Present: Koenig (chair), Filtz, Francis, Gitelman, Harter, McMullen, Proebsting, Rettig, and Tadepalli

Absent: Gupta, McCandless, McLain, Rockey, Unsworth

Guests: Martin Fisk, Doug Markle

1. Minutes from the Meeting on December 1

The minutes from the Graduate Council on December 1, 2005 were approved as distributed.

OLD BUSINESS

MAT Cascades Campus

Hal Koenig (College of Business) reminded the Council that at its December 1 meeting, members raised concerns over the library holdings documentation within the College of Education’s proposal for a Master of Arts in Teaching degree on the OSU Cascades campus. Koenig told the Council that that issue has been resolved.

Koenig also informed the Council that the Curriculum Committee, which is reviewing the undergraduate version of Education’s proposal, had even greater concerns over the proposal’s lack of detailed documentation. They felt that the School of Education had not provided enough information for the Committee to make an informed decision.

In order to prevent future submissions of similarly incomplete proposals the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee are planning to modify a document found on the OUS website (unmodified document appended to these minutes) and adopt it for their use. The revised document will outline the information that is to be submitted in support of requests for approval of delivering existing academic program(s) to the Cascades campus. With the growth of the Cascades campus will come an increase in the number of new program proposals. Curriculum Committee hopes the new procedures will assist them in getting the information they need to make decisions in a timely fashion.

Koenig informed the Council that they might want to consider inviting the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee to meet with them in order to discuss their new procedures once they have been formalized.

Sally Francis (Graduate School) asked Koenig if he is suggesting asking the Council to consider revising the Council’s MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) clarifying the OSU-Cascades approval process for establishing existing OSU Degrees and Certificates on the Bend campus.
Bruce Rettig (Graduate School) explained to the Council that if a unit's new program proposal includes a graduate program, Graduate Council is asked to endorse it before it can proceed to the Curriculum Committee. Therefore it would be useful for the Curriculum Committee to articulate to the Graduate Council what they propose to do so that we may decide how we may wish to proceed. Rettig suggested that either the co-chairs of the Curriculum Committee could attend a Graduate Council meeting or they could write up whatever it is that they are proposing and forward it to the Graduate Council for review. Rettig indicated that he felt that it would be more effective if our respective procedures were aligned.

2. Follow-up Report of the Master of Arts in Applied Anthropology

Martin Fisk (Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences) joined the meeting. After introductions, Koenig informed the Council that the report that Fisk came to present is actually the second follow-up report prepared after the full review of Anthropology’s graduate programs conducted in 2002. Fisk further explained that he was the chair of the original review panel which also included Tom McLain and that the two of them were assigned to conduct the two follow-up reviews.

Fisk reported that in 2004, at the time of the first follow-up review, John Young was Chair of the Anthropology department and it appeared to Fisk and McLain that not much effort had been made toward following the recommendations made by the review panel in 2002. Graduate Council heard the first follow-up report and though the Council accepted the report they ordered that a second follow-up review be prepared in a year's time.

In preparing for the second report, Fisk and McLain met with David McMurray, currently interim chair of Anthropology, after first sending him all the previous reports including the response to the first follow-up report from John Young to the Graduate Council. Fisk learned that David McMurray had not previously seen any of these documents and therefore should probably not be held accountable for any progress or lack of progress the department has made toward addressing the review panel’s recommendations.

In the original review, there was strong concern over the extended length of time Anthropology students took to complete the master’s degree. Fisk reported that the department has recently instituted a four-year time limit.

Another issue raised in the original report was the amount of graduate student debt acquired while in the program due to the very limited funding offered. Fisk reported that Anthropology has addressed this by limiting the number of new Master’s students entering the program and by obtaining additional Teaching Assistantships. The Department has also secured two Ph.D. assistantships (and will limit the number of entering Ph.D. students to two this fall). Overall Fisk and McLain were happy to see that the change in management has changed the outlook for the department.

In their report they concluded that they felt that the department was on the right track. Fisk concluded by mentioning that McMurray informed him that he would like to meet with Sally
Francis to propose that the program undergo another full review earlier than previously scheduled.

Theresa Filtz (Pharmacy) asked Fisk about the previous student funding issues in Anthropology. She also asked Francis if it is now a priority with the university to at least partially fund Master’s Students so that they will not fall into such great debt. Francis responded that it is not and that the concern with funding master’s students was specific to Anthropology because the program admitted many more students than they could support and the funding problems were compounded by students' extended time to degree (often over seven years).

Rettig related that since McMurray has become Chair, he has received many calls from him and briefly described one discussion regarding time to degree. McMurray had asked Rettig if Anthropology could set an even shorter official time limit than the seven-year limit set by Graduate Council. Rettig reported that he sees a positive shift in thinking in the department. He feels that McMurray is serious about improving his programs.

Starr McMullen (Liberal Arts) expressed her concerned that McMurray had not previously seen the review reports before Fisk had forwarded them to him. She asked if the 2002 review report was not shared with the Anthropology faculty. Fisk answered that he assumes that the report never left John Young's desk. When McMullen expressed her concern, Francis assured her that in her experience most department heads are eager to share the report with their faculty and special retreats are often scheduled to discuss them.

McMullen asked Fisk about the three Ph.D. program concentrations being dropped in favor of bringing in two students and noticed that the department also dropped some required courses for the master’s degree. McMullen asked if the department switched those courses over to the Ph.D. Fisk answered that he recalled that in the original review, the reviewers felt that the new Ph.D. program was too big a fish to swallow and he thinks that the department now recognizes that too and they are now focusing on a package that they can actually accomplish. Fisk told McMullen that he did not know if the Master’s courses were moved to the Ph.D. program. McMullan explained that what she is wondering about is what courses the first Ph.D. students are going to take. She asked Fisk if Anthropology has Ph.D. courses or will the incoming Ph.D. students just be doing independent study.

Rettig reported that when the original CAT I proposal came before the Graduate Council the Anthropology department committed to a number of graduate stand alone courses in order to meet the 50% rule.

Francis asked Fisk to clarify an item on one of the report's attachments which indicated that with the institution of the new four-year time limit, 30 of the 75 MA students would be cut. Francis asked if there would be a phase-in process and asked how students would be notified. Fisk answered that his feeling is that there would not be any cutting done, but that the students who have been in the program too long a time are being told that it's time to finish up. They will have the opportunity to finish. Fisk explained that the unit intends to shrink the program by not admitting as many students as was their custom.
McMullen informed the Council that she is concerned that units in the CLA often want to add new programs, which require more resources, without realizing that some other budget would have to be cut back. She is concerned about Anthropology’s budget. Fisk remarked that Anthropology is also concerned about the costs involved with starting the new program.

Discussion was held concerning possibly revising the timing of Anthropology's next review. Koenig reported that one thought was that the Council might want to move the report up. Francis reported that a five year OUS review of the new Ph.D. program would be scheduled and that the executive committee of the Faculty senate had recently called for a three year internal review of all new programs as well. Francis recommended that she talk with McMurray to see if those reviews would satisfy his department’s need.

A motion to accept the follow-up report as submitted was moved and seconded. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

Fisk and McMullen left the meeting.

3. Follow-up Report of the Master of Science in Environmental Health and Occupational Safety Management

Doug Markle entered and introductions were made.

As background information Markle told the committee that he and Barbara Bond were assigned both to the original Graduate Council review panel and to the follow-up committee. The original review of Public Health occurred in 2003 with the reviewers making fifteen recommendations and one procedural recommendation.

Markle first described the procedural recommendation. The original review reviewed only one degree program in a department that had six different degree programs. The reviewers felt that expecting the Graduate Council to review individual degree programs in a multi-program department and for the department to have to deal with that is neither desirable nor efficient. Therefore they recommended working with the department to coordinate their accreditation review with a Graduate Council program review of all their graduate degree programs.

Markle told the Council that at the time of the original review, the department of Public Health was going through tremendous changes. They were contemplating completely dropping the undergraduate program, increasing the number of graduate students, decreasing the number of graduate teaching assistantships and increasing the number of graduate research assistantships. The department planned to take the money being saved on GTAs to hire new faculty and increase faculty research funding. The department would be changing from a faculty doing a fair amount of undergraduate teaching to a faculty doing graduate teaching and research only. Markle alerted that Council that many of these departmental changes have come to pass and therefore some of the recommendations made during the original review no longer apply.

The reviewers’ first recommendation was to consider moving the EHOSM MS students into the MPH (Master in Public Health) program. The reviewers believed this to be a good idea because
the MS in EHOSM was a non-accredited program with few students (about ten). Markle remarked, however, that this program's graduates had a very high placement rate. The MPH program was a larger, accredited program very highly ranked in the country. It also had five different tracks including a dormant track in Occupational Health and Safety. The reviewers therefore believed that incorporating the EHOSM program into the MPH made quite a bit of sense. Markle reported that instead of precisely following this recommendation the department decided to start a new MPH track and are retaining the MS degree in EHOSM. They wanted to keep the EHOSM program because it is tied to a fellowship and they believe it is successful in servicing students wanting to get jobs in the private sector. Markle remarked that by having such similar program names, the department of Public Health could be confusing applicants (the MPH degree is in occupational environmental safety and health and the MS degree is in environmental health and occupational safety management).

The second big recommendation was to eliminate the MS in Public Health (not the same program as the MPH: Master of Public Health) partly because there were only two students in that degree program at the time of the review. Although this recommendation is still under discussion in the department, Markle feels it is likely that the MS in Public Health will be eliminated within a year or so.

Markle told the Council that there were a few student complaints heard during the review concerning the department’s instrumentation courses. The problem was that the college did not have the instruments needed to provide students with hands-on experience. Since the time of the review, one of the courses has been eliminated. Additionally, it is now the department's policy to make it very clear to students that if they want experience with mass-spectrometers and other instruments they will need to go somewhere else. In addition the department encourages internships which usually include some instrument training.

Another recommendation was for the department to consider new ways to promote cohesion among the graduate students. At the time of the review the MPH program had many more students and they were more cohesive than the EHOSM students who were primarily non-traditional students (part time, with part time jobs). The acting department chair feels that there is more student cohesion with the department's institution of a new mentoring program.

Because of the department’s rather dramatic change to a focus on graduate research, the review panel recommended that the department needs to make promotion and tenure expectations clear to entering junior faculty (who would naturally be held to a different standard than the faculty who joined the department before the change). Markle reported that the Department chair directly mentors new faculty on a one to one basis and though the department has no written Promotion and Tenure guidelines, new hires are directed to the university's P&T guidelines.

Although the department has always been successful in obtaining external support for students, the review committee recommended that with their move to a research focus the fundamental priority of the faculty should remain scholarship over grantsmanship. Fisk reported that the Dean and the Chair recognize the distinction and encourage both.
At the time of the original review, there was some confusion concerning whether or not chemistry was needed for admission to these degree programs. The reviewers felt that chemistry was absolutely needed. Markle reported that the department now requires introductory chemistry and organic chemistry and works on a case by case basis to ensure deficiencies are corrected before students begin the program.

Markle concluded his report by briefly touching on Public Health’s efforts made toward some of the other recommendations. He also expressed his and McLain’s excitement that the department’s dramatic switch to an all graduate research focus appears to have been successful. Markle told the Council that Public Health did maintain a minor although the undergraduate program was dropped.

Koenig called for questions.

Prasad Tadepalli (Engineering) asked Markle about the differences between the Public Health programs with the similar names. Markle confessed that it was frustrating to learn how the department differentiated the degrees and he believes that the similar names are a bit of a problem for them. Markle reiterated that the MS in EHOSM was retained because the department felt that the program had a definite role to play while the review panel thought that a certificate program in EHOSM would have been an excellent replacement.

A motion to accept the follow-up report as submitted was moved and seconded. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Graduate Student Conference

Francis informed the Council of plans the ASOSU Graduate Student Affairs Task Force Director, David McCandless, has made to redesign the annual Graduate Student Conference for which he is responsible. Instead of the past format featuring presentations of students’ scholarly accomplishments throughout the day, workshops will be offered on topics such as building a curriculum vita or designing a poster presentation. Francis asked the Council to recommend additional appropriate workshop topics and/or recommend people who would be able to present a workshop. Francis will forward the suggestions to David McCandless. The Conference has been set for May 24, 2006.

Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship Program (IGERT)

Francis informed the Council of the new change in NSF submission guidelines for the IGERT. Institutions are now restricted to nominating a maximum of four proposals.

Jack Higginbotham (Research Office) asked Francis to propose to the Graduate Council that its members review and decide which four OSU proposals will be submitted. Council members agreed that they would cooperate and discussed possible processes. It was agreed that all members would read the proposals and rank them (#1 being the top/best). The rankings will be
forwarded to Helene by February 13th and the Council will discuss the rankings and decide which four proposals will be submitted at its meeting of February 16th.

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 pm.
Proposal for Delivery of an Existing Program to a New Location

This document outlines the information that is to be submitted in support of requests for approval of delivering existing academic program(s) to new location(s).

1. Program Description
   a. Program title, level, and delivery sites.
   b. Department and school/college that would offer the program. Include the name of the institution program coordinator.
   c. Briefly describe the academic program. List all course titles, including number of credits.
   d. Indicate in what ways the proposed program at the new location(s) will differ from the on-campus program.
   e. List any special requirements or prerequisites for admission to the program at the new location(s).
   f. Is there an accrediting agency or professional society that has established standards for this program? If so, is the program currently accredited? If accredited, what steps would be needed to accredit the program at the proposed new location(s)?

2. Demand
   a. List any similar programs offered at the proposed or nearby location(s).
   b. Provide evidence of need for the program at the new location(s).
   c. Estimate enrollment and number of graduates over the next five years. Will any enrollment limitation be imposed? If so, how will those to be enrolled be selected?

3. Personnel
   a. List the names and qualifications of faculty (regular and adjunct) who will be involved in delivering the program to the proposed location(s). Will new faculty be needed?
   b. Estimate the number and type of support staff needed to provide the program at the new location(s).
4. Other Resources

a. Describe facilities (e.g., buildings, labs, equipment) necessary to offer the program at the new location(s).

b. Indicate how library needs will be met.

c. Indicate how students at the new location(s) will receive student services (e.g., academic advising, financial aid assistance, course registration, access to book/text purchases).

5. Alternative Delivery Methods/Formats

a. Are alternative delivery methods being used (e.g., telecommunications)? Please describe.

b. Will this program be delivered in an alternative format (e.g., weekend, evening, on-site)? Please describe.

6. Budgetary Impact

a. Indicate the estimated cost of the program for the first four years of its operation. (Use the “Budget Outline” and “Budget Outline Instructions” forms on the Forms and Guidelines Web site.)

b. If grant funds are required to launch the program, what does the institution propose to do with the program upon termination of the grant?

c. Will the allocation of going-level budget funds in support of the program have an adverse impact on any other institutional program, including the on-campus program? If so, in what ways?

d. If the program will be financed from existing resources, specifically state:

i. what the budgetary unit will be doing as a result of the new program that is not now done, in terms of additional activities, and

ii. what these new activities will cost and whether financed or staffed by shifting of assignments within the budgetary unit or reallocation of resources within the institution. State which resources will be moved and how this will affect those programs losing resources.
Second Follow-up Review of the Masters of Arts in Applied Anthropology (M.A.A.A)  
December 2005

The Masters degree program in applied anthropology was reviewed in 2002 by the Graduate Council as part of the regular cycle of graduate program reviews. In 2004 a routine follow-up review was conducted and the Graduate Council discussed that report. The Graduate Council recommended that a second follow up review be conducted in the 2005-6 academic year.

Thomas McLain (representing the Graduate Council) and Martin Fisk (Chairman of 2002 Review) met with David McMurray the new chairman of the Anthropology Department on December 20, 2005 to discuss the previous two reviews and the response by former Anthropology Chairman, John Young. Professor McMurray indicated that he had not seen the 2002 or 2004 reports of the Graduate Council reviews prior to being contacted for our meeting. The issues discussed were streamlining the curriculum, improving time to completion of degrees, student funding, faculty composition and productivity, grant funding, departmental budget, and planning for the new Ph.D. program. David provided several handouts to facilitate the conversation and to address several key points. These are attached.

The number of graduate level world culture courses has been significantly reduced which was a recommendation in the 2002 review.

The department is making efforts to reduce the time to completion of masters degrees and recently instituted a limit of four years for completing the MA. Current students, who are not active, and grandfathered against the continuous enrollment policy, have recently been notified of this time limit. New students are now given copies of "Normal Progress Guidelines" and "M.A. Degree Timeline" documents (attached) and provided explicit guidance for filling out Programs of Study to minimize time of matriculation.

M.A.A.A. students are either self funded or funded by teaching assistantships or research grants. New GT A support for two students has been secured. Some funding is also available from e-campus courses. The department is limiting the admission of new M.A. students to only those that can be supported (typically 7 per year). For the Ph.D. program, which starts Fall 2006, funding has been secured for two students and only two students will be admitted.

The number of full-time faculty is presently eight, down from nine at the time of the 2002 review. Three senior faculty have retired, two assistant professors have been added, and a new faculty member will arrive in 2006. There are no impending retirements. The scheduled increase to 12.5 FTE mentioned in the proposal to establish the Ph.D. program will not be achieved in the next decade.

In an attempt to raise the level of scholarship by the faculty, the department chairman is offering financial incentives for faculty to publish results in the peer reviewed literature.

McLain and Fisk think that given the fiscal limitations and the number of faculty that the new chairman is making satisfactory progress in addressing many of the recommendations given in the 2002 review, and with the concerns expressed by the Graduate Council in January 2005. They recommend that McMurray discuss with Dean Francis some of the challenges with implementing the PhD program and the possibility of a three-year rather than a five-year review of that program.

Submitted by:
Dr. Martin Fisk, Professor, College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences
Dr. Thomas McLain, Department Head, Wood Science and Engineering
Notes for MAAA (Anthropology) Review follow up Dec. 20. 2005

Presently 8 full time faculty; new hire starting Fall, 2006; five fixed term faculty teaching less than .5 fte each.

-----------------------------

**Efforts made toward streamlining the department:**
- deleted from the course catalog ANTH 460/560; ANTH 439, 451, 432, 587 and 411-419 plus all 511-519
- Program completion deadline for MA/MAIS of four years put into place which is cutting 30 of the 75 MA students from the program; restricting admission of new MA students
- dropped the three concentrations in the Ph.D. in favor of bringing in only 2 best candidates and only candidates with funding.

-----------------------------

**University Mission Compliance activities**
- Received two GT As for international student mentoring (with Moira Dempsey) and to manage anth 208, 209 courses for study abroad students

-----------------------------

**Strategic Initiatives Activities**
- Department has signed onto the Sustainable Rural Communities initiative
- Developing a Rural Studies Certificate
- Received support for 1 Ph.D. student
- Received research money for several grad and undergrad researchers

-----------------------------

**Improving Departmental Productivity**
- Instituted summer research write up funds to cover one month writing time
- Instituted cultural anthropology field school development funds for both grads and undergrads
- Instituted a DeLoach Scholarship-like fund to allow grads and undergrads to work with profs. on projects
- Liberal travel money and classroom enhancement money now made available
- Instituted making classroom enhancement and travel money available to fixed term faculty

-----------------------------

**Improving Student Affairs**
- increasing funding possibilities for grad students via greater ecampus involvement
- received two GT As in International Education
- instituted "Normal Progress Guidelines" for MA & MAIS Degree Timeline
- began a late fall term meeting with new students to go over program planning

-----------------------------

**Money Matters**
- Library money in Ph.D. proposal = $6,000/yr for 4 years. Who pays?
- TA support in Ph.D. proposal = $10,000. Who pays?
- .5 position with education. No money.
- John's replacement? 50-50 chance
- Chance of increasing faculty numbers beyond PERS casualty replacements? Next to nil.
Normal Progress Guidelines

To encourage Anthropology graduate students to complete their educational program in a timely fashion, a set of benchmarks have been established. These normal progress guidelines help students assess their own progress. They also enable departmental administrators to identify problems early and to provide timely advice and assistance. Students who fail to meet normal progress guidelines risk losing their research or teaching assistantships and also may be dismissed from the program.

The benchmarks for M.A. and M.A.I.S. students are:

- Maintain a 3.0 grade average overall.
- Maintain a 3.0 grade average for courses in the program of study filed with the Graduate School.
- Maintain a 3.25 grade average for anthropology core courses.
- Complete required courses and the thesis within four years of entering the program. (Funding normally is available for no more than the first two years).
M.A. Degree Timeline

Students are encouraged to complete their educational program in a timely manner. To do this, we have provided the following suggestions:

- Anthropology core courses should be taken the first year.
- A thesis topic and your committee should be chosen before the 3rd term of your first year.
- All course work should be completed by the end of the 2nd year.
- The thesis defense date must be reported to the entire committee one quarter in advance of the defense.
- The major professor must receive the final thesis draft at least six weeks before the intended defense date.
- Your major professor must read your 1st draft and return it to you within three weeks.
- Register with the office staff (1) when you choose a defense date and (2) when you submit your final thesis draft to your major professor.
- The committee members must receive the final draft two weeks before the defense.
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL
MASTER’S PROGRAM FOR THE DEGREE OF:

**Masters**

Check One:
- EdM
- MA
- MBA
- MBE
- MEng
- MF
- MFA
- MOcE
- MPH
- MPP
- MS
- MSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name (Family)</th>
<th>SAMPLE #1</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Init.</th>
<th>(Former)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Now Held</td>
<td>When/Where Rcvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Dept.</th>
<th>Anthropology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check One:</td>
<td>Thesis [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Applied Anthropology</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Major Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Symbol</th>
<th>Title of Major Courses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Theory of Culture</td>
<td>ANTH 575</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>ANTH 581</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>ANTH 591</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Ecology</td>
<td>ANTH 577</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Food</td>
<td>ANTH 582</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Anth</td>
<td>ANTH 596</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Conf</td>
<td>ANTH 505</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash, Class &amp; Culture</td>
<td>ANTH 571</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wealth &amp; Poverty</td>
<td>ANTH 584</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>ANTH 502</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>ANTH 595</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Uses of Anth</td>
<td>ANTH 585</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>ANTH 510</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>ANTH 503</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 53

### Minor Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Symbol</th>
<th>Title of Minor Courses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>World Views</td>
<td>PHL 543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environ Politics</td>
<td>PS 575</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environ Soc</td>
<td>SOC 580</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat-based tourism</td>
<td>FOR 553</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 13

Transfer courses indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Symbol</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 4XX/5XX Program Credits 33
Total Graduate Standalone Credits 33
TOTAL CREDITS ON PROGRAM 66

**Wrong Way — more courses than needed!**

*Mark courses that will be graduate standalone with the letter “G” in this column.*
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
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Check One

EdM MA MBA MBE MEng MF MFA MOcE MPH MPP MS MSE

Last Name (Family) SAMPLE #1 First Name Middle Init. (Former)

Day Phone # ID# Email Address

Degree Now Held When/Where Rcvd

Major Dept. Anthropology

Check One: Thesis □ Non-Thesis □

Major Applied Anthropology

Minor Integrated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Symbol</th>
<th>Title of Major Courses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Theory of Culture</td>
<td>ANTH 575</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>ANTH 581</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td>ANTH 591</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Ecology</td>
<td>ANTH 577</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Food</td>
<td>ANTH 582</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wealth &amp; Poverty</td>
<td>ANTH 584</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>ANTH 595</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Uses of Anth</td>
<td>ANTH 585</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>ANTH 510</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>ANTH 503</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Symbol</th>
<th>Title of Minor Courses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>World Views</td>
<td>PHL 543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environ Soc</td>
<td>SOC 580</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat-based tourism</td>
<td>FOR 553</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 9

Total 4XX/5XX Program Credits 21
Total Graduate Standalone Credits 24
TOTAL CREDITS ON PROGRAM 45

Right Way

*Mark courses that will be graduate standalone with the letter “G” in this column.
## Budget Allocation Model Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>BAM</th>
<th>Initial Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>$2,311,577</td>
<td>$142,628</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$54,662</td>
<td>$2,508,950</td>
<td>$2,431,028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1,336,338</td>
<td>303,487</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>1,835,036</td>
<td>1,774,017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>1,425,155</td>
<td>72,573</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,940</td>
<td>1,517,668</td>
<td>1,488,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1,166,831</td>
<td>86,304</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>91,563</td>
<td>1,345,627</td>
<td>1,741,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>1,394,422</td>
<td>137,841</td>
<td>133,644</td>
<td>1,665,907</td>
<td>1,627,649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1,250,227</td>
<td>85,689</td>
<td>12,580</td>
<td>34,486</td>
<td>1,382,962</td>
<td>1,065,539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1,305,819</td>
<td>275,681</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,601,613</td>
<td>585,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>872,083</td>
<td>117,051</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>223,531</td>
<td>1,215,704</td>
<td>1,611,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1,030,281</td>
<td>50,932</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>95,857</td>
<td>1,177,930</td>
<td>1,033,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>907,146</td>
<td>78,419</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>16,278</td>
<td>1,002,578</td>
<td>1,027,594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>604,691</td>
<td>135,079</td>
<td>8,119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>747,888</td>
<td>949,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>416,143</td>
<td>71,933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>703,077</td>
<td>1,235,157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Study</td>
<td>84,581</td>
<td>325,037</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>409,618</td>
<td>110,704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Studies</td>
<td>362,324</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32,556</td>
<td>394,890</td>
<td>372,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Study</td>
<td>274,894</td>
<td>11,689</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>287,003</td>
<td>459,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Media Comm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>281,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Adm Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>636,774</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>636,774</td>
<td>369,823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$14,742,563</td>
<td>$1,894,343</td>
<td>$43,048</td>
<td>$1,753,291</td>
<td>$18,433,245</td>
<td>$18,433,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A measure of research grant success relative to others in CLA.

12/20/05
GRADUATE COUNCIL FOLLOW-UP REVIEW OF
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY MANAGEMENT

This follow-up review of the Masters of Science program in Environmental Health and Occupational Safety Management (EHOSM) was conducted by Douglas Markle, College of Agricultural Science, and Barbara Bond, College of Forestry. We had a pre-review meeting November 17, received a written response to the recommendations contained in the original review on November 28, and met with the Chair, Marie Harvey, and program coordinator, Cathy Neumann, on November 29. Because of scheduling problems, Dr. Bond was unable to attend the November 29 meeting but provided questions and subsequent input to this review.

At the time of the original review, the program was contemplating substantial changes including: dropping the undergraduate program, increasing numbers of graduate students, decreasing GTAs, increasing GRAs, increasing faculty FTE, and increasing faculty research funding. The undergraduate program has been dropped but a minor in Environmental Safety and Health has been created. The Department and Program are still in transition but seem to have made considerable progress towards their goals. The original recommendations, written responses, and commentary follow.

Recommendations:

1) Consider moving EHOSM to the MPH degree. Currently the M.S. in EHOSM is a non-accredited degree program with minimal enrollment, approximately 10 students. In contrast, the MPH program is accredited, ranked second nationally, and enrolls approximately 82 students in three distinct tracks (Public Health Promotion and Education, Health Policy and Management, and International Health). Five other tracks, including Occupational Health and Safety, are approved under the MPH program, but are dormant. The review committee feels the M.S. in EHOSM would be better located under the MPH program in an EHOSM track. This recommendation would offer several important advantages detailed in our report.

   Response: As of fall 2005, we began accepting students into a new Environment, Safety and Health MPH Track, as part of Oregon MPH Program. We are keeping our M.S. degree in EHOSM because it is part of a NIOSH fellowship and meets the needs of students who want to work in the private sector with industries.

   Commentary: The M.S. program still has about 10 students and they are still easily placed in jobs after graduation, so the Department feels the program serves a legitimate academic need. The new MPH track has 6 students in its first year which is considered a very good start. The goal of increasing numbers of graduate students appears to be on track.

2) Consider eliminating the M.S. in Public Health. While this recommendation is admittedly beyond the “charge” of this committee, we feel the Department’s new direction makes this an opportune time to re-evaluate a traditionally low-enrollment (currently only two majors) program.
Response: Our Department is having on-going discussions on this topic and we will likely eliminate this degree sometime in 2006.

3) Re-evaluate some core courses. We encourage expanding the required core to include an environmental health course, such as H 540 (Environmental Health). The purpose of H 542 (Environmental and Occupational Health), required only for the Occupational Safety (OS) concentration, is not clear. This course would seem to duplicate the core required for H 545 (Occupational Health).

Response: Please see new EHOSM M.S. degree (below). This has been in effect since fall of 2004. We have completely revamped our program by merging the two concentration areas.

**M.S. in Environmental Health and Occupational Safety Management**

(49 credits)

**Required Core (28 credits)**
- H515 Research Methods (3) or H525 Principles of Epidemiology (3)
- H524 Health Data Analysis (4)
- H548 Public Health Toxicology and Risk Assessment (3)
- H540 Environmental Health I (3)
- H541 Environmental Health II (3)
- H546 Industrial Hygiene Instrumentation (3)
- H585 Environment, Safety and Health Policy and Law (3)
- H588 Occupational Safety and Health (3)
- H595 Design and Management for Environment, Safety and Health (3)

**Thesis or Project H503 or H506 (6 credits)**

**MINOR (15 credits)**

Commentary: This recommendation was from the outside reviewer and has clearly been implemented.

4) Evaluate effectiveness of internships as a substitute for courses requiring instrumentation (H543 and H546).

Response: H543 has been deleted when we streamlined our program above. H546 remains a part of the program and graduates are encouraged to do internships. For example, one M.S. degree graduate student in the program is currently doing an internship with a demolition company in Eugene OR, to evaluate and update their safety program.

Commentary: This recommendation was also from the outside reviewer and has been partly implemented. At this time, there is no evaluation of effectiveness but the program is making clear to all prospective students that it is not a lab-based program and directs students to other institutions if they seek those types of programs.
5) Consider ways to promote more cohesion among all departmental graduate students especially during this time of change. This should include continuation of program strengths (orientation for new students, list serve & student handbook) but might include modifications such as a single graduate student handbook with recommended course sequences, a student-organized seminar series, a larger role on Departmental committees, or creation of a student lounge area.

Response: There are several ways this is being accomplished:
1. Graduate students are invited to attend thesis presentations
2. This year we instituted a graduate mentoring program, with a pizza party for all new students and mentors
3. Graduate students participate in faculty searches
4. There is a single handbook for all MPH students in the Dept.
5. There is a MPH research symposium, every other year as well as the Oregon Public Health Assn. Meetings were held at OSU this year, where there was a poster session designated for graduate students.

Commentary: Both Dr. Harvey and Dr. Neumann feel there is more cohesion department-wide. Older graduate students serve as mentors to new students. They have no rigid structure for this mentoring and say that it seems to be helping new students make the transition. Professional presentations are being encouraged by paying student registration fees for all presenters at regional and national meetings. About 12 students in the Department gave posters at the Corvallis meeting and they won 2 of the 3 best student poster awards.

6) Make Promotion and Tenure expectations clear to junior faculty and any new hires and mentor all faculty through the transition.

Response: Chair is currently working with 1 assistant professor, 1 associate professor (without tenure), and two associate professors to be promoted.

Commentary: The Department has no written P&T guidelines but directs faculty to the University guidelines. In addition, the Chair has discussed P&T expectations with the Dean and the faculty.

7) Continue the excellent external support of students and pursue more outside research funding, but recognize the difference between scholarship and grantsmanship, the fundamental priority of the former, and the importance of maintaining faculty morale, especially if dollar targets for outside grants do not materialize in a timely fashion.

Response: ESH faculty continue to find funding for graduate students and the Dean and Chair acknowledge the difference between scholarship and grantsmanship and they encourage both.

Commentary: The transition in the Department’s focus from undergraduate and graduate teaching to graduate teaching and research is in full progress. Three faculty were hired last year, all at higher ranks and all with funded research programs. Two searches are underway this year and similar hires are anticipated. In the P&T discussions with the Dean and faculty, the Chair has made clear that grantsmanship does not
necessarily equal promotion, especially for the older hires, but that scholarship is important. Student research funding through GRAs is increasing and faculty also arrange for direct funding of students, especially with industry employers.

8) Re-evaluate admissions requirements and expectations for students entering with non-science backgrounds.
   **Response:** We do this with every applicant, and have established both provisional requirements and suggested course recommendations based on the student’s work experience and academic record.
   **Commentary:** This recommendation was primarily directed at the student’s background in chemistry. The standard now is introductory chemistry and organic chemistry and the Department works on a case by case basis to insure deficiencies are corrected, often in summer before admission.

9) Move cautiously as the GTA budget is reduced and regularly evaluate the impact.
   **Response:** The GTA budget was never reduced.
   **Commentary:** Rather than reduce the GTA budget to create FTE for new faculty, the College has found other funds for FTE for five new faculty.

10) Move forward on a certificate program in EHOSM as a way to address the needs of working professionals and increase total enrollment.
    **Response:** We are not doing this but rather focusing on both MPH and MS programs.
    **Commentary:** This was a resource decision whose implementation would have detracted from the overall goal to increase research effort.

11) Conduct exit interviews of all graduates for on-going internal assessment of the effectiveness of the program and extent to which high placement rates are due to graduate quality or market demand.
    **Response:** We are not currently doing this, but once the OMPH program has an established exit interview process we will adopt this and use it for MS degree students as well.
    **Commentary:** They expect a process to be in place next year.

12) Mentor entering students on the process of research, including research funding possibilities.
    **Response:** We do this routinely with new and existing graduate students in our Dept.
    **Commentary:** The Department is using two listserves to advertise funding and other research opportunities to graduate students.

13) Consider giving graduate students a larger role in Departmental committees.
    **Response:** Graduate students currently serve as representatives for our MPH Coordinating committee and faculty searches. As mentioned earlier,
this year we have also implemented a mentoring program for new graduate students in the Dept.

14) Develop a long-term strategy to improve or replace student office, laboratory and computing facilities.
   **Response:** Currently, the Dean is working on finding funding to renovate the 4th floor of Waldo Hall.

15) Maintain the positive, mutually supportive relationship between faculty and administration during the term of the two-year interim chair.
   **Response:** We will have a permanent Chair as of June 2006 (Dr. Marie Harvey).

**Procedural Recommendation:**
In the original review we noted that we reviewed one degree program in a Department offering six graduate degrees and recommended that the Masters in Public Health (MPH) program review, scheduled for 2008, be changed to a review of all graduate programs in the Department of Public Health, including EHOSM. This review and follow-up should be supplied to the 2008 Review team.