

**Graduate Program Review Committee
of the Graduate Council
MH 395
9:00 – 10:30 am
May 12, 2011**

AGENDA

- I. Welcome and call to order
- II. Review of minutes from April 22nd meeting
- III. Review of Doctor of Medical Dentistry Degree Proposal
- IV. Adjournment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS (2010-11)

Ahmad Elshennawy (CECS)
Karen Aroian (CON)
Michael Caputo (CBA)
Debopam Chakrabarti (COM)
H.G. Parsa (RCHM)
Harry Weger (COS)
Patrick LiKamWa (COP)
Paul Dombrowski (CAH, Chair of Committee)
Richard Gause (Libraries)
Mary Little (CED)
Patricia Bishop (Ex Officio, College of Graduate Studies)
Max Poole (Liaison from College of Graduate Studies)

**Analysis Summary for New Degree Authorization
Doctor of Medical Dentistry**

	Criteria	Proposal Response to Criteria
1.	The goals of the program are aligned with the university's mission and relate to specific institutional strengths.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____
2.	If there have been program reviews or accreditation activities in the discipline or related disciplines pertinent to the proposed program, the proposal provides evidence that progress has been made in implementing the recommendations from those reviews.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____
3.	The proposal describes an appropriate and sequenced course of study. Admissions and graduation criteria are clearly specified and appropriate. The course of study and credit hours required may be satisfied within a reasonable time to degree. In cases in which accreditation is available for existing bachelor's or master's level programs, evidence is provided that the programs are accredited or a rationale is provided as to the lack of accreditation.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____
4.	Evidence is provided that a critical mass of faculty members is available to initiate the program based on estimated enrollments, and that, if appropriate, there is a commitment to hire additional faculty members in later years, based on estimated enrollments. For doctoral programs, evidence is provided that the faculty members in aggregate have the necessary experience and research activity to sustain a doctoral program.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____
5.	Evidence is provided that the necessary library volumes and serials; classroom, teaching laboratory, research laboratory, office, and any other type of physical space; equipment; appropriate fellowships, scholarships, and graduate assistantships; and appropriate clinical and internship sites are sufficient to initiate the program.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____

	Criteria	Proposal Response to Criteria
6.	Evidence is provided that there is a need for more people to be educated in this program at this level. For all degree programs, if the program duplicates other degree programs in Florida, a convincing rationale for doing so is provided. The proposal contains realistic estimates of headcount and FTE students who will major in the proposed program and indicates steps to be taken to achieve a diverse student body.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____
7.	The proposal provides a complete and realistic budget for the program, which reflects the text of the proposal, is comparable to the budgets of similar programs, and provides evidence that, in the event that resources within the institution are redirected to support the new program, such a redirection will not have a negative impact on undergraduate education. The proposal demonstrates a judicious use of resources and provides a convincing argument that the output of the program justifies the investment.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____
8.	The proposal provides evidence that the academic unit(s) associated with this new degree have been productive in teaching, research, and service.	Met with Strength ____ Met ____ Met with Weakness ____ Unmet ____