OHSU-PSU Academic Policy and Curricula Committee

APCC Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 8, 2023

10:00am – 12:00pm

Zoom: ███████████████████████

Attendees Present

	Voting Member Name	Attended?	Note		Student Name-	Attended?	Note
1.	███████	██		16.	███████	██	███
2.	██████	██	████	17.	███████	██	
3.	███████	██		18.	TBD		
4.	██████	██		5.			Ex-Officios / Guests
5.	████	██	███		**Ex-Officios / Guests**		
6.	████	██		19.	██████		██████████
						██	
7.	█████	██		20.	█████	██	
8.	█████	██		21.	█████	██	

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

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome	▮ introduced and welcomed two new student members, ▮ and ▮ ▮ was unable to make today's meeting. ▮ shared that ▮ is a ▮ ▮ noted that we currently do not have ▮ When ▮ emailed with ▮ noted ▮ was not intending to join APCC as ▮ tenure as ▮ is ending next month. ▮ also has a standing meeting that conflicts with APCC's meeting time. ▮ shared with ▮ that the ▮ will be getting 2 new Chairs in January and that ▮ plan was to see if at least one of them would be able to join APCC. ▮ was unsure if we should wait until January or if ▮ ▮ noted that reaching out to ▮ would be a good idea. ▮ noted that ▮ would send out a request to the PhD listserv noting the need for a ▮	▮ **will send a request to PhD listserv for a** ▮ ▮

Vote on October Minutes	▮ asked if there were any changes needing to be made to the APCC October minutes. There were none raised.	**October Minutes have been approved.**
	▮ moved to approve the October APCC Minutes. ▮ seconded. No discussion.	
	12/12- Approved	
	APCC October minutes were approved.	
Consent Agenda (No Discussion)	Reduction of competencies in IP courses ▮ ▪ BSTA 502IP ▪ CPH 502IP ▪ EPI 502IP ▪ ESHH 502IP ▪ HSMP 502IP ▪ PHE 502IP ▮ noted that consent agenda items are not discussed unless a committee member raises a concern or question. If everyone agrees to the changes, they will be passed. ▮ noted that ▮ had questions regarding the language used in the syllabi for the IP courses. Specifically,▮ mentioned the portion under "Credit Hours and Grading" that reads, "...failure after the second attempt will result in dismissal from the SPH." ▮ noted that this was already an established core course policy. ▮ also voiced concern over the language in the section under "Prerequisite Enrollment Information" and ▮ noted that the language and grammatical errors in the document can be revised, but that the consent agenda is specifically regarding the reduction of competencies in IP courses. ▮ noted that the changes proposed are only regarding the learning outcomes. ▮ noted if there are any questions re: the syllabus to reach out to ▮. In the chat, ▮ noted that ▮ and the ▮ reviewed both the PE and IP syllabi this summer. They made changes (already published for fall term), and not all needed to go through APCC - just this one. ▮ inquired if changes to course objectives need APCC approval. ▮ noted that they still need to go through the OHSU system even though they don't need to go through PSU curricular change system. Since OHSU needs to approve them, ▮ believes that APCC does as well.	**Consent Agenda items were approved.**

