

## Academic Planning Council Minutes

A regular meeting of the Academic Planning Council was held on February 17, 2006 at Park Library, Strosacker Room. The Provost was present. A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

**Present:** Baugh, Dailey, Eke, Hageman, Howell, Lary, Kohrman, Krider (for Martin), Moore, Newby, Orf, Rawls, Riordan, Shapiro, Storch, Vetter // **Absent:** Adams, Christie, Jones, Roscoe // **Guest:** Gail Scukanec, Brad Fahlman, Alan Jackson, Gary Dunbar, Michael Sandstrom

### *New Business*

**I. Minutes:** Hageman moved to approve the January 20, 2006 minutes; Lary seconded. Carried.

### **II. New Program and New Initiative Proposals:**

**A. Science of Advanced Materials (SAM), Ph.D.** – Full proposal presented by Alan Jackson and Brad Fahlman. This initiative started three to four years ago.

Issues from APC members (that should be addressed in full proposal):

1. Integration/synthesis of learning across disciplines is difficult in interdisciplinary programs. How will you achieve it?
2. Current performance and engagement of faculty who will be associated with program.
3. Proposal is relying heavily on CMU 2010 funds. What happens if you do not receive this funding?
4. Elaborate on the state and federal funding anticipated and the claim that there is always a lot of support for research like this.
5. Document need for five new faculty given size of the program.
6. Working on drafts of bylaws to reduce teaching loads and focus on research and writing proposals. Share interdisciplinary council bylaws and highlight such changes in bylaws of participating departments.
7. What is impact on other programs in the department? What is relationship to other programs in state? Are there opportunities to collaborate with other institutions as suggested in the HLC report?
8. Dow is moving much R&D and university collaboration overseas. What is your relationship with Dow? How will this affect the program? What is the nature of other corporate relations for this program?

Voting on this will be open until 5:00 p.m., February 24, 2006. Completed ballots and questionnaires to be sent to Devine.

**Voting Results:** 9 total votes out of a possible 17 votes  
8 Approve to proceed to Senate  
0 Revise and resubmit a full proposal which responds to concerns of APC and provost  
1 Do not approve to proceed to Senate

### **B. Ph.D. in Neuroscience, M.S. in Neuroscience and Neuroscience Minor**

- Shapiro moved to table or postpone due to time constraints in reviewing materials; Orf seconded.
  - Last meeting discussed when doctoral programs are to come to council.
  - Timing is due to the extent that the SAM & Ph.D. in Neuroscience proposals to be submitted to UBAC together. Cannot be funded internally within department, needs to be funded by university.
- Voting options: Option 1: Stop now, discuss at next meeting – 2 Yes / 9 No  
Option 2: Hear and vote next week – 9 Yes / 2 No  
Option 3: Hear and ballot today – 0 Yes / 0 No

Concept proposals presented by Gary Dunbar and Michael Sandstrom. These programs interrelate to each other. Need strong doctoral program for undergraduates – for role models and to assist in lab. Need doctoral

and masters programs for undergrads and for faculty to remain competitive. Have first rate facilities. Very popular program - students come to CMU to be part of program.

Issues from APC members (that should be addressed in full proposal):

1. Do participating departments support this program?
2. What will GA' role be in teaching? Which courses will they teach?
3. What is the size of the market for this program?
4. How will faculty grant writing support graduate stipends?
5. Is there a market for this program beyond CMU students?
6. There is heavy reliance on external grants. What if this is not available in sufficient quantity?
7. The library budget seems too low. Library is willing to work with proposers to develop more realistic library needs.

Voting on this will be open until 5:00 p.m. February 24, 2006. Completed ballots to be sent to Devine.

#### **Voting Results**

**(Ph.D.)** 9 total votes out of a possible 17 votes

8 Endorse program concept and encourage development of full proposal for review by Graduate Council and then by APC

0 Postpone decision on program concept and encourage revision of concept proposal for review by APC

1 Reject program concept

**(M.S.)** 8 total votes out of a possible 17 votes

7 Endorse program concept and encourage development of full proposal

0 Postpone decision on program concept and encourage revision of concept proposal

1 Reject program concept and discourage development of full proposal

**(Minor)** 8 total votes out of a possible 17 votes

8 Endorse program concept and encourage development of full proposal

0 Postpone decision on program concept and encourage revision of concept proposal

0 Reject program concept and discourage development of full proposal

#### **III. Specialized Accreditation:**

- A. School of Music – recommend approval to proceed with specialized accreditation

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.