**Agenda**

**Neuroscience Program Faculty Advisory Committee Meeting**

**February 18, 2016**

**Present: Sortwell, Miller, Sisk, Symonds, Galligan, and Kneynsberg (Grad Rep)**

Meeting was called to order at 3:06 pm

The approval of minutes from the January 22nd meeting. Jim Galligan calls for approval of minutes, seconded by Peter Cobbett. Minutes are passed with no corrections.

1. **Update on Graduate Recruiting, 2016 (Attachment #1)**

* Peter Cobbett started by thanking Jim Galligan and Julie Delgado for taking the leads during recruitment weekend, in his absence.
* Peter went on to report that nine offers of admission were sent out to students, please see attachment #1 for reference to who was admitted to the program.
* We have two DO/PhD students in Ania Pathak and Matthew Rumschlang. There were no MD/PhD students admitted this year. With the curriculum change to the MD program, we need to see how the program changes affect students pursuing a MD/PhD. Part of the MD curriculum changes are no courses, just small team learning. The students will be in clinics during the 1st year. Due to these changes, it is unclear when the students would be taking NEU classes.
* Caryl inquired if any of the student would be a good fit for Grand Rapids.
  + Jamie Hentig could be a good fit in GR.
  + Erik Brink could fit anywhere
* Caryl also reminded that student should start rotations during the summer semester. Jim Galligan indicated that starting during summer semester was encouraged in their offer letter.
* Jim Galligan indicated Jamie Hentig is likely to come, along with Matthew Rumschlang and Ania Pathak. He did not get a feel for the other students if they would come.

1. **Individual Development Plans for PhD students**
   * Caryl spoke to FAC regarding the Individual PhD development plans for students in Grand Rapids. Over two years ago, the process was implemented to provide more formal and structured oversite for the students and faculty.
   * Each student has an IDP, the onboarding would start the first year with the student meeting with the mentor and a third member of IDP committee advisor. There will be three meetings, the first meeting consisting of the advisor and the student, the subsequent two meetings would be with the student, mentor and IDP committee member.
   * The role of the IDP committee member is to serve as a student advocate role. The IDP committee member does not have a stake in the dissertation process for the student.
   * Part of the IDP process will be to assist the student with research progress, what have they learned? What do they want to learn? Mapping out a research plan. This process will assist student with learning different techniques in the lab, which they may not be exposed to in their own research. We are trying to create a well-rounded graduate.
   * Some of the things they may work on are
     + Literature reviews
     + Courses
     + Working with a Professor to develop a technique
     + Professional development plans
       - Helping identify career trades
       - Workshop on campus/BEST
       - IDP exercises
       - Identifiy two-three possible interest in career tracks.
   * There is a two part initial onboarding process; ½ research and ½ onboarding. The process is two prong, part research focused and part professional development
     + It will start with creating a plan using the IDP template.
       - The plan is I want to learn XYZ and work with ABC professor
       - The process will set goals for the student to accomplish before the next IDP meeting. Since the expectations are clear and spelled out through the plan it creates clear communication.
   * After the initial onboarding meeting, a yearly meeting will take place between the student, mentor, and IDP liaison. During this meeting, progress is measured on goals accomplished and discussion is had if goals were not accomplished.
   * IDPs is completed after students join labs.
   * The second year and beyond Grand Rapids NEU student have completed an IDP
   * Jim Galligan expressed concern that students can get two different views from two different committees.
   * Caryl Sortwell indicated that the IDP process does not comment on the dissertation process or research. They are preparing the students for research broader than their thesis.
   * Andrew Kneynsberg indicated that the process is helpful to students. It is good to write things down and it is clear to everyone the expectations. The second meeting you are just checking off things that were accomplished. With the Liaison, they are independent in dissertation work. They provide good support structure and the IDP prevents a lot of problems from occurring.
   * Cheryl inquired if there is just one IDP liaison? Caryl indicated if you have a trainee, you need to be an IDP liaison on another committee. For every student you are mentoring, you will have to serve as an IDP liaison on another students committee.
2. **Annual NEU faculty evaluations**

* With the rapid expansion of the Neuroscience program. A discussion was needed how to proceed with the Annual reviews of NEU faculty. Currently, Jim Galligan conducts the annual reviews. However, he does not feel he should do this without input.
* Cheryl Sisk agreed it is a good idea and there are good models for NEU to review. However a problem delegating this task, what levels should review? And who should do the reviewing?
* Caryl Sortwell indicated that TSMM has a review committee comprised of every level of faculty (Prof to fixed term associate professor).
* Peter Cobbett expressed concern that every level will have input on faculty whom they may not know the degree or specifications of work.
* There was discussion regarding is non-tenured faculty can evaluate tenured faculty. Kevin Miller said it was ok as long as a senior person to advice committee.
* The Committee to review should be comprised of 3-5 people

1. **New Business**

There was no new business to be reported or discussed

1. **Old Business**

* Andrew Kneysnsberg passed out a handout regarding the proposed changes to research forum discussed at the January 20, 2016 FAC meeting.
* The handout spelled out changes to forum and other changes. It indicated the new forum requirements being proposed. Spelling out first year crash courses, grants, building mentorship skills, teaching – how to’s and practice talks, brain awareness week, neuroethics, preparing for comprehensive exams, finishing grad school and defending, upperclassman talks, and professional development/career planning. There is an attach log sheet to indicate the dates you attended talks, similar to the RCR series.
* Forum is viewed as an important part of training program and if incorporated into the handbook, it can make it more transparent to have students attend.
* Attendance would be taken at every forum session and passed onto Julie Delgado to track the attendance.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:14 pm

Attachment #1

Graduate Program Applicants Offered Admission, Fall 2016

Eric Brink (CNS Recruiting Fellowship)(Albion College)

Laura Cortes (CNS Recruiting Fellowship)(University of Illinois)

Sara Sam (University Distinguished Fellowship)(Virginia Tech)

Charlene Rivera-Bonet (University Enrichment Fellowship)(University of Puerto Rico)

James Hentig (AAGA, applied)(Western Michigan University)

Lace Riggs (AAGA, applied)Cal State University, San Bernadino

Eric Rumschlag (DO/PhD) University of Michigan

Ania Pathak (DO/PhD) Michigan State University

Yunpeng Pang Kalamazoo College