	There was uncertainty on whether the Consent Agenda items required a vote. ▮ noted that the Consent Agenda was voted on last year. APCC agreed to vote on the Consent Agenda. 12/12- Approved. Consent Agenda items were approved.	
Proposed Program Changes	Community Health Promotion Concentration (3 proposals), ▮▮▮▮▮ ▪ Changes to requirements to Community Health Promotion concentration (substitution PHE 369 with PHE 321U) 　○ ▮▮▮ shared that the Health Studies Community Health concentration currently includes PHE 369 (Health Policy and Law) as a requirement. ▮▮▮ noted that PHE369 was conceived as Ethics Policy and Law, but that there are already two other classes that are robust in Ethics and Law, making this class redundant. ▮▮▮▮▮ agreed that it didn't make sense to offer two classes that had similar content. They are proposing to drop PHE 369 as a requirement and instead switch it with PHE 321. ▮▮▮ noted that PHE 369 will not be completely removed from the books; there is potential to bring it back in the future. ▪ Revise PHE 321U from "Introduction to Health Policy" to "Introduction to Health Policy and Health Law"; ▮▮▮ noted that the course description is changed to recognize the addition of "Health Law", and several changes in the syllabus. This course will be taught by HSMP faculty. ▪ Revise PHE 427 from "Introduction to Health Informatics" to "Managing Information in Health Services." ▮▮▮ noted that upon review, the two 400-level classes had not changed for several years and that it wasn't serving the needs of SPH students. They decided they needed a 400-level synthesis course to better prepare graduates of the HSA concentration. The course description and syllabus will reflect the changes to the emphasized course concepts (translating informatics). ▮ moved to approve the program change for CHP and the revisions to the syllabi for 321U and PHE 427. ▮ seconded. 12/12- Approved. MPH in ESHH program - Update program requirements, ▮▮▮▮▮	**Proposed changes to the requirements to the Community Health Promotion concentration and syllabus revisions for PHE321U and PHE427 were approved.** **The proposed program changes to the requirements for MPH in ESHH program were approved.** **EPI PhD proposal will be moved to the December meeting.**

████ noted that when CEPH visited, they noted that one of the requirements to address their concerns was regarding the curriculum depth in ESHH; they were concerned that there were not enough program required courses.

- Proposal – Adding 3 existing courses to the list of program requirements for the MPH in ESHH. This would increase the number of program required credits by 10.
    - ESHH 530 (Environmental and Occupational Health Chemistry) - 4cr
    - ESHH 532 (Ecological Public Health) - 3cr
    - And one of CPH 515 (Geographical Information Systems for Public Health) -3cr **or** CPH 522 (Communicating Public Health Data) -3cr
        - ESHH does not own either of these courses; they're currently sitting within PHP. There are concerns about course size and caps. Having these classes as requirements could potentially keep a student from graduating if there wasn't enough space. Additionally, not all students want to do mapping, so the goal was to assist students with their communication competency.

████ was unsure was CPH stood for; ████████ noted that PHP and CPH stands for Community & Public Health.

████ noted that in a previous job, it was required that if a change impacted another program, that the program would need to approve of the change. ██ inquired what PHP thought about the change. ██████ noted that last year, ESHH had requested that CPH 515 was moved over to ESHH ownership. It was not moved over, but ██████ noted that historically, adding a few ESHH students has not proven to be an issue as the cohorts tend to be small. Additionally, given that it is an online, asynchronous class, ██ didn't believe it would be an excessive burden. ████ noted as the previous ████████ did not have concerns.

██ moved to approve the proposed program changes to the requirements for MPH in ESHH program. ████ seconded.

12/12 approved.

EPI PhD, ██████ - Will be moved to the December APCC meeting

- Leave of Absence requirement
- New required course CPH 622

	▉ noted they will not be discussing the changes to Epi PhD Program today as there is one more change they are going to add, so this item will be moved to the next APCC meeting.	
Standing Report from AAC	▉ shared that there are not any curricular changes currently. ▉ noted that anything that is submitted by Nov. 21st can be considered in the December APCC meeting. The deadline for any Cat 2 changes and the recommended deadline for all changes is 12/26; any items submitted by 12/26 will be considered in the January APCC meeting. The final deadline for Cat 3 changes is January 30th. ▉ inquired about utilizing the Equity Lens Tool in regard to the materials for today's meeting. ▉ noted that the tool is meant to be a self-reflective tool and that the committee members were provided access to the tool to complete on their own. ▉ does not review them. ▉ shared that she used the framework of the Equity Lens Tool while creating ▉ proposal for the ESHH program. ▉ inquired if there was to be discussion and review of the tool within the committee. ▉ shared that ▉ was under the impression the tool was meant for personal use and that faculty/staff would have this academic year to get familiar with the tool. ▉ didn't believe it was required that it would be reviewed unless the person wanted to discuss with colleagues. ▉ suggested that it should not be reviewed as some may not use the tool if they know it will be reviewed by outside parties. ▉ shared that ▉ was happy to have it be a personal tool, but that ▉ was unsure how there may be future changes made to the tool without review and discussion. ▉ suggested using the tool individually, making note of any areas that may need adjusting and bringing those ideas to the committee. ▉ suggested having time set aside in the agenda after the end of the curricular change process for the committee to have time to discuss how the tool was or wasn't used and provide feedback for data. ▉ holds open office hours usually twice a month. Please reach out to ▉ for details.	

