

OHSU-PSU Academic Policy and Curricula Committee

APCC Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, December 13, 2023

10:00am – 12:00pm

Zoom: [REDACTED]

Attendees Present

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

9.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	22.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
10.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	23.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
11.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	24.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
12.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	25.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
13.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	26.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
14.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	27.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
15.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	28.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
16.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	29.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
				30.	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome	[REDACTED] welcomed [REDACTED]	
Vote on November Minutes	APCC Voting members did not request any discussion regarding the minutes. [REDACTED] motioned to approve the November 2023 Minutes. [REDACTED] seconded. 10- Yes; 3- Abstentions; 0- Disapprovals	APCC November Minutes were approved.
Proposed Program Changes	<u>UNI New Course – [REDACTED]</u> [REDACTED] submitted a curricular change request to add a new UNI course for Fall 2024. It is an introductory course on the complex topics related to data equity. Currently, this course already exists as a BSTA 504 course within SPH, but [REDACTED] is proposing to make it a permanent course with a UNI designation instead of a SPH Biostats designation and have the course count as an IPE course for SPH students. [REDACTED] noted that having it designated as a UNI course would allow the HIP students to participate.	Proposed UNI course was approved.

	<p>This request will only go through OHSU for approval, not PSU Grad Council because it's a UNI course and PSU grad students outside of SPH wouldn't be allowed to register.</p> <p>█ motioned to approve the proposed UNI course. █ seconded.</p> <p>13- Yes; 3- Abstentions; 0- Disapprovals</p>	
<p>Standing Report from AAC</p>	<p>MPH in ESHH program revision update: It has completely passed through the PSU part of the approval process and now going through the OHSU approval process.</p> <p>There are 3 UG level changes, 1 program level and 2 course changes that are still pending. The UG Curriculum Committee at PSU have not met yet.</p> <p>The reduction of competency proposals are waiting on the OHSU side. They do not require PSU approval.</p> <p>There are a minimum of 9 proposals that will be ready for review in the APCC January meeting.</p> <p>The next deadline for submission is 12/26.</p> <p>Open Office Hours (no appt needed, just drop in!!) █</p> <p>█</p> <p>█</p>	
<p>CPH Exam</p>	<p>█ have developed an alternative method for evaluating students instead of using the CPH exam. The idea was presented to the OHSU provost office because it turns out that almost all of what we are trying to accomplish with the CPH exam is related to a requirement at OHSU. Their office provided some feedback specifically asking for a proposed replacement to the exam, not just an alternative. The working group is working on this and will be sending the proposal back for them to review again. █ believes APCC will be able to vote on the proposal in the January meeting.</p> <p>Proposal: Using the combined products of the practice experience in the integrative project (oral presentation, IP paper and PE portfolio). There will be 6 criteria that the students need to demonstrate within those items to essentially pass. These six criteria include:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How racial equity and historical context applies to a student selected public health issue -Application of theory to support a public health program, policy or research study -Description of implications of a public health program, policy, or issue -Clear communication to other public health professionals -Demonstration of at least 5 CEPH foundational competencies -Demonstration of 4 program competencies <p>Students would self-evaluate and then a PE/IP coordinator would evaluate as well.</p> <p>█████ shared the student perspective on this proposed replacement. Currently, the CPH exam is impacting the students' mental and emotional well-being from taking it and/or failing the exam. It is also affecting graduation rates. There is data noting that many of the students affected by this exam fall into the 30-30-30 criteria for OHSU especially the race and ethnicity which is impacting our 30-30-30 goal for graduation rates among this population of students. █████ added that students pay a fee to enroll in the program that covers the CPH exam, so this replacement would also eliminate a student fee.</p> <p>This replacement would start with next year's incoming class and be used across all MPH programs. The working group is going to petition the registrars office to let current students who have not passed the CPH exam use the replacement evaluation.</p> <p>█████ noted that if there are any students who do want to take the CPH exam, that they are able to take it.</p> <p>█████ will be working with program directors over the next year to assist with revamping the assessment process.</p>	
<p>MPH Curriculum Revisioning Sub-Committee</p>	<p>The MPH Working Group switched the meeting schedule and format. The small groups now meet separately once per month and then bring back their ideas to discuss in the large group meeting for everyone to ask questions and provide feedback.</p> <p>There have been some resources created to help any newcomers understand the process and the goals of the group.</p> <p>█████ still needs to get in touch with alumni and will be reaching out to █████ for assistance.</p>	

<p>Generative AI Update</p>	<p>██████████ are planning to have an open forum after MLK Day. They are getting in touch with PSU's AI task force to see if they will give a presentation/provide general information about AI.</p> <p>██████████ confirmed that our student reps are welcome to attend/participate in the forum.</p> <p>██████████ will provide more updates in January.</p>	
<p>Policy Process Follow Up</p>	<p>APCC broke out into small groups to discuss the document shared in the November meeting on guidance for policies and procedures.</p> <p>██████████ noted that any feedback given may not make it into the document before the new dean arrives, but it may be helpful to have APCC's feedback in writing.</p> <p>██████████ shared ██████████ concerns regarding the lack of student input for submitting policies and who is all included in providing feedback. ██████████ requested that the small groups provide their own feedback on those concerns and any others they may have directly to the document.</p> <p>██████████ shared that ██████████ would like for the process to be easier for faculty, students and staff to submit their suggestions and not requiring a huge packet for submission.</p> <p>██████████ shared that ██████████ small group discussed student involvement in the process. It would be great to have students involved in the proposal development stage and be voting members. To help make sure students have an opportunity to propose a policy, the small group discussed having students bring their policy to SLC and then having SLC submit the proposal.</p> <p>There was discussion regarding the policy proposal process in general in terms of what pathway an individual's proposal would go through (submitting directly to the dean or going through a committee and then having the committee submit the proposal).</p> <p>APCC members also noted the lack of clear examples and general confusion regarding the process.</p> <p>██ will be putting the comments into a document for the committee to review and discuss in January.</p>	<p>██████████ will create a feedback document for review in the January meeting.</p>
<p>Open Discussion</p>	<p>██████████ shared that the PE/IP Coordinator Sub-Committee has been discussing the pass/no pass for PE. ██████████ inquired where this mandate came from and if it is changeable.</p>	<p>The PE grading practice will be added to the January agenda.</p>

	<p>█ noted the inequity with the current structure as it is recommended that students do it over 2 terms. For the first term, they receive a pass/no pass and for the 2nd term, they receive a letter grade. However, if the student takes it in one term, the four credits are graded.</p> <p>█ noted that the PE is for demonstrating competencies, so a letter grade doesn't make much sense. A student is either demonstrating them or they're not.</p> <p>The root of the issue is that PE is a core and required course. All required/core courses require a B- or higher.</p> <p>█ noted that it is a practice, not a policy. In order to change it, there are multiple details to iron out.</p> <p>█ will continue to review and this item will be added as a January discussion item.</p>	
<p>Next Steps/Closing</p>	<p>Next APCC: January 10th, 2024 from 10-12pm</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 12pm</p>	