

University Graduate Council Minutes

Monday, March 18, 2013

3:15

114 Sherrick Hall

- 3:20 Begin
- CH: Bill Ruff
- February minutes approved
- No comments from campus
- PhD in Materials Science Program
 - John Neumeier and Rob Walker
 - Background
 - Desire for MT Tech to get PhD program
 - Reluctance from MUS system to do it
 - MSU got pulled in
 - Regents asked for collaboration from campuses in proposal
 - Proposal
 - John:
 - A lot of interest to have this program on campus
 - One negative is available resources? Particularly without harming other programs
 - Strength of collaborators varies
 - Few from UM
 - Few from Tech with research background (shift from teaching classes to research focus)
 - MSU may bare the brunt of resources
 - Rob:
 - VPR @ Tech pulled this together
 - Agree with John's comments
 - Integral in curriculum development
 - Questions?
 - Rob Mokwa: APW Group review
 - Concerns are resource based
 - Cost of proposal
 - 3 Campus approach:
 - Can provide many assets to those involved
 - Also lead to complexities, difficulties, and expense of program
 - MSU has capability of doing this and is doing it without the degree title
 - Nick Ward comments:
 - Feels this is being thrust upon MSU
 - Can MSU do a Materials Eng PhD by itself?
 - Table 1 shows the need is for Mat Eng not Mat Sciences
 - Answer: Multidisciplinary program; titled sciences because we didn't want UM granting engineering degree
 - Alan Dyer

- What is the need that this program is trying to fulfill?
- Can we not do something as an affiliate?
 - Rob Walker:
 - Tech was going to do this but science curriculum was coming from MSU
 - This program is looking to capture students who might otherwise go to U of Co etc
 - Provides us with leverage and to be competitive if this goes through to apply for opportunities (research) Expanding GR opp.
- If Tech participates, UM awards degree
- Research Resources?
 - MT has metallurgy/extraction metallurgy
 - UM has pharmacy and life sciences
 - MSU has the engineering
- Christopher Livingston
 - What is the MSU asset? Vs. umbrella?
 - MSU has been pulled in and either must play along or pull out and lost face. Possible for this to be EPSCOR program (umbrella)
 - Asset= 5 yr program to strengthen GR programs
 - How does this relate to publications and currency of research?
 - Students will be directed to one campus or the other based on focus/research interests
- How does this work in the background? Transcript and tuition payments? Faculty workload, etc
 - Core Curriculum=1 year this includes 3 foundational per semester, 1 @ each campus
 - Online courses used heavily during first year
 - Year 2= research focus ID and electives are being taken at their home campus
 - Qualifying exams for admittance to ensure playing field is level
- What is in place to prevent student from doing coursework and research at one institution and then earning degree from the third? No
- No attention paid to FA needs, Residency etc since credits from U of M and MSU cannot be totaled to meet these requirements.
- Ruff:
 - Consideration of a pilot program?
 - Rob-problem is there are too (6-8) few students to create cohort and community needed
 - Pilot still requires offering courses and offering this for 6-8 vs. 10-12 is not worth the effort and money
- An example to look at is the MBS program. They choose chemistry, physics, biology, etc.
- Can it exist w/o MSU?
 - It would still demand resources from the state.

