

# UCF Graduate Council

[Home](#) > [Program Review](#) > [Minutes](#)

## PROGRAM REVIEW AND AWARDS COMMITTEE MINUTES

### Minutes of January 28, 2011 meeting

#### Members Present

Karen Aroian, Patricia Bishop, Michael Caputo, Debopam Chakrabarti, Paul Dombrowski, Ahmad Elshennawy, Rich Gause, Patrick LiKamWa, Mary Little, Max Poole, Harry Weger

#### Recorder

Rhonda Nelson

**Members not present:** H. G. Parsa

**Welcome and call to order:** Dr. Paul Dombrowski called the meeting to order and a quorum was established.

Minutes from the December 10 meeting were approved by the committee.

**Consideration of the M.S. in Research Administration proposal:** Drs. Mary Ann Feldheim and Jo Ann Smith presented the M.S. in Research Administration proposal to the committee. They talked about the key requirements, indicated that a white paper was written in the fall of 2009, they met with regional campuses on the funding model, and in the fall of 2010 hired Jo Ann Smith. This is a completely online program done in the lockstep format. They reported that they have just received AAHRPP accreditation. The program will be an enhanced tuition model through Continuing Education. Discussion was held on the funding model. The committee was concerned about faculty overload. The group discussed the faculty and their credentials and how they would be sustained. Dr. Feldheim talked about the 2 levels of overload faculty and their stipends. She shared that the outside faculty would be judged by the advisory board. The committee advised that criteria should be established for this. Discussion was held regarding the budget. It was suggested that travel to conferences and marketing should be noted in the budget. Dr. Feldheim shared that they plan to have excess funds to hire another faculty administrator. Discussion was held on the tuition charges. The committee asked that they clearly specify in the budget the charges for the student. A question was raised on whether the program could be successful if only 20 students were enrolled instead of 30. Dr. Feldheim shared that they have several options in working this out and did not see a problem. A question was raised on how to judge the quality of the program. Dr. Feldheim indicated that they would partner with ENCORE to really get it into a professional standard. The committee suggested that this information be added to the proposal. A comment was to also beef up the research and technology in their literature. It was suggested that the program might consider requiring the PPI for their entrance admission. This is a new instrument from ETS on Ethics that costs the student \$10 to take and receive a score. Discussion then followed on what happened when students had to drop a course since this was a lockstep program. There was also some discussion on why the GRE was not being used. They also discussed how they would evaluate their students on online courses.

After listening to the presentation and asking questions, the committee then analyzed the proposal against the eight criteria set out by the Board of Governors of the State University System. Each criterion was discussed amongst the committee and then voted on with a measure of *met with strength*, *met*, *met with weakness*, or *unmet*. The committee suggested that additional information be added to the following areas: the compelling need area, faculty hires and faculty lines, peer institutions if available, and more evidence in the productivity area.

Overall, the committee felt that the proposal was strong and unanimously voted that the proposal move forward with recommended revisions.

Time did not permit the review of the graduate faculty from the Studio Art and the Computer program. The committee will review this at a future meeting.

**Action items and adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.