



OHSU-PSU Academic Policy and Curricula Committee

APCC Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, October 11, 2023

10:00am – 12:00pm

Zoom: [Redacted]

Attendees Present

	Voting Member Name	Attended?	Note		Student Name-	Attended?	Note
1.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	[Redacted]	16.	TBD		
2.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		17.	TBD		
3.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		18.	TBD		
4.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
5.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Ex-Officios / Guests		
6.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		19.	[Redacted]		[Redacted]
7.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		20.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
8.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		21.	[Redacted]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

9.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		22.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
10.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		23.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
11.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		24.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
12.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		25.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
13.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		26.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
14.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		27.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
15.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]		28.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	
16.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]					

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome	[REDACTED] noted the [REDACTED] would be joining late due to a fire drill in the building.	

	<p>█████ welcomed █████ to the Committee as a voting member and noted that █████ had accidentally not been invited to the September meeting. █████ has since been added to all calendar invitations and SharePoint folder.</p>	
<p>Vote on September Minutes</p>	<p>█████ noted that █████ provided an update on the minutes regarding the PE/IP update. █████ noted █████ will update the minutes accordingly. APCC confirmed it was okay to proceed with voting on September minutes.</p> <p>█████ moved to approve the September Minutes noting that the PE/IP portion of the minutes will be corrected. █████ seconded. No discussion/additional corrections.</p> <p>13/15 approved. 2 abstentions.</p> <p>APCC September Minutes were approved.</p>	<p>September Minutes were approved.</p>
<p>Standing Report from AAC</p>	<p>█████ noted that there are currently zero pending curricular change requests at this time.</p> <p>█████ created a Basic Racial Equity Lens Tool via a Qualtrics Form utilizing the questions on the Equity Lens Tool that █████ shared last week. The Qualtrics version is a working draft, so it may likely change over time. █████ walked through the document with the committee.</p> <p>█████ requested that █████ change the term “stakeholders” to “interested groups/parties” due to the offensive nature of the term. █████ confirmed he would update accordingly.</p> <p>█████ explained that if “N/A” is put as an answer within the form that there will be a follow-up question for the submitter to explain why the question is N/A.</p> <p>█████ noted that this form can remain anonymous. However, if you want a copy of the document, the submitter will have to put their email. To avoid this, the submitter can take a screenshot of the submission instead.</p> <p>█████ noted that it would be difficult for the submitter to remain anonymous as many a times we know who is making the proposal. █████ noted the potential of having this become an SPH systematic tool that is required for all requests and approvals.</p> <p>█████ noted that this form can be applied to policy decisions and curriculum changes.</p> <p>It can be used for a variety of purposes that don’t always require approvals, but to be used as a personal reflexive resource.</p>	<p>█████ will update language to “interested groups/parties” in the Basic Racial Equity Lens Tool</p>

	<p>█████ noted that there may not really need to be a reason for the form to be anonymous.</p> <p>█████ clarified that the Dean’s Office is asking that we begin using these equity tools in the process of decision making. The tool is specifically about Racial Equity.</p>	
<p>Policy Status Review</p>	<p>█████ created a spreadsheet that has all the policy discussions had within the history of the APCC. This was created with the intention to figure out what has been done and what needs to be done. █████ created a grading level that notates the status of each policy.</p> <p>█████ noted that █████ may be able to provide additional insight on the early days of APCC.</p> <p>█████ noted that █████ had developed guidance on policies which includes SBAR. █████ isn't sure if the provosts require all of those items or if they just need to see the text of the policy. There is work to be done on the guidance document, but the purpose of the doc is to provide a step-by-step on how policies get developed, approved, and implemented.</p> <p>█████ noted that the policy process document will be presented by █████ in the November meeting. █████ also noted that normally APCC focuses on curriculum in the fall term, but as there were no curriculum changes, █████ decided to use the time to discuss policy.</p> <p>Currently, the Leave of Absence and Doctoral Degree Progress policies are listed as ready to be reviewed but have not been submitted to the Dean’s Office to review. APCC had previously voted on these policies and approved them to move forward to the Dean’s Office, but they never got sent. If you are interested in assisting with next steps to officially submit these policies, let █████ know. █████ noted █████ would be interested in assisting with this process.</p> <p>█████ also noted that █████ had mentioned that there are OHSU policies and PSU policies that don’t need to be replicated by SPH. █████ clarified that there may be a need to create a replicated policy if OHSU/PSU’s policy isn’t equitable. █████ told █████ that we should just focus on creating brand new policies or confirming which policy SPH will choose to follow if OHSU and PSU have contradicting policies. █████ noted that whether we choose to follow an OHSU or PSU policy, the policy has to be approved by both provosts. █████ reiterated the use of the Equity Lens Tool with any policy decisions.</p> <p>█████ raised that █████ primary faculty appointment is within SPH, but administratively housed in █████ █████ noted there may need to be some clarification around which policies she and others in similar situations should adhere to. █████ noted</p>	<p>APCC Members: Notify █████ if you’re interested in assisting with next steps re: Leave of Absence and Doctoral Degree Progress Policies.</p>