- We have a lot of expertise here.
 - Students out there who would be interested in this program and we could easily mentor these students and have more graduate students here doing practical things in line with our land grant mission.
- Q: Aren't there enough options from surrounding states?
 - A: yes, but the expertise is at MSU
- Q: Do there support form the state tax payers/community
 - A: In Butte-Yes
 - Could be good for Bozeman i.e. look @ optics businesses (26 total). Additional grant opportunities
- Concern will \$ for this take \$ away from another?
 - 3 faculty positions: 1 per year, should cover teaching requirements
 - Pg 21: MT Tech fundraising campaign (\$2.5m), they apparently have \$3m in hand per the Provost at Tech
 - Faculty in Engineering: many willing to work in program until faculty positions for program hired.
- Offer of support from UGC?
 - Jean: Who says the train is leaving the station- Faculty APWG
 - Q: What is the outcome if MSU does not participate?
 - A: It would die. Students at Tech and UM would be worse off. MSU Faculty would miss out on improving existing GR programs by being able to bring in students with different background, skills.
 - Q. Who is addressing resource issue?
 - Potvin is pushing Tech to produce budget which started/finalized in Feb 2013
 - Goal perhaps is for BOR to understand the costs of a program like this:
 - Faculty work load
 - Infrastructure
 - Credit for degree
 - Voicing support and recommendation:
 - *Ward*: Loves idea of program but not how it is being presented. Vote: No
 - Benefits to other side-bad precedent
 - *MSU Faculty (10)*: do support this if "it is done right". Discussion on how this will work
 - Is this "collaboration" attractive to a student?
 - That is a recruiting issue-we offer personal mentoring in smaller labs i.e. more resources and attention per student. Size has appeal to particular students. Most student will likely end up at MSU because of faculty and resources available here.
 - Program will be reviewed per milestones & metrics
 - Yearly meeting sharing results, discuss collaboration

- *Alan D:* Supportive-but concerned planning is headed for faculty workload, admin flow. It is underestimating workload and finances needed.
 - Hope program will over time become an equal partnership.
 - Opportunity for positive competitiveness between campuses.
- *Chris L:* Like the idea conceptually
 - Home base at MSU and then move on to MT Tech or UM based on research.
 - Planning and how students will go through program is not thought out
 - No clear understanding of MT Tech and U of M plan for \$ and research improvements
 - Risk is high of it failing w/o pilot program, no projection from institutions.
 - Would like to see document from all institutions stating what they think is going to happen.
- *Bill Ruff:* In favor but do have concerns for \$
 - Benefits are grants, patents, and PhD grads
 - Low risk to MSU students
 - Would like to see this program to be a bellwether for other interagency collaborations. Expand review process: What worked well with interagency collaborations and what did not?
- *Anne Ch:* Supports it due to faculty support. (Conditional Yes)
 - Need support for faculty and students in addition to good guidance for students especially Tech students who may not fully understand research components.
 - Common comp exam
 - Common admission standards
- *Ives email:* In favor of proposal
- *Jean:* Conditional yes-resources must be forthcoming of faculty
 - Look for models of how to do this administratively to prevent reinventing the wheel
 - Not concerned with distance teaching because we have grown our NURS program by going online
- *What will be the GS contributions*
 - MUS Health Insurance
- MS of ARCH: Steve Jurosek
 - New Requirement minimum # of credits for March degree (UG and GR level)
 - Want to add to UG to hit 126 UG and 42 GR=168 total
 - Presentation of proposal-handout
 - Changes will take place Fall 2014 alight with next catalog
 - Accrediting agency is asking for this requirement (NAAB)
 - Vote-Approved
 - Does this match up with UG review? Let Steve know if he needs to do anything?
- Tabled policy review
- Adjoined at 5:00 pm

Summary PhD in Materials Science Program

Pros

- Program captures students who might otherwise go to U of Co, etc
- Provide us with leverage, infrastructure to be more competitive for opportunities (research, grants).
- For faculty: Great opportunity for increasing collaboration and working with others across the state
- A lot of interest on campus
- Benefits are grants, patents, and PhD grads
- Low risk to MSU students
- Students out there who would be interested in this program and we could easily mentor these students and have more graduate students here doing practical things in line with our land grant mission.

Cons

- Availability of resources?
- Logistics in working out the program between three institutions
 - Not most cost effective model
 - Financial Aid/health insurance needs for student
- Concern MSU would shoulder “lion’s share”

Important Considerations:

- Need support for faculty and students in addition to good guidance for students especially Tech students who may not fully understand research components.
 - Common comp exam
 - Common admission standards
- Strength of collaborators varies
 - Few from UM
 - Few from Tech with research background (shift from teaching classes to research focus)
 - MSU may bear the brunt of resources