Date: May 4, 2021

To: Faculty Senate

From: Sarah Read, Graduate Council Chair

Re: Report of the Graduate Council for the 2021-2022 Academic Year

Per the Faculty Governance Guide, the Graduate Council's charge is to:

1) Develop and recommend University policies and establish procedures and regulations for graduate studies, and adjudicate petitions regarding graduate regulations.
2) Recommend to the Faculty Senate or to its appropriate committees and to the Dean of Graduate Studies suitable policies and standards for graduate courses and programs.
3) Coordinate with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to bring forward recommendations to the Senate regarding new proposals for and changes to 400/500-level courses so that decisions regarding both undergraduate and graduate credits can be made at the same Senate meeting.
4) Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing graduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Suggest needed graduate program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.
5) Advise the Senate concerning credit values of graduate courses.
6) Act in liaison with appropriate committees.
7) Report at least once a year to the Senate, including a list of programs and courses reviewed and approved.

The Graduate Council has been composed of the following members during the past year:

Member	Years Served	College / School
John Beer	2020-22	CLAS-AL
Robert Bremmer	2021-22	OI
Emily Ford	2019-22	LIB
Julie Hackett	2021-22	SB
Ericka Kimball	2021-22	SSW
Margaret Leite	2020-22	COTA
Feng Liu	2020-22	MECECS
Amy Lubitow	2021-22	CLAS-SS
Christina Luther	2019-22	AO
John Nimmo	2019-22	COE
Yangdong Pan	2020-22	CLAS-SCI
Sarah Read - Chair	2019-22	CLAS-AL
Jill Rissi	2020-22	SPH
Billie Sandberg	2021-22	CUPA
Wayne Wakeland	2019-22	CLAS-SCI

We would also like to acknowledge the ongoing assistance provided by the Council's consultants from the Graduate School and Academic Affairs: Rossitza Wooster, Mark Woods, Andreen Morris, Courtney Ann Hanson, Beth Holmes, and Roxanne Treece.

The Graduate Council has met approximately twice per month during the academic year to address graduate policy issues, and to review proposals for new graduate programs, program changes, new courses, and course changes. Teams of Council members have also read and recommended on the disposition of graduate petitions.

I. Graduate Policy and Procedures

During this academic year the Graduate Council has worked on several initiatives to help improve the curricular proposal and review process:

Fall Quarter

- Although not funded, the Graduate Council authored and submitted a ReImagine Grant in collaboration with the PSU Library, Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion and the Office of Academic Innovation to fund the development of a training module to support faculty in answering the two questions regarding inclusion on the OCMS form for New Course Proposals.
- Graduate Council submitted to Faculty Senate a report that forwarded our members' concerns about how to establish accountability for the implementation in new courses of the material included in the two questions regarding inclusion on the OCMS form: "Report to Faculty Senate From Graduate Council Regarding Ongoing Concerns with Accountability for OCMS DEI Question Classroom Implementation." This report was discussed in FS Steering Committee and submitted to FS on the consent agenda.

Winter Quarter

- In lieu of the ReImagine Grant, Graduate Council met with Michelle Desilets of the PSU Libraries to discuss revision and updating of the library's [Culturally Responsive and Inclusive Curriculum Resource Guide.](#) GC and Michelle planned to add a tab to the Guide that will serve as a "one stop shop" for OCMS proposers.
- To better support OCMS proposers in answering the two proposal questions regarding inclusion, GC has developed a repository of good examples that will be stored in a Google folder owned by GC. This folder (pdx.edu view only) will be linked to the resource page on the library website.
- In the context of the OAA accreditation initiative to develop or revise learning outcomes for all programs, Graduate Council received a request from the Graduate School to consider including the review of program learning outcomes in the review of Change to Existing Program proposals. After consultation with the Institutional Assessment Committee, GC supported adding the request to the Rationale section of the OCMS form that proposers discuss how proposed changes will support or modify the program learning outcomes. The program learning outcome document will be attached to the form as an addendum. This action was also reviewed and supported by UCC.

Spring Quarter

- To streamline the curricular review and development process, GC developed a checklist of essential points for review of OCMS proposals at the department and college-levels before they are submitted to Graduate Council. This checklist was sent out to chairs of college, school and department curriculum committees with an explanatory memo on May 10, 2022. This action was also reviewed and supported by UCC.
- To support the checklist initiative, GC developed a process to copy the college and department proposal approvers on emails when proposals are returned for significant addition or revision.

II. New Programs and Program Changes

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the proposals for new programs and program changes recommended for approval by the Council and subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate (except where noted). Many of these proposals were returned to the proposing unit for modifications during the review process. Proposals that are still under review are noted later in this report.

Table 1. New Programs

Program	Unit
PSM in Applied Geoscience	CLAS
Graduate Certificate in Affordable Housing Development	CUPA

Table 2. Program Changes

Program	Change	Unit
PSM in Environmental Science and Management	Reduce credits from 57 to 47, reducing concentration and "plus" courses credits	CLAS
MS in Environmental Science and Management	Increase credits from 45 to 46, add Practicum course requirement	CLAS
MS in Finance	Reduce total credits to 45, change core requirements and elective options	SB
MS in Statistics	Create three option culminating experience	CLAS
MA/MS in Sociology	Replace core course with new core course for non-thesis option	CLAS
PhD in Electrical and Computer Engineering	Add two required courses, increase total credits	MCECS
Master of Education	Split program into 7 different majors (all currently existing), revise BTP Elementary major	COE
Graduate Certificate in Global Supply Chain Management	Revise core and elective requirements	SB
PhD in Public Affairs and Policy	Increase core, reduce field credits	CUPA
MS in Political Science	Remove core course, add new core course	CUPA
Master of Social Work	Remove core course, revise concentrations	SSW
MS in Early Childhood: Inclusive Education	Revise core and Constructivism concentration	COE
Master of Public Policy (pending June FS)	Revise core and methods, reduce total credits from 60 to 54	CUPA

Graduate Certificate in New Product Development Management (pending June FS)	Change program title to New Product Management	MCECS

III. Course Proposals

Table 3 summarizes information on the new course and course change proposals submitted by the various units. Through late April, a total of 60 new course proposals were reviewed and recommended to the Senate for approval, along with 137 proposals for changes to existing courses. Many course proposals were returned to the proposing unit for modifications as part of the review process, most of which in turn were received back and processed during the year.

Table 3. Proposals by College and School

Unit	New Courses	Course Changes
CLAS	18	13
COE	11	12
SB	5	7
COTA	3	5
SSW	1	33
MCECS	10	64
CUPA	7	2
SPH	4	1
LIB	1	0

IV. Petitions

Teams of three Council members reviewed 94 petitions for exceptions to PSU policies pertaining to graduate studies and issued decisions. The distribution of these petitions among the various categories is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Petition Decisions, May 2021 through April 2022

Code	Petition Category	Total	Approved	Denied	% Total Petitions	% Approved
A	**INCOMPLETES**					
A1	Waive one-year deadline for Incompletes	14	14	0	14.7	100
B	**SEVEN YEAR LIMIT ON COURSEWORK**					
B1	Waive seven-year limit on coursework	10	8	2	10.5	80
D	**DISQUALIFICATION**					
D2	Extend probation	5	5	0	5.3	100
D3	Readmission one year after disqualification	1	1	0	1.1	100

F	**TRANSFER CREDITS**					
F1	Accept more transfer or pre-admission credit than allowed	6	5	1	6.3	83
F8	Waive bachelors+masters limits	5	5	0	5.3	100
J	**PhD & DISSERTATION PROBLEMS**					
J4	Extend 5 years from admission to comps	5†	5	0	5.3	100
J5	Extend 3 years from comps to advancement	27	27	0	28.4	100
J6	Extend 5 years from advancement to graduation	15	15	0	15.8	100
J7	Waive residency requirement	3†	3	0	3.2	100
J8	Waive continuous enrollment	1	1	0	1.1	100
M	**MASTER'S EXAM**					
M1	Waive three-month waiting period to re-take exams	1	1	0	1.1	100
M3	Allow 3rd attempt at comprehensive exam	1	1	0	1.1	100
N	**MISCELLANEOUS**					
N6	Waive limit for Dual Degree credits	1	1	0	1.1	100
	TOTAL	95	92	3		97

† indicates more than one request category on a single petition; total reflects 95 decisions on 94 petitions

Almost fifty percent of all graduate petitions were for doctoral time limit issues. Since these policies have become fully implemented, a high volume of petitions for these issues has become the new normal. The Council hopes that doctoral programs will increase efforts to mentor their students through the degree process in a timely fashion.

Excluding doctoral time limit petitions, the total number of petitions is similar to previous years. It is noteworthy that the total number of petitions was not higher given the pandemic and the extraordinary extenuating circumstances it created for students. The Council interprets this as a sign of careful graduate advising in the respective academic units as well as close scrutiny of petitions by departments before they are forwarded to Graduate Council.

Table 5. Historical Overview: Petitions, Approvals, and Degrees

Academic Year	Total Petitions	Percent Approved	Grad Degrees Awarded
2021-22	94	97%	[n.a.]
2020-21	82	98%	1595
2019-20	67	95%	1594
2018-19	62	94%	1709
2017-18	81	90%	1756
2016-17	93	92%	1673
2015-16	108	95%	1546
2014-15	97	97%	1677
2013-14	106	95%	1627
2012-13	69	90%	1820
2011-12	56	91%	1642

V. Program Proposals in Progress

- Graduate Certificate in Healthy and Efficient Buildings

VI. Future Graduate Policy

- The Graduate Council, under the leadership of Amy Lubitow, will continue efforts towards a more just, equitable, and inclusive graduate education experience at PSU.
- The AY 21-22 Graduate Council hopes that the process improvements detailed in Section I will continue to be supported during AY 22-23.
- Graduate Council will assess how it can be helpful to units writing reports for the third round of the APRCA process. The GC Chair may serve as the GC representative on the APRCA committee for AY 22-23.

