

## UBGS MINUTES

**To:** UBGS Members  
**From:** William Wiener, Ph.D.  
**Date:** 09-06-07  
**Re:** Marquette University Board of Graduate Studies  
Approved Minutes of the **September 6, 2007** UBGS Meeting

---

*Present:* Margaret Bull, Dale Noel, Rich Friman, Robert Griffin, Colin Hahn, Kim Halula, Gerald Harris, Ed Inderrieden, John Karkheck, Tim Melchert, Craig Pierce, Albert Rivero, Thomas Taft, Phoebe Williams, Bill Wiener

*Excused:* Jay Caulfield

*Also Present:* Melody Baker (note taker), Ellen Rudy (NURS), Judy Miller (NURS)

The committee was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and the agenda was approved. New members, Dale Noel, Thomas Taft, and Phoebe Williams were introduced.

### **Reports:**

*Report from the Graduate Dean:* The appointment of executive officers was discussed. It was decided that the officer appointments would be for three years so the appointments from last year will continue with Dr. Inderrieden as chair, Dr. Griffin as vice-chair, and Dr. Caulfield as secretary.

Resignation of the Provost – Dr. Wiener mentioned this week's announcement of the provost's resignation and stated that the model of administration will continue with Vice President and Provost. An interim provost will serve beginning in January while a search is being conducted.

*Report from the Chair:* Last spring it was agreed that the officers would speak to the provost regarding the Yardley Report and how much of the report the board would be allowed to see. At that time, the report had not been received yet and Dr. Inderrieden expects to meet with the provost again regarding this issue. Part 1 of the report will be shared with the board later in today's meeting. It was asked if the board would be expected to respond to the report. It is unclear at this time, although the board generally feels they should be able to give an opinion. Dr. Wiener explained that it may be necessary to keep the second part confidential, because it is personal to specific programs. There was discussion among the board members regarding having access to the complete Yardley Report and strong opinions in favor of the board having access, especially if a response is expected from the board.

Concerns were raised regarding any possibility of closing a program as a result of the Yardley Report. Dr. Wiener stated if the administration and Dean desires to close a program, all information (including Yardley) used to reach that decision, will definitely be brought to the UBGS. Dr. Wiener also stated that before any program is closed, the decision would come before the UBGS, as well as the Academic Senate.

Dr. Inderrieden asked the members how important they felt it was to see the full Yardley Report and if the entire board or a delegation should see it. Dr. Wiener stated that the deans and chairs of PhD programs have seen their department's reports. The chairs will be sharing their department report with their faculty also. It was decided that Dr. Inderrieden and the executive committee of the UBGS will go ahead and meet with the provost to discuss whether all UBGS members should see the second part of the Yardley Report. In the meantime, it was agreed that the provost should be scheduled to appear at the October meeting if possible. Dr. Inderrieden pointed out that none of the members of the executive committee are from PhD granting colleges and questioned whether it would be better for UBGS representatives from PhD granting colleges to view part 2, if that is allowed. Dr. Taft suggested that perhaps someone could summarize part 2, removing any identification to departments.

In the end, it was agreed that: the provost would be scheduled for the October meeting, the board would read part 1 in the meantime, Dr. Inderrieden and the executive committee will meet with the provost to express the board's interest in seeing the entire report, and the next step will depend on the outcome of that meeting. A motion was made and seconded to proceed as such.

*Report from Graduate Assistant Dean:* Mr. Pierce reported on the status of the INPR program, the number of prospects, and the number of students currently in the program and what stage they are at.

#### **Unfinished Business:**

*Status of Electronic Thesis and Dissertations:* Since the UBGS approved to go ahead with this new process last spring, Dr. Wiener has presented it to the Academic Senate. There were some issues and questions raised and since then he has obtained some data on peer institutions that are using this process, as well as additional information from Proquest to satisfy some of the Senate's concerns. He will be presenting this new information to the Academic Senate at the next meeting and asking for approval again.

*Academic Honesty Policy:* UBGS work on this policy began about 2 years ago. So many modifications were made that it became confusing next to the undergrad policy. Last year, it was decided that the existing undergraduate university policy would be used, with modifications made only where necessary for graduate students. The members were given copies of these revisions and Dr. Wiener explained the changes and reasoning for them. Research misconduct was one of the significant differences that would impact a graduate student vs. an undergrad. Dr. Wiener pointed out that some cases could fall under the Academic Honesty Policy, while others may fall under the Research Misconduct Policy. The undergrad board will review the policy with these revisions to see if an agreement can be reached on one unified policy. If not, the graduate policy will be posted separately.

*Accelerated Degree Programs Update:* Dr. Wiener notified the members that there will be more discussions regarding these during this academic year, with the hopes of the UBGS developing a policy.

*Continuous Enrollment and Graduation:* There is an issue with some students completing their requirements but missing the graduation application deadline. Dr. Wiener would like the UBGs to develop a policy to not require students to be continuously enrolled if they have completed all their requirements and are just waiting to graduate. Dr. Wiener made a motion to this effect. This was seconded. There was some brief discussion and a vote was taken to remove CE for students who have completed all requirements but did not meet the deadline. The motion passed unanimously in favor.

**New Business:**

*Joint subcommittee on Program Review* - Dr. Wiener proposed the establishment of a joint subcommittee for program reviews, consisting of members of the Graduate and Undergraduate Boards of Studies. All university programs are reviewed by external reviewers at regular scheduled intervals. After the graduate school dean receives the reviewers' report, the report goes to the program, which produces a written response, to include clarification of misinterpretations and corrections. These two documents are issued to the provost who, along with the Vice Provosts, Dean, and the Chair uses them to formulate guidelines for production of an action plan by the department. Prior to this last step, Dr. Wiener would like to see some input from this joint subcommittee of the UBGs/UBUS to serve as a third datum in this process. The input would be based on the reviewer's report, the departmental report, and the department self-study. The entire review process takes about a year. The discussion was suspended at this point, so that there would be time to review the Nursing DNP proposal. Discussion is to be resumed at the next meeting. Dr. Wiener will bring to that meeting a document identifying the roles and responsibilities of the subcommittee.

*Nursing DNP Proposal:* Dr. Judy Miller, the Director of Graduate Studies for the College of Nursing, and Dr. Ellen Rudy, the interim dean for the College of Nursing, joined the meeting.

Dr. Miller shared a PowerPoint presentation of the proposal for the Doctorate of Nursing Practice. The college believes that this degree will contribute towards a better prepared workforce and gave statements and examples to support this. The requirements and prerequisites for this program were presented also. Dr. Miller further explained why this program was necessary to be competitive. It is the college's hope to begin this program in the fall 2008.

Dr. Miller then took questions from the board:

- If the current MSN program continues after the DNP begins, will there be any decreasing of credit requirements of this program?
  - Not at this time, although it has been under consideration if they will continue the MSN program, or eventually phase it out. Dr. Rudy said it would be best to wait and see how the successful the DNP is before closing the MSN.
- Looking at the financials, is the number of MSN students expected to stay the same, while new additional students in the DNP add to the revenue?
  - It's possible the revenue will be a little lower than projected due to the fact that some of the people who would have gone into the MSN are the people who will chose the DNP

when it is offered. Dr. Miller went over the figures on her proposal and said that the current financials are the figures that went through the budget office. Dr. Rudy explained that the revenue figures are also due to more credits per student, not more students.

- Any concern about the recent direct entry discussions by the Wisconsin Nurses Association?
  - No, direct entry programs will not impact the DNP.
- How many part time faculty will be required for the DNP?
  - A few more, depending upon enrollments, and due to the addition of the clinical course. Also, some additional full time faculty will be necessary for other added courses.
- How will the capstone project with 40 students work?
  - The student's learning environment will be in a clinical setting, with the clinicians in that setting, a bit different than other capstone projects.
- Will the students be self funded?
  - There will most likely be a combination. Some employers provide tuition reimbursement.
- With emphasis on evidence based research and models will there be an element of this in the capstone projects?
  - Yes, the students will have exposure to this. The expectation is that the evidence will be tried in practical ways.
- How do the number of required credits in this proposal compare to other institutions?
  - Dr. Miller explained that there are a variety of approaches and that MU was trying to establish a program that would not be an unnecessarily long process but would get people educated well and into the workplace in a reasonable time. Dr. Rudy stated that it is unlikely to find people willing to take more credits at the cost of MU tuition.
- Is a capstone present in all projects?
  - Yes, a capstone is present in all projects.
- Is it correct that in order to stay competitive with other universities, it is necessary to go ahead with this program?
  - Yes.
- Is your current program accredited? And will the DNP be accredited?
  - Yes and yes, by the same agency. The College of Nursing is up for an accreditation review in the spring of 2009. Of course we will not have had a DNP graduating class yet by that time, but no other schools will have had one either because this is so new. However, because the program is expected to be accredited the essential recommendations have been closely followed.
- Do the majority of DNP programs require more credits?
  - Yes, but MU is still within all guidelines and recommendations.
- Will fewer credits make you more competitive?
  - It depends on a tuition comparison.
- Will the accrediting agency give a pre-approval before spring of 2009?
  - We are not sure. No school has yet been accredited for DNP as of now.

Drs. Rudy and Miller were dismissed. A motion was made and seconded to approve the DNP program. There was some discussion regarding the financial projections and lack of clarity. A concern was raised that this program is being proposed at a time when the Yardley Report is critical of MU's research practices. Dr. Bull reminded the board that the DNP is a professional degree not a research degree. She also explained that "evidence based" means looking at patient outcomes. It was recommended that the program may need to be updated in the future when comparisons can be made with other institutions. It was also mentioned that as a new program it will be up for review after the first three years.

A vote was called taken to approve the program and passed unanimously with the recommendation to make comparisons to other programs in the future and make updates as necessary.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20pm.

Items not completed that will move to the October agenda:  
Establish subcommittee for program reviews (3 UBGS people)  
Doctoral Credit Policy  
Graduate Standing Criteria  
Discussion of part 1 of the Yardley Report