Graduate Council
Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2017
220 Van Wormer Hall

Attendees: Daniel Ashwood, Kathy Ballman, Fred Beyette, Fran Meyer, Steven Cahn, Ron DeBry, Gary Dick, Dan Gottlieb, Jiukuan Hao, ChengCheng Li, Tasos Ioannides, James Mack, Ralph Katerberg, Arnie Miller, Chip Montrose, Tanja Nusser, Angela Potochnik, Missi Stec, Rebecca Williamson, Jun Ying

Absent: Jeff Timberlake

Staff: Lori Griffin

Agenda Items	Synopsis of Discussion	Outcome
Meeting Minutes	The Council reviewed and unanimously approved the minutes from the February 2017 meeting. On future meeting minutes, personal identifiers will be removed from discussions.	Approved
MS in Cosmetic Science	• Presented by Kavssery Anath, and Karen Henry - College of Pharmacy. • The proposed MS in Cosmetic Science is a track within the existing MS in Pharmaceutical Science. The College of Pharmacy seeks to make Cosmetic Science its own MS degree. The cosmetic track of the degree has been in existence since 1972. • This new degree will be of particular interest to current professionals. • The culminating experience will be a capstone geared toward bringing out new science or new interpretation of the science. • P&G and other cosmetic and chemical companies will be very interested in graduates of the program. • Interest in the program continues to gain popularity even before any formal marketing has begun. The program currently has over 100 students. • Vote to APPROVE was unanimous.	Discussion and Motion
MS in Pharmacy Leadership	• Presented by Pam Heaton and Karen Henry – College of Pharmacy. • The proposed MS in Pharmacy Leadership is a track within the existing MS in Pharmaceutical Science. The College of Pharmacy seeks to make Pharmacy Leadership its own MS degree.	Discussion and Motion

	• The goal of this new program is to fill the leadership gap that currently exists in Pharmacy. The program will be marketed to current pharmacists that want to move into an administrative role.
	• The program director, Jenelle Sobotka, is a national pharmacy leader, and with her leadership it is anticipated that the program will be very popular.
	• This program is highly unique to UC. There is no other program in the United States.
	
	• The following items were noted by Graduate Council:
	
	   1. Admissions requirements need to be consistent. Will program require pharmacists with old bachelor's degrees take the GRE? Must be clear on the number of years of pharmacy experience. Will need to decide when setting up if the need is for flexibility. Council recommends a rubric, which will make decisions quantifiable and defensible.
	   2. Within the curriculum it was noted that two cores classes are from the Lindner College of Business. Signatures from collaborating colleges are needed.
	   3. The proposal does not address diversity in its courses. Patricia will take the information back to Jenelle so that it can be made clear in the proposal.
	   4. Proposal needs to add collaborative approach in defining the courses for economics courses.
	   5. The program should add policy and finance component as electives.
	• Vote to APPROVE was unanimous, with the changes above needed before the proposal goes to the State.	

PhD in Informatics	• Presented by Hazem Said from CECH. • The summary of the program indicated that there will be coordinated effort among the schools within CECH in addition to departments across campus. • Their goal is to model the programs after Indiana University Bloomington, whose program is very successful. • Prospective enrollment is currently from IT. Specifically, MSIT enrollment and computing programs. • The proposers believe strongly in the name and domain and hope to develop further what the interdisciplinary courses will look like between the PDP and Full proposal. They have already talked to 7- 8 programs, and between now and full proposal they plan to go back to the programs to gain support. • Comments/concerns on the proposal from Graduate Council: 1. The proposed name does not fit the curriculum, and a name with Information Technology (IT) would be more appropriate. The use of the word *informatics* implies that there is significant overlap or the potential for	Discussion and Motion

	collaboration with other programs, which is not demonstrated in the proposal.	
	2. COM (Biomedical Informatics) noted its familiarity with the IU program. So far what is described is not the IU model, but an IT model. If they want to model IU, they need a very different foundation and quite a few more defined options for students. IU has more than 100 faculty, so mimicking this program is a very lofty goal.	
	3. More (and clear) definition is needed on collaboration with other UC colleges. Likewise needs faculty input as well as an interdisciplinary curriculum.	
	4. What about research? How will it be conducted? It is not addressed in the proposal.	
	5. The PDP does not include coursework or any info on curriculum. What is the curriculum? What are the students going to learn, and how does that overlap with say, computer science and engineering?	
	• Council moved to REJECT the program. All voted to reject except for one vote to approve.	
	• Council will recommend that the proposal be restarted. The program (faculty, courses and content) is still preliminary and it is necessary to establish an Informatics (or information technology) program based on the strengths of multiple colleges, rather than attempting to grow such necessary interactions at a later date. Likewise, there is need for conversations among stakeholders in this area of broad interest in order for this to really move forward.	
Advanced Standing	• Proposal for advanced standing presented by Janet Graden from CECH (attached). • The question of how to apply advanced standing is not just a CECH issue. There are core issues and needs conversation and clear policy that includes setting precedents and accommodating program variability. • Discussion ensued about whether the standard for approval of advanced standing should be at the university or college level. How do we maintain consistency within the colleges? • There is a potential problem if each college has different standards, especially as the university creates more and more interdisciplinary programs. • Advanced standing topic will require continued discussion. • No vote was taken on CECH's proposal, and it will be a topic of upcoming meetings.	Discussion
Next Meeting	April 25, 2017	Information