Marie moved to approve the proposal to change the MEng degree assessment practices with the understanding that a rubric will be developed and relevant information will be inserted in the Graduate Handbook; motion seconded and approved unanimously with Theresa Filtz voting in abstentia.*

### **Amending Graduate Reviews**

- a. First meeting with Associate Dean or graduate studies representative (i.e., program director) (in lieu of College Dean) and review team. A number of deans have balked at this meeting occurring so early in the review, and it's not a good use of the dean's time.
- b. Extend review for an additional one-half day; the Dean would be in the debrief meeting and be able to assess the draft report at this time.
  - Should the individual at the first meeting also participate in this meeting with the dean? They could be there, but the dean needs to be present to discuss resources.
- c. Extend review for an additional one-half day, or into the evening of day one, to complete draft of review. The spirit of this is to have a draft report completed before the external reviewers leave town.
  - The following morning would be better for those who live out of town – if the review goes too late, external reviewers may need to stay overnight.
  - Staying late into the night may not be as productive.
    - Suggested to remove the suggestion to extend the review by one-half day and, in its place, indicate that the draft report will be finalized prior to the external reviewer's departure.

*Action: There was no support to extend the graduate review for one-half day. Instead, the Council supports indicating that the draft report will be finalized prior to the external reviewer's departure*

### **Matters Arising**

#### INTO Proposals

Ryan distributed the following proposals from INTO:

1. Alternative Language Assessments from TOEFL
  - Rosemary noted that a language test similar to TOEFL has probably been in existence for 10 years. It is a testing alternative for those unable to attend a TOEFL exam and is less expensive than TOEFL.
2. IELA was developed with Cambridge University (CU); it has support material from CU and INTO – it is very new. If accepted, it would likely be on a trial basis for at least three years – likely not large numbers will apply. This would be for entry to INTO pathways and graduate study. To some extent, OSU would be a beta tester.
  - Steph noted that, in Public Health, there is a lot of legislation – would there need to be a disclaimer indicating that INTO would benefit financially from the IELA testing service?

- Elena Sapp from INTO is available to attend the next Graduate Council meeting – Rosemary will invite her to attend.
  - Rosemary has heard that the TOEFL alternative makes it easier for applicants to finish at one time; it would ease the application process.
3. Another proposal from INTO contains ideas to adjust the pathway for students with a GPA under 3.0 or those not meeting language requirements.
- a. One proposal was that, if completing 3 undergraduate credits and 6 graduate credits with at least a B grade, students would be admitted to a graduate program with only 9 credits vs. 15 credits.
  - b. Jennifer stated that INTO is working on a 10-year launch of the pathway and trying to create more rigor in the pathway, as well as creating more graduate courses in the pathway.
    - i. Programs should have input.
    - ii. INTO needs to be observant of Graduate Council policies.

*Minutes prepared by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff*