

**MINUTES**  
**The Graduate Council**  
**December 4, 1996**  
**Leona Tyler Conference Room, Chapman Hall**

---

**Members Present:** Katharine Cashman, Shanna Davis (masters student representative), Ian Duncan, Marian Friestad, Roger Haydock, Van Kolpin, Richard Sundt, Mark Tveskov (doctoral student representative), Steadman Upham (*ex officio*), Claire Wachter, Janet Wasko, Virpi Zuck

**Members Absent:** Judith Grosenick, David Schuman (*ex officio*)

**Staff in Attendance:** Jiffin Arboleda, Shirley Collins, Toby Deemer, Maggie Morris

The meeting was called to order by chair Marian Friestad at 3:35 p.m. The minutes of the November 6, 1996 meeting were approved as distributed.

**Announcements**

• **Update on the Preproposal Process**

Chair Marian Friestad introduced for the record a copy of her letter to John Moseley dated November 7, 1996, in which she summarizes their conversation concerning the preproposal process and the reporting relationship of Graduate Council. The flow chart which mistakenly identified Graduate Council as reporting to the University Senate has now been corrected.

• **Update on Oregon Master of Software Engineering Program**

Dean Upham reported that his letter expressing Graduate Council's reactions to the software engineering degree proposal was delivered to John Owen and colleagues at a meeting of OJGSE, and was discussed briefly with them. Subsequently, the graduate deans of the other OSSHE institutions expressed appreciation for the UO Graduate Council's work in drawing attention to concerns about the proposal. Dean Upham noted that the software engineering program is bound up with a statewide engineering initiative introduced by the OSSHE Board at its most recent meeting. The Board rejected OSU's proposal to consolidate OSU and PSU's engineering offerings in favor of its own plan to create a statewide college of engineering. Whether or not statewide computing enterprises will be incorporated under the engineering rubric is still to be determined. Meanwhile, the Graduate Council's letter to the proponents of the software engineering master's program has made them aware of the thoughts and objections raised at the institutional level.

• **UO MBA at SOSOC**

In a memorandum to Chancellor Cox dated November 18, 1996 (copy provided in the meeting packet), Dean Timothy McGuire of the Lundquist College of Business expressed the College's willingness to provide MBA training to students in southern Oregon, as long as there is an expressed need and desire for the degree program. However, Marian Friestad reported that since that memo was issued, there has been a change in approach. It is now more likely that the UO MBA program will become a part of the statewide distance education initiative, which would serve the entire state and not just southern Oregon. It is probable that UO will be asked to coordinate statewide business programs just as statewide engineering is coordinated from OSU. In this context, the Graduate Council may eventually see a proposal for a generalized distance education MBA.

### •International Credential Templates

Toby Deemer discussed the international credential templates that were distributed at the beginning of the meeting. The templates are designed to make the graduate admissions process more uniform by outlining the minimum qualifications for entrance to graduate study at the University of Oregon. This would relieve individual admitting units from conducting a complete evaluation of every international credential. Departments retain the right to request exceptions to the template guidelines.

The templates are the result of a year's research by a GTF working under Ms. Deemer's supervision. Templates for additional countries will be prepared during the coming year. Those that have already been prepared were introduced to departmental admissions assistants in a workshop held this fall. Feedback from departmental staff and from Graduate Council members is welcome.

Dean Upham thanked Ms. Deemer for her persistence with this project which turned out to be much more complex than was originally intended. Although the templates are not yet complete, Council arrived at a unanimous decision to endorse the process of creating the templates. Those produced to date were formally received.

## New Business

### Program Review

Referring to last spring's report from Daniel Kimble, the faculty liaison for program review, Dean Upham noted that current program review guidelines have been in effect without modification since 1991. At this halfway point in the decennial cycle, they might profitably be revisited in an effort to clarify any items that have proven counterproductive or confusing.

Most Council members have participated in program reviews either as internal reviewers or as members of departments undergoing review, and had observations to contribute. It was suggested, for example, that the term "program review" be broadened to "department and program review" to reflect the fact that the process looks at a program's administrative apparatus as well as its academic program. It was also noted that not all questions are applicable to every review; programs might be encouraged to skip items that do not apply to them, and to offer instead an explanation for why or how the item is inappropriate for that review.

Concern was expressed for the burden imposed on departments by the extensive statistical requirements of a review. However, it was noted that the Office of Institutional Research, not the department itself, provides most of the statistical information. Dean Upham commented that when program cuts were being made in 1991, it became apparent that there were insufficient statistical records being kept for a number of programs; the quantitative information collected through the decennial review process should prevent a similar data void in the future.

The revised guidelines will not be implemented until the review cycle which begins in Fall 1997, so it was determined that Council members would make notations as they participate in this year's reviews (or from their own previous experiences of the process). These notes will be forwarded to Dean Upham or to the chair to be collated for final discussion before the end of the academic year. A reminder will be placed on the agenda for each of the remaining meetings until the review of the guidelines is completed.

As a postscript to this discussion, it was observed that two non-academic units, the Office of Academic Advising and the Knight Library, are both on the review schedule. Dean Upham explained that the review of Academic Advising is at the request of the Provost, who asked that this established, credible process be invoked to offer him advice on the performance of that unit. The Library has always been on the list because it prefers to function as an academic unit, and because the review complements the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) review to which the Knight Library is already subject.

### **Graduate Certificate Credit**

As background to the issue of graduate certificates, Dean Upham related requests from specific academic units that wish to consider establishing certificate programs. Requests for guidelines will likely increase, given the rising emphasis on accessibility and increasing pressure to offer credentials for relevant job training. The University does not currently have a formal policy governing the baseline requirements (especially the number of credits) for a certificate. The two existing certificate programs, Women's Studies and Russian & East European Studies, have been in place for a number of years and arose independent of formal guidelines.

Several suggestions were proffered as models for certificate programs. One would be a year of full-time study (27 credits passed) with minimal restrictions placed on the courses selected; this would result in a general, free-standing certificate of postgraduate study. Another might be a certificate earned in conjunction with a graduate degree, for example a certificate in international business that might be added to an MBA. (Institutional practice to date allows for double counting degree credits toward certificates.)

The discussion will continue at the next meeting, by which time the Graduate School will have surveyed other OSSHE institutions and peer institutions to learn how certificates are being handled elsewhere.

### **Eligibility for Teaching Graduate Classes**

Dean Upham noted that there are frequent requests for GTFs to be allowed to teach graduate level courses. The Graduate School has operated under the policy that prohibits this practice. Given current concerns about the production of student credit hours, it would be helpful to draft a statement that clarifies the institution's stance for departments.

This topic will be placed on the agenda for further discussion at the next meeting.

With the note that the meeting schedule for winter term will be circulated when it is finalized, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Richard Sundt, Secretary

xc: President  
Vice Presidents  
Vice Provosts  
Academic Deans