	<p>this may fall more under APC as they contribute to faculty policies whereas APCC contributes to academic policies.</p> <p>█████ shared the SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) checklist that provides guidance for development and approval of SPH Policies and Procedures. █████ noted that this document will be shared once █████ has a more finalized version of it.</p>	
<p>Equity Lens Tool</p>	<p>APCC broke into 3 small groups to review the policies below using the Equity Lens Tool that APCC AY22-23 revised last spring.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 01-10-003 Advising 2. 01-30-005 Research Integrity 3. 01-20-001 Admissions Committees <p>The consensus from the small groups was that more time will be needed in future meetings for discussion and review.</p> <p>█████ noted their small group discussed whether an Admissions Committee policy was even needed. █████ shared that a few were in favor of not having it as a separate policy.</p> <p>█████ proposed splitting into small groups in future APCC meetings to read existing policies and decide which policies need to be created/revised vs. what established OHSU/PSU policies can be adopted.</p> <p>█████ shared that █████ small group discussed policy and implementation. One thing to consider is the SPH policies focus on the implementation of OHSU and PSU policies. █████ suggested having a section of policy on how we are implementing and upholding the policies. █████ noted that this would fall under the procedures and that procedures don't have to go through provost approvals. █████ shared the diagram for policy approval and noted to bring questions on this to November meeting when █████ joins. █████ said █████ understanding was that APCC would not be writing the procedures, but that AA would be responsible for writing them.</p> <p>█████ noted that usually in Governmental Policy, the policy outlines what the procedures/regulations should detail. █████ shared that having that can help prevent some confusion especially with the differing</p>	

	<p>policies between OHSU and PSU. ■ agreed and noted that this could be a level of review when revising/creating policies.</p>	
<p>CPH Exam</p>	<p>■ noted that the CPH exam is not well aligned with CEPH Curriculum needs. ■ noted the CPH Exam is not the only means to evaluate a student’s understanding/skills. ■ noted that students can take CPH Exam more than 2x, but it comes at a financial and potentially traumatic cost.</p> <p>■ noted that there are several instances where the CPH Exam is problematic. There are continuing education credits tied to the CPH Exam which is a pro for some students, but not helpful to others. The CPH Exam has some items that SPH doesn’t cover in the curriculum. ■ explained that the CPH Exam is not necessarily required for some careers. The degree is separate from licensure or certification.</p> <p>■ noted ■ is opposed to using a standard exam to evaluate the SPH Students for graduation when we no longer require a standard test to get admitted into the school. ■ shared that SPH needs to provide support to students who want to take the exam, but that it shouldn’t be a requirement. The exam doesn’t provide a true competency evaluation of the students.</p> <p>■ noted the for some students the CPH exam is the last step toward graduating. ■ would like to see the CPH Exam as an option, but not a requirement.</p> <p>■ noted that CPH Exam is integrated component into the assessment plan. If we make changes on this requirement, this impacts other components, and we would need to figure out what other assessment changes would need to be made. It feels like the requirements for the MPH is lower, so what does it say if our students are passing the MPH exam but not the CPH?</p> <p>■ noted this change would require being brought to both OHSU and PSU as well as CEPH. This is most likely a 1-2 year change process.</p> <p>■ asked what the APCC’s role in changing the CPH Exam requirement consists of. ■ noted that APCC would pose some alternative solutions. ■ noted that this would be a degree requirement change (category 2). APCC would need to draft the documents notating the proposed changes and alternative options. The PD’s will also want to discuss program changes.</p> <p>■ suggested making it just 1 systematic process. ■ noted he wouldn’t suggest putting it in the MPH Curriculum Revisioning process as the timeline for the revisioning process could take longer.</p> <p>■ noted that AA is already seeking out what can be done re: CPH Exam on the institutional level.</p>	<p>APCC Admin will add CPH Exam to November Agenda.</p>



SCHOOL OF
PUBLIC HEALTH

	<p>Once AA brings options back to APCC to consider, then APCC will vote on potential changes.</p> <p>Potentially the new Dean may have feelings about the exam, so this conversation will need to be brought forth to him.</p> <p>We will continue to discuss this topic at the November APCC Meeting.</p>	
ChatGPT	<p>This item will be moved to November Agenda.</p>	
APCC Open Discussion	<p>If you would like to join the [REDACTED] please contact [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. The next meeting is on Oct. 20th from 1-2pm.</p>	
Next Steps/Closing	<p>Next APCC: November 8th, 2023 from 10-12pm</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 12:01pm</p>	