MEMO

May 10, 2022

From: Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
To: Chairs of department, school and college curriculum committees

Subject: Department, School and College Curriculum Committee Checklist for Preparing and Approving OCMS Proposals

_____

Dear Chairs of College, School and Department Curriculum Committees,

The Graduate Council (GC) and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) aim to review proposals as quickly and fairly as possible in order to support curricular change and development at PSU. While overall curricular review happens within a reasonable timeframe, we feel that the process can move more quickly for the benefit of all. The primary factor slowing the review process is proposals that have been submitted with incomplete or insufficient information. These proposals have to be returned to the proposer for revision or development, sometimes multiple times. Depending on the responsiveness of the proposer, a slow turnaround can add 2-8 weeks to the review process, due to the fixed bimonthly meeting schedules of GC and UCC and the monthly meeting schedule of Faculty Senate.

With your help we can streamline and speed up the process. So that we can work together towards the common aim of making the proposal review process as smooth and efficient as possible, we have created a checklist (attached as pdf and Google Doc) that prioritizes the most important elements of the OCMS forms to check for thoroughness and completeness. All proposals coming through your committee should be checked against the attached list before being sent to the next level of approval.

We also want you to be aware of the three most common sections of the OCMS forms that require revision:

- **Rationale** Section: Should be detailed for a reader outside of the department and college.
- Pedagogical and Curricular **Inclusion Questions**: Should be answered substantively within the unique context of the course and the discipline and with respect for PSU's core values of access, inclusion and equity.
- **Dual-level** courses distinction: 400/500 courses need to have differentiated outcomes and assignments in the syllabus.

In addition, we want to draw your attention to a new addition to the Change to Existing Program form:

- **Program Learning Outcomes**: Rationale for program change proposals should connect proposed changes to the program learning outcomes. Program Learning Outcomes document can be uploaded as an addendum to the Rationale section.

Finally, in order to support this new streamlining effort, departmental and college **curriculum reviewers will be copied on emails** when a proposal is returned for a substantive revision, especially in the case of these three most common revision requests. Returned proposals will include the statement:

 "We are cc'ing departmental and college curriculum reviewers on this email in order to increase awareness regarding school/college-approved proposals that are being returned to the proposer because some requirements were not met."

Thank you for your partnership in supporting curriculum change and development at PSU.

Please reach out with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,
Sarah Read, Chair, Graduate Council
Peter Chaille, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Department, School and College Curriculum Committee Checklist for Preparing and Approving OCMS Proposals

Checklist prepared and approved by GC and UCC, Spring Quarter, 2022.

Click to go directly to the relevant checklist:

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

EXISTING PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS

COURSE DROP PROPOSALS

PROGRAM ELIMINATION

Done/Not Done	Form Section	What to Check For
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS		
	Rationale	Explains for a reader outside of the department and college how the program is academically rigorous and corresponds to the department's curriculum and the University's mission and goals.
	Evidence of need for a new program	Examples may include prospective student surveys; contacts with and feedback from government agencies, business interests, and/or local community groups that would be likely partners with the new program and who would possibly employ graduates of the program; etc. Letters of support from such external entities may be included.
	Letters of Support	If the new program curriculum relies on either core or elective courses offered outside of the sponsoring department, letters of support for the new program need to be included from department chairs in those departments.
	Content Overlap	New program proposals should note content overlap with other units and what contributions the new program may make to other departments' curricula. The names of those in other units who were consulted should be included.

	Faculty Ratio	Ratio of tenure-line to adjunct faculty should be reviewed for new programs, and heavy reliance on adjuncts needs to be justified
	Resources	Availability of necessary resources (library, technology, class/lab/studio space) should be addressed and explained. A library statement is required for new program proposals.
	Ready for Meeting	For new program proposals, the Graduate Council or UCC administrator will ask the department to have a faculty member present for the meeting at which the review panel will present the proposal.
Done/Not Done	**Form Section**	**What to Check For**

EXISTING PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS

	Rationale for Changes	This is the most important field for reviewers, and the list of changes and rationales for changes should be written for a reviewer with no knowledge of the program. In some cases some historical information is useful in the rationale, if reasoning for making changes is based on past decision making, enrollments, faculty or other factors. Rationale should also address how the proposed changes support or modify the program learning outcomes.
	Addenda: Program Learning Outcomes	Upload the Program Learning Outcomes document here to support text in the Rationale section.
	Program Description	Existing program description in the bulletin, if any.
	Proposed Catalog Statement	Should include both existing text and proposed text.
	Budgetary Impact	Even if there is no budgetary impact, please explain how that is so (do not leave blank).
	Adjustments for Transitional Students	Be explicit about how the changes will impact students.
	Addenda	Any budgetary docs or letters from chairs from other

Done/Not Done	Form Section	What to Check For
		departments regarding addition or deletion of courses from other departments from the program.

