# Graduate Council Meeting Minutes

CHAIRED BY: David Kieda TIME: 3:00pm

DATE: February 23, 2015 PLACE: 300 Park

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Connie Bullis, Tim Garrett, Chuck Hansen, Susan Johnston, Laura Kessler, Robert Mayer, Valeria Molinero, Ginny Pepper, Sean Redmond, Ryan Smith, Vanessa Stevens

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Yuanyuan Xie

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Ed Barbanell, David Kieda, Abigail Ririe, Donna White

EXCUSED MEMBERS: Krishnan Anand, Robert Baldwin, Tim Formosa, Nyce Keiyoro, Mary Jane Taylor, Bryan Trump, Elham Yazdani

FINAL AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dean Kieda welcomed the Graduate Council to the fifth meeting of the 2014-15 academic year.

**2. Proposal: Honors/Law 3+3 Combined Program**

Leslie Francis from the College of Law presented a proposal for a new combined Law and Honors program.

Vote: Amendments requested

Abstained:

Comments: Programs where law schools partner with undergraduate programs are growing throughout the country. Guidelines for accreditation have been followed by the College of Law. There are no requirement changes for an Honors BA or for a Law degree. The only change is that the first year of Law classes would count as elective hours for the BA. There is no penalty for choosing not to complete the program. The program offers the potential for more streamlined advising, and peer group enrichment.

 The Bachelor’s degree is awarded first. This needs to be clarified in the proposal.

 The program is being piloted with Honors students. There is potential in the future to allow more students to choose this path. Many Law classes and hours make sense as allied hours.

 Chuck Hansen questioned whether this program conflicts with Graduate School policy. The programs require a minimum number of credits for a Graduate Degree. As long as this number of credits is reached, classes can be waived. The courses are not listed on both programs of study. The proposal needs to clarify how hours are counted and to be sure credits are not double-counted for the undergraduate and graduate degree. When these amendments are made, the Council will review the proposal again.

**3. Proposal: Center for Engineering Innovation** (previously approved Provisionally)

Florian Solzbacher, Director of the Center for Engineering Innovation, presented.

Vote: Amendments and clarification requested.

Abstained:

Comments: This center was designed to close the gap between the research done at the university and in industry. Concepts initiated at the university are rendered into useful processes for industry. This offers the opportunity for new revenue streams, and it gives engineering students real world projects.

 There are various avenues of funding. Presently, the center serves more as a private sector contractor. The center is also tied into the USTAR mission. As it grows, they are hoping to grow a base for industry buy in and endowments, NSF, NIA funding programs (grants). The Dean of the College of Engineering at the moment holds the reins on this center. Funding is also provided from SVPAA and VPR Tom Parks.

 Pricing structure for contracts is determined similarly to re-charge centers.

 Students are already working in the center. Right now faculty have a research appointment and work in the center. In the future the center may offer continuing education and training programs. They are considering offering professional development in the future. This is not necessarily student curriculum.

 The proposal needs to clarify the role of students, faculty, and academics in the center. Also, include further illumination on potential professional development or curriculum. Is there a governance structure? A board of directors?

 The proposal is a bit premature. Curricular endeavors, governance, and financing need to be clarified further in the proposal, and cleared up in the documentation.

 There is a further concern that faculty do not have any say in the center. Some form of users group needs to be established for faculty feedback. The Council also needs further letters of support.

**4. Proposal: Population Health, PhD**

Lauren Kirwan and Tom Greene, Interim Chair of Department of Population Health Science from the School of Medicine presented a proposal for a new degree in Population Health.

Vote: Approved unanimously

Abstained: None

Comments: This degree is the academic component of the new department. The goal is to train professionals to conduct research in population health science. This proposal is pending on a vote of faculty from the College of Health/Medicine. Students that do not have a master’s degree upon entry will be required to take a year of classes from the MSTAT program.

 Recruitment projections: The department is hoping for a fair number of in state recruitments as no other PhD in biostatistics exists in the state. They will also be seeking applicants nationally.

 There are two emphases: biostatistics and health systems research.

 The result of the vote of College of Health faculty should be added to the proposal before it goes to the Senate.

 The department is hoping to begin offering classes for this degree in fall of 2016.

**5. Program Review: Nutrition**

Connie Bullis from the Graduate Council presented the program review for the Department of Nutrition.

Vote: Approved unanimously

Abstained: None

Comments: Edit: Faculty “Division consists of” will have the second, repeating part omitted.

 Addition: Under diversity: “Four full-time tenure track”.

 Edit: The division of a high first-time pass rate for graduates.

 Recommendation 5: The department has created a new advising center. The recommendation should include continuing to pursue issues in the strategic plan, and the chair and dean’s responses to internal and external reviews. (Too broad? State the issues in respect to?)

 Clarification: Clarify proximity of advisors, lack of privacy between advisor and advisee.

**6. CIB (Center Institute and Bureau)**

 Brenda Bowen presented the Global Change and Sustainability Center’s annual review, and discussed the review process. In general the review was not overly burdensome, and she offered a few suggestions for clarifying exactly what the Council needs to see on a review. Questions should not ask for several separate items at once. Perhaps the review form could be broken down into sections more. Once the Council discusses exactly what needs to be present on the annual review form, Abi Ririe will put the form into an online template for directors to fill out.

Time of Adjournment 5:28pm.

The next Council meeting will be held 30 March 2015 at 3:00pm in the USTAR building SMBB 3250, Executive Board Room.