

	<p>NOTE: Regarding last meeting's discussion of CEPH D-Criteria, after further consideration and in consultation with the Program Directors, the decision to reduce the number of competencies was reversed. Instead, the SPH will note that we understand that the programs have had too many competencies and will intentionally revise the competencies following the CEPH site visit.</p>	
<p>Academic Dean Updates</p>	<p><u>Graduate Stipend Policy Update:</u> We did not have an opportunity to do an electronic vote prior to the March meeting as discussed at last meeting. ADAA and the 3 PhD PDs were content with the language and willing to move forward on this policy. Reminder that the language is constrained by what PDs wanted and the collective bargaining agreement. In the interest of efficiency, messaging and electronic vote will occur prior to the April meeting.</p> <p><u>Group 1 Policies (Academic Standing, Incomplete Coursework, and Student Complaint Procedure):</u> ADAA went through each of the 3 policies and provided reminder of brief background info and explained reasoning for edit changes. It is important to write the most succinct and clear policy since policies have to be approved by Provosts at both Schools but procedures do not need Provost approval as long as they are consistent with the written policy.</p> <p>Discussion on the importance of separating policy vs procedures especially between the 2 different institutions and having the policy identify who is the responsible entity for an action to take place. To provide transparency, the goal is to have a webpage that lists both the policy and procedures on same page.</p>	
<p>Breakout A: Discussion of Group 2 Policies</p>	<p>For this agenda item, members split into two breakout rooms of their choice for a 20min discussion on the 2 policies: Academic Dismissal or Academic Dishonesty. Breakout groups reconvened to summarize their group responses.</p> <p>Some feedback on <i>Academic Dismissal</i> policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title needs to be modified to state that it's an SPH policy not just OHSU-matriculated student policy • Language should be sensitive to the difference between what "may" happen vs what "will" happen in a dismissal situation • Policy needs to be sensitive to other processes that may have extenuating circumstances (i.e. Title IX requirements) • Policy needs to include a sense of duty for timeliness of notification/communication to students. When a student triggers a criterion for a warning or probation, the formal communication should be sent ASAP (i.e. Communication should precede the drop dates in next term). <p>Some feedback on <i>Academic Dishonesty</i> policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest having definitions at the top of policy page 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide education around what academic dishonesty is (students may not understand/be familiar with policy) • Clarification of the different forms of academic dishonesty and how levels of dishonesty are determined • Add opportunities to discuss with instructor and having consistency with first time vs repeated offenses 	
<p>Breakout B: Discussion of Group 2 Policies</p>	<p>For this agenda item, members split into 2 breakout rooms of their choice for a 20min discussion on the 2 policies: Leave of Absence or Doctoral Degree Progress. Breakout groups reconvened to summarize their group responses.</p> <p>Some feedback on <i>Leave of Absence</i> policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall this policy is well-developed and has a lot of detail already. Perhaps the “extenuating circumstances” part of first paragraph can be developed further • Do reasons for LOA need to be explicitly described in order to be eligible? The considerations that include examples are helpful but should not be a definitive list • Conversation related to if the last sentence (under Responsibilities > OHSU paragraph) is needed in terms of contact with PD because students won’t need LOA for that term, but the next term following regular process • LOA policy should reference degree completion policy <p>Some feedback on <i>Doctoral Degree Progress</i> policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy needs to articulate the distinction between successful proposal defense and advancing to candidacy (the two institutions have differences). The policy should be sensitive to outside influences on progress, like the cycles of revision for IRB approval. • OHSU has a “hard-stop” on the PhD process at the end of 7 years. This is due to the invalidation of course credits after this length. • The policy needs to be sensitive to the plight of part-time students. These are legitimate constituents of our programs. 	
<p>Pulling it all together & Next Steps</p>	<p>Note: In the APCC agenda meeting, it came to light that there needed to be more feedback/amendments to the policies before voting in the March meeting. For April meeting, we may select the most established policies from Group 1 and 2 to be voted upon (especially considering CEPH).</p> <p>12:00pm Meeting Adjourned.</p>	