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

	Rationale	Explain how this new course came to be, how it contributes to the curriculum and whether it has an enrollment history as a 410 or 510 omnibus course.
	Syllabus	The syllabus should be reviewed for: ● Overall course content and rigor. ● Title IX and DRC statements <u>must</u> be included. ● [Course learning outcomes](#) and course objectives are stated clearly. ● Appropriate consideration of diversity and inclusion within the course framework ● Appropriate dual-level (400/500/600) distinctions, if applicable.
	Overlap	Overlap with subject matter in other departments should be thoroughly assessed in order to avoid duplication of effort, including the names of those in other units who were consulted. It sometimes happens that a unit has not thought broadly about potential overlap with other units until the Council brings possible overlap to their attention. <u>Courses for which it is deemed that no overlap exists still need to include a short statement explaining how that conclusion was reached.</u>
	Dual-level courses (formally called slash courses, i.e., 400/500 level courses)	Courses must conform to University policy for differentiated requirements. The proposal and syllabus should make clear that the differentiation in work is substantive and demonstrate how it will create a unique graduate experience in a course that may be composed largely of undergraduate students, i.e., it needs to be more than just an 'extra assignment' for the sake of additional work or that graduate students are expected to produce "higher quality" work. Differentiated learning outcomes and requirements must be clearly listed on the syllabus and on the proposal in the Teaching and Learning: Student Activities and Methods of Evaluation sections, and may include but are not limited to:

Done/Not Done	Form Section	What to Check For
		• Work of greater depth or involvement , e.g. the term research paper for graduate students may require additional references or (additional) data analysis. • Different work, e.g. graduate students may be required to analyze a more complex data set using more sophisticated research methods and tools.
	Instructor credentials	CVs must be included for adjunct faculty who will be teaching proposed new courses to show they are qualified within the field.
	Library Statement	Required for new course proposals.
	Inclusive Content and Pedagogy Questions	Ensure substantive, descriptive and course-specific answers to the two questions related to inclusion. The library has created a resource guide to support these questions.
	Copyright	Course materials should be provided in a manner that is consistent with PSU's copyright policy (available as part of the Library's Copyright guide. https://guides.library.pdx.edu/copyright-guidance)
Done/Not Done	**Form Section**	**What to Check For**
	COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS	
	Rationale	Explain to a reader <u>outside</u> of the program or department why the change is necessary and any relevant background information.
	Syllabus	Depending on the type of course change, the syllabus may or may not be reviewed in detail. • Make sure the syllabus conforms to requirements for a new course (see New Course section above). • Minor title changes or changes to prereqs are examples of changes that may need minimum or no syllabus review. Existing syllabus should still be included. • Changes to credit hours or significant changes to course title and/or description are examples of changes that will need syllabus review. Existing and updated course syllabus should be submitted.

	Is it a new course?	If the course change is substantive enough that the student could take the old and new version of the course for credit, it likely should be a new course proposal, not a course change.
Done/Not Done	**Form Section**	**What to Check For**

COURSE DROP PROPOSALS

	Banner Information	Includes current catalog description
	Course and Program Dependencies	Must include any programs that include the course as a required or elective course, including those <u>outside</u> of the department.
	Rationale	This is the most important field for reviewers, and the list of changes and rationales for changes should be written for a reviewer with no knowledge of the program. In some cases some historical information is useful in the rationale, if reasoning for making changes is based on past decision making, curricular changes, enrollments, faculty or other factors.
	Addenda	Includes any statements from programs with dependencies acknowledging the drop of the course.
Done/Not Done	**Form Section**	**What to Check For**

PROGRAM ELIMINATION

	Rationale	This is the most important field for reviewers, and the rationale for program elimination should be written for a reviewer with no knowledge of the program. <u>It should also be written with a Faculty Senate audience in mind</u>, since program elimination proposals, even once approved by GC and UCC, are often queried for the reasons behind the elimination. In some cases, historical information is useful, if reasoning for eliminating the program is based on past decision making, curricular changes, enrollments, faculty changes or other factors.

	Transitional Students (Teach out) Plan	This section should be completed with a short explanation even if there are no remaining students in the program.
	Budgetary Impact	Even if there is no impact, include an explanation of how or why.
	Addenda	Includes statements from other programs with dependencies acknowledging the elimination of the program.