MPH Curriculum Revisioning Sub-Committee	▮ shared that MPH Working Group had the first meeting of the term in October. The meeting consisted of providing context to new members and then breakout groups that brainstormed curriculum structures. ▮ noted that in the near future, sub-groups will be meeting once per month in addition to the monthly large group meeting so that the process can be moved along more efficiently. ▮ noted there are probably ~20+ students. Currently, the working group is short on biostat and ESHH representation. ▮ has been helping with communicating to students, which has been very helpful with getting more involvement. There has been some PhD student interest. ▮ has been reaching out to those students inquiring if they would participate in the meetings or provide their thoughts via email on what curriculum changes could look like in the future. ▮ shared that a challenge is getting students and faculty to regularly attend. There is a student newsletter being developed that will highlight this group and share information about the process so that more become aware of the initiative. If there are any students who state interest, please have them contact ▮▮▮▮▮	
Admissions Rubric	▮ noted that there was some discussion last year regarding changes to the Admissions Rubric, but that there hadn't been enough time to make changes for the last MPH admission cycle, so it is being brought forward for this year. The changes they're wanting to make are specifically for the MPH Admissions Rubric, not the PhD Admissions Rubric. The MPH Admissions Rubric is the same for all programs. ▮ noted that the MS and certificate have been using the MPH Admissions rubric as well. ▮ noted that volunteers are needed to begin this process and in thinking through the content of the rubric and the scoring. ▮ noted that Program Directors need to be largely involved in the process, but that additional representation is needed. This small group would be responsible for making suggestions and edits to the rubric over the next month. The rubric would be brought back to APCC for approval.	**APCC Members: Please email ▮ if you would like to assist with the MPH Admissions Rubric revision.**

	██████████ stated their interest in assisting with this process. ██ is wanting to have the first meeting occur this month; Afterwards most of the work could mostly be done via shared document(s) on SharePoint. Please reach out to ████ if you are interested.	
ChatGPT	████ noted that ███ had emailed ████ asking if there should be an SPH panel or discussion where faculty can talk about how they're incorporating ChatGPT in class/curriculum. The goal is not to create a policy re: the use of ChatGPT but to provide some guidance. ██ suggested asking SPH to get someone with AI/ChatGPT expertise to come speak on the topic at an All Faculty and Staff meeting. This could be a nice starting point for faculty. ████ noted that some faculty shared their current approach re: ChatGPT in the September minutes. ████ noted in the chat that ██ has discussed some pros and cons of ChatGPT with students in EpiData. For example, how it can be helpful to translate code and plot outlines but not to use it to write papers, etc. ██ shared that the use of AI is currently not allowed in ██ class. While it has been rare, some students have tried using it. ██ noted that when ██ has confronted the student(s), they have divulged that it was used due to their perception of dire circumstances in needing to get an assignment done. ████ did note that ██ is softening to the idea of using ChatGPT for writing support. ██ shared that ██ attended a seminar on generative AI use for writers. ██ biggest takeaway is that it is not acceptable for AI to create a writing piece but is it acceptable to use for spelling or grammar checks. ████ noted in the chat that ██ has also talked with folks about issues of using it to proof-read for content you want to submit to peer-review because then your content lives in public domain. ████ proposed that this could potentially be a great IPE course for teaching the appropriate use and application of generative AI. ██ noted ██ would like to participate in the discussion, but that the term "panel" caused additional anxiety. Potential substitutes: forum, discussion, exploration committee, etc. ██ suggested asking OAI to come to the discussion.	████ **will notify** ████ **of the interest for the ChatGPT/AI discussion.**

