GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
March 13, 2003
3:00pm, Kerr Admin. Bldg. 650

Present: Brauner (Chair), Bird, Bond, Ciuffetti, Feller, Fisk, Francis, Markle, Pedersen, Prucha, Rettig, Sanchez, Selker, Watrous

Absent: Collins, Gobeli

Guests: Sunil Khanna, Kay Schaffer, Nancy Rosenberger

I. Approval of Council Minutes

The minutes of the February 27, 2003, meeting of the Graduate Council were approved as corrected.

II. Proposal for the PhD Degree in Community Impact Anthropology

Nancy Rosenberger (Anthropology) introduced a proposal to initiate a new instructional program leading to the PhD in Community Impact Anthropology. As stated in the proposal, this is a response “to the increased demand for applied anthropologists capable of conducting on-the-ground ethnographic studies relevant to local communities and key societal institutions domestically and internationally. From corporations to hospitals, watershed councils, tribes, development agencies or state and local governments, people in institutions increasingly realize that to serve their various constituencies effectively, they must have a deep understanding of the perspectives, institutions, communities with whom they interact.”

All three areas of concentration—local values, indigenous knowledge, and environment; ethnicity, culture, and health; and business, organization, and work—are interdisciplinary. Professor Deanna Kingston, herself a King Island Inupiak Eskimo, provides unique insights and leadership in the first area. Professor Chunhuei Chi in Public Health will provide important contributions to students working in the second area. Professor Gregg Walker in Speech Communication will provide much help in understanding aspects of negotiation. Professor James McAlexander in the College of Business and Professor Sam Stern in the School of Education will also provide important contributions to the program.

Anthropology core courses are being shifted to the 500 level from their current slash (400/500) offerings. This enrichment of graduate courses will improve the educational opportunities for Master of Arts students. Doctoral students will be required to take methods courses, both qualitative and quantitative, as well as a core course in gender and ethnicity. To insure that students’ perspectives are not limited to domestic issues, students will include study of a geographic region as well as a competency in foreign language comparable to the OSU requirement for a BA degree. “As part of the comprehensive review, students will first develop annotated bibliographies and comprehensive papers in three areas: anthropological theories
relevant to community impact anthropology, interdisciplinary concentration, and PhD proposal.”

Students must also “participate in term-long full-time residency program by selecting and collaboratively working with an external research supervisor in the area of their specific interests.” This residency experience could become the basis for the dissertation, although students could also select another area of research for the dissertation. Budget constraints and constraints on faculty time require that the department ease into the PhD program slowly. Four students would be admitted in the first year (expected to be 2005) with the number rising to eight new students in 2008. Faculty FTE also would grow slowly.

Sunil Khanna (Anthropology) explained that the proposal was heavily influenced by information received in his department about trends in the anthropology profession. It reflects both what is expected in the skills of graduates by peers and prospective employers and the expertise of the current faculty. Kay Schaffer, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts pointed out that liaison with the anthropology faculty at University of Oregon has uncovered support for the OSU proposal. She also expressed her support for increasing faculty FTE in Anthropology as laid out in the proposal. John Selker (Engineering) said that he learned during the review of the MA in applied anthropology that one person left the program last year and that several retirements are expected soon. Given this loss of faculty, will CLA replace them? Schaffer said that she supported replacing the upcoming retirements with new faculty in addition to the expanded FTE.

Bruce Rettig (Graduate School), observing that the proposal included a 500/600 slash course, said that this type of course is not needed because doctoral students are able to take 500 level courses and use them on their programs of study. Rosenberger asked if the Curriculum Council would have a problem with 500/600 slash courses. Rettig said that those kinds of courses have not been approved in the past because they were deemed unnecessary.

Barbara Bond (Forestry) asked about the expectations for research and teaching in faculty assignments. In particular, where does the department anticipate funding coming from, since most of the faculty effort (FTE) will be assigned to instruction rather than research? Rosenberger said that, because PhD students would be eligible for some grants that master’s students cannot receive, funding is expected to increase. David Brauner (Liberal Arts) said that the department has been successful in the past at securing grants. He foresees even more opportunity for grant funding in the future with a PhD program.

Doug Markle (Agricultural Sciences) asked about the FTE of the graduate coordinator for the program, suggesting that 0.50 FTE assigned to this task seemed high. Rosenberger said that a current faculty member would have this position in addition to regular responsibilities. Also, that coordinator would work with a newly formed board of advisors and would work with that board to establish internships for students.

Markle also asked how the undergraduate teaching load would change with the new departmental educational focus. Rosenberger said that graduate teaching assistants are expected to play an expanded role, including teaching several of the undergraduate courses. For example, the graduate teaching assistants for Anthropology 110 and Anthropology 210 would be the sole
instructors. PhD students could also direct discussion groups in other larger anthropology undergraduate courses.

Alex Sanchez (Education) asked about the impact of the PhD program on the master’s programs. Specifically, would this affect the employment prospects for master’s students? Has there been consideration of phasing out the MA program? Rosenberger said that students with master’s degrees receive lower level positions in agencies than students with PhD degrees. Allowing the master’s degree students to complete the new PhD would help graduates obtain higher-paying jobs with greater opportunities for career advancement. The MA in applied anthropology would not be phased out, but participation in the Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies with students selecting two fields in anthropology would be phased out. Brauner said that an increasing amount of faculty time would need to be devoted to doctoral students; these new commitments would require at least some of the faculty to change the nature of their interaction with master’s degree students. Selker asked about registration numbers for courses in Anthropology as the doctoral program is phased in. How viable do you expect the new 500 level courses to be with a smaller number of master’s students? Rosenberger said that the numbers of students would be sufficient to support stand-alone graduate courses. One course in each area of focus will be a stand-alone graduate course. Rosenberger acknowledged that this change will create a new demand for faculty time but believed that the department could handle it.

Markle asked whether opportunities existed to share faculty resources and talents between OSU faculty and the faculty at the University of Oregon. Khanna said that faculty might be invited to participate in the OSU program, but that students are not likely to make extensive use of courses at the University of Oregon. Brauner did say that the historic preservation program at the University of Oregon has attracted some students from OSU; this is a precedent for the two schools working together.

Barbara Watrous (Veterinary Medicine) asked about the letter from Sociology, which expressed some concerns with the program. Khanna said that the Anthropology Department chair has spoken with the chair of Sociology. Rosenberger said that some sociology professors are considering participating in this program. She added that one issue emerging from the OSU 2007 planning effort is to facilitate work across departmental lines.

Selker asked for a table that would describe the undergraduate, masters and PhD programs and show how the department faculty members are going to supply the teaching FTE that is needed, especially given an expanded emphasis on research. Rosenberger said that the faculty is well aware of the need for increased FTE. Classes should be adequately staffed, but some of the other supervisory issues as well as adequate mentoring, which is needed with doctoral students, could present major challenges. Selker, explaining that his concern is that the FTE appears to be insufficient, argued that the college should make it a priority to fund this program.

Responding to Sanchez’s observation that the library assessment concluded that resources are inadequate for the program, Schaffer observed that the proposal earmarked $6,000 per year for new acquisitions. After Khanna suggested that the Internet is a rich source of information for
anthropologists, Selker said that, during the review of the MA program, few student offices were equipped with Internet connections. Rosenberger reported that grants for upgrading computers are being vigorously pursued. Martin Fisk (Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences) asked whether any other space or facility requirements might present problems. Brauner said that remodeling is beginning on facilities used by the Anthropology Department. Space for offices does not seem to be a problem, but the facilities do need to be upgraded. Selker suggested that money be identified for development of graduate office facilities.

Bond supported the proposal, arguing that the appropriate way to add doctoral programs to the College of Liberal Arts is to begin with the strongest departments. Fisk was concerned that the amount of faculty resources (FTE) may not be sufficient to support the addition of a doctoral program. Lynda Ciuffetti (Science) agreed that funding must be provided at an appropriate level. Selker asked whether the Council wished to request a letter from Dean Schaffer that would provide a written record of her statement to the Council that the College of Liberal Arts is prepared to redirect funds to the new program. Sally Francis (Graduate School) and Ciuffetti also asked about the graduate teaching and research assistants; they were concerned that funding shown in the budget would not be sufficient to support those positions. Fisk asked how the funding level in the proposal would allow for the launch of the PhD program if no new faculty area added until 2005. In response to Bond’s observation about the impact on undergraduate courses of redirecting faculty resources, Sanchez suggested that undergraduate courses might improve in quality if PhD students teach courses, rather than relying as heavily on videotapes as is done now. Recalling concerns raised in liaison letters from units such as Public Health, Markle asked whether the new program duplicated effort now under way in other programs. Elaine Pedersen (Health and Human Sciences) suggested that Public Health was focusing on domestic issues while Anthropology would emphasize international health issues.

Selker would like to see a chart showing more information about FTE. Bond asked what the purpose of that chart might be. Selker said that it could provide an opportunity for the department to seek more funding for faculty FTE from Dean Schaffer. Bond said she would prefer to send a letter to the dean with a strong recommendation that she seek resources that would increase the FTE in the proposal. Francis restated that argument as a concern on the part of the Graduate Council that the resources may not be adequate to fund the program. Selker said that the department should press for more resources at this stage of the planning process, rather than seeking more resources after the program is approved. He suggested that the departmental FTE is possibly adequate but minimal and he would strongly encourage the department and the college to find more funding for faculty FTE. Selker said that his position was based on the concern of the Council’s team that reviewed the MA program; that group was concerned about the viability of an expanded graduate program given the amount of FTE in the department.

A motion was offered to send a letter to the Anthropology Department with a copy to Dean Kay Schaffer voicing a concern about the number of faculty FTE needed to support this program. That letter should include a recommendation to create a strategic plan for allocation of FTE, with the expectation that this analysis would reveal the need to hire faculty at an earlier point in the program. The motion passed with an amendment to include approval of the Category I proposal.
and a commendation to the department for its thorough research and vision in building on its strengths.

The Council then adopted a motion to request that the Graduate School send the letter on their behalf to the chair of the Anthropology Department and to ask the Curriculum Council to delay their action on the proposal until the department receives the letter and provides a response, which could be attached to the proposal as it moves forward.

III. Conditional Admission

Among the recommendations submitted to Dean Francis from the Task Force on Graduate Admissions Standard on May 26, 2002, were the following:

4. **The restrictions currently imposed on the ability of conditionally admitted students to hold graduate assistantships, to meet formally with their program committees, and to file graduate programs, should be eliminated.**

The Task Force recognizes the value of conditional and provisional categories of admission, but the restrictions placed on graduate students admitted conditionally appear to complicate the lives and programs of such students to little useful purpose. The current policy/practice of the Graduate Admissions Committee, using provisional admission (with standard provisions) as an alternative to conditional admission, accomplishes the same end and has eased many of the problems previously encountered. However, this approach seems unnecessarily complicated and may change with the composition of the Admissions Committee. With the proposed modification, maintaining a distinction between conditional admissions (with conditions imposed by the Graduate Admission Committee) and provisional admissions (with provisions imposed by the graduate program) would continue to have merit.

5. **With the recommended change in the restrictions on conditionally admitted students, the primary function of conditional admission would be to ensure that these students are tracked and receive appropriate attention. Therefore, graduate programs should be required to carefully monitor and report on the progress of these students after completion of their first term (12 credits) of work and quarterly thereafter until conditional status is removed.**

   Students admitted to graduate study with conditional status are likely to be at higher risk than students admitted with regular status. Requiring written reports from the programs that have appealed to admit these students might serve to facilitate better tracking of the success of these students as well as encouraging greater attention to mentoring. To be effective, an assessment of progress should occur as early in the student’s program as is meaningful, presumably immediately after grades are available for the equivalent of one-term of work.

The Council approved a motion to adopt the two changes (first, to remove restrictions on offering assistantships and filing programs of study for conditionally admitted students and,
second, to require quarterly reporting on progress) with an amendment that conditionally admitted be changed to academically conditionally admitted. Karyn Bird (Chair, Graduate Admissions Committee) voiced her gratitude to the Council for their action on these recommendations.

IV. Graduate Level Learning

Near the end of the Faculty Senate meeting on March 6, 2003, that body approved the following motion, which had been offered by Bill Lunch, Senator, Liberal Arts: “I move to... refer the proposed change in graduate education to require that fifty percent of all credits be taken in graduate-only seminars or courses to the appropriate committees and councils of the Faculty Senate for review and consideration, leading to a recommendation to the Executive Committee and ultimately, to a decision by the full Senate.” Graduate Council members who attended that meeting raised concerns about the authority of the Council to approve the changes in conditional admission or any other policy without those actions requiring referral to the Faculty Senate.

Francis said that the Graduate Council historically has been the final authority on issues of graduate education policy. Although the Council has the authority to make these decisions, it is a committee of the Faculty Senate. A major reason that the issue came before the Senate was that communication of the Council’s policy change had been delayed by the desire to consider issues related to the 50% rule (criteria for the 500 component of slash courses and whether any 400 level courses would be allowed on a program of study) before explaining the entire set of changes to the campus community.

Francis summarized some of the conversations that have taken place since the Faculty Senate meeting. Bill Lunch has confirmed that his motion was intended to refer future action on this issue to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. She talked with Bruce Sorte, President of the Faculty Senate, who outlined two parallel tracks for future action: First, let the Faculty Senate Executive Committee know where the Council is going regarding remaining actions affecting slash courses and related policy issues. Second, ask the Graduate Council members to check with constituents regarding this policy.

Several Graduate Council members expressed concern with these requests. Selker agreed that the Graduate Council does have homework to do. Namely, they should communicate the decision and the history of the decision to the university, preferably in a workshop setting. Brauner said that the fact that adoption of the 50% rule and delay of communication while working on related issues has caused misunderstanding about the timing and nature of actions needed to comply with the policy. In some cases, this appears to have led to a sense of panic. Chairs of three CLA departments sent a letter to Brauner expressing deep concern and requesting either a change in the policy or, at least, a delay in its implementation. Ciuffetti asked whether, if this policy is not changed and that is communicated to the Executive Committee and if the Faculty Senate subsequently votes against the policy, will the policy be changed?
Francis distributed part of the accreditation standards, drawing attention to Standard 2.F. Graduate Records and Academic Credit, which includes the requirement that “Graduate program faculty are involved in specifying admission criteria, transfer of graduate credit, and graduation requirements.” She emphasized one section in particular, which reads:

2.F.4 Graduation requirements for advanced degrees offered by the institution are determined by the faculty teaching in the applicable graduate programs. At minimum, the policies governing these graduation requirements include: the specified time period in which the degree must be completed; the number of credit hours that must be completed at the degree-granting institution, normally at least two-thirds of those required for the degree; the minimum number of graduate-level credits, normally at least 50% of those required for the degree; for the master’s degree, a minimum of one academic year of full-time study or its equivalent, with a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours; the number of graded credit hours that must be earned for the degree; the minimum standard of performance or acceptable grade point average, normally a B or its equivalent; the types of qualifying and exit examinations which the candidate must pass; the proficiency requirements the candidate must satisfy; and the thesis, dissertation, writing, or research requirement which the candidate must satisfy.

Francis noted that the Graduate Council is the only Faculty Senate body composed of graduate faculty members and the only Senate body representative of every academic college. She added that its representative nature adds a responsibility for the Council members to communicate with and get feedback from constituencies. Markle asked whether the referral under discussion was the second time policies involving slash courses had been referred back from the Faculty Senate. Francis said that the previous Graduate Council policy decision had been retracted when the Curriculum Council chose not to support the elimination of the 400/500 level slash course system because of its impact on undergraduate education.