	███ noted in the chat that it would be helpful to discuss how ChatGPT would be appropriate and help learning, and situations that are not. The functions of generative AI are evolving as well. ███ shared that if students have a clear sense of what is ethical/non-ethical use of generative AI, students will largely abide by those guidelines.	
Policy Overview	███ noted that last year, the Faculty Council spent a lot of time discussing policies and procedures. Though they did not get as far along as they hoped, ███ has created a guidance document based on those discussions. ███ presented the document that ██ created that provides guidance for development and approval of SPH policies and procedures. This document reviews what happens *after* APCC approves a policy. The PowerPoint can be found in the ████████████████████████████████████ The procedures are in place to operationalize the policy. They would be developed by staff (not APCC) to be consistent with the policy, but they won't require the full range of approval. ███ noted that there will be a cover letter needed with policy submissions in the form of a one-page SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation). ██ suggested completing this form while creating the policy because it will assist with creating the policy. ██ noted that the Equity Lens Tool should also be used in the development of policies. Draft policies can be submitted to the Dean's Office: ████████████████ A package of materials must accompany the draft proposal, including an SBAR, relevant OHSU and PSU policies, notes or meeting minutes regarding development of the draft policy, equity tool analysis, etc. Policies fall into 2 distinct categories: Administrative and Non-Administrative. The bulk of all SPH policies fall into the non-administrative category. These include policies relating to academic, student affairs, faculty affairs, and research areas. Non-administrative policies follow a process managed by the Dean's office that involves community input, Provost approval, and faculty approval. The PowerPoint includes a matrix showing the policy approval process. ███ inquired about who would be considered stakeholders. ██ noted that ██ isn't certain on who would be considered stakeholders. ███ shared that when it got to the point where the provost approves the policy, there will no longer be any edits made to the policy. This would move the feedback portion earlier in the process.	**APCC: If you have any questions or input on the guide, please reach out to** ████████

	▮ inquired about conflicting policies between SPH and OHSU/PSU and the potential need for SPH to go to PSU or OHSU to add a clause or an amendment that notes the differentiation. ▮ confirmed that this would be the case; doing so would be called a "carve out" for the SPH, but the reality of getting the committee on academic policies at OHSU to review and change the policy is a multi-year process. ▮ envisions getting the two Provosts to sign off on our policy and then CAP would work to reconcile and build it into the OHSU policy. There is most likely going to be a time in which the policies are not in sync with one another. ▮ noted that ▮ will also be presenting this guide to the APC. ▮ asked if the ▮▮▮ had a list of policies that they wanted APCC to be working on. ▮ noted that the beginnings of a list exists that ▮ suggested the committees consider. ▮ did not assign any policies to specific committees, but it is broken out by academic affairs, faculty affairs, student affairs and research. ▮ asked if students are allowed to submit policy. ▮ noted that it is not explicitly stated in the guide whether they can or not, but most likely it any policy submissions would be coming from a standing committee. SLC cannot submit a policy as they're not an official committee of the school. If you have any questions or have any input, please reach out to ▮	
Open Discussion	▮▮▮ submitted a proposal for funding from PSU for ways to increase departmental revenue. They proposed some work to generate a 4+1 MPH program and a 2+2+1 Community College to PSU to MPH program. There will be a communication on it coming out soon, but please use the link below to vote! Link: ▮▮▮	
Next Steps/Closing	**Next APCC: December 13ᵗʰ, 2023 from 10-12pm** Meeting adjourned at 12:04pm	