

UBGS MINUTES

To: UBGS Members
From: William Wiener, Ph.D.
Date: 10-04-07
Re: Marquette University Board of Graduate Studies
Approved Minutes of the **October 4, 2007** UBGS Meeting

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

Excused: Ed Inderrieden

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Kristina Ropella (BIEN), Dean Jeutter (BIEN), Jay Goldberg (HCTM)

The committee was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

Reports:

Report from Graduate Dean

When a motion to approve an Electronic Thesis and Dissertation (ETD) procedure with Proquest was presented to the Academic Senate last academic year, there was quite a bit of discussion, mostly about concerns of interference with publication. Dr. Wiener contacted Proquest and received assurances for all concerns which he then resubmitted to the Academic Senate at its last meeting this semester. The ETD was then voted on and passed. However, a number of faculty from the Humanities had voted against the motion due to concerns about future publishing of dissertations by university presses. Wanting to be sensitive to the needs of the Humanities, Dr. Wiener has made arrangements to have a Proquest representative meet with the humanities faculty to answer questions and address any further concerns. A trial ETD website has been set up for experimentation and to fine tune the process. It won't be live until next semester.

Dr. Wiener has spoken with Provost Wake and it was agreed the Yardley Report will be discussed with the Academic Senate in an Executive Session at its next meeting. Today's discussion of the report by the UBGS will be summarized and presented to the Academic Senate by Dr. Griffin.

Report from Committee Chair

Dr. Griffin reported that the UBGS executive committee officers (Inderrieden, Griffin, Caulfield) had met with Dr. Wake to express the feelings of the UBGS regarding the Yardley Report per discussion at last month's meeting. She was agreeable that Part 2 of the report would be made available to the UBGS executive committee once the report has been vetted. In addition relevant information from the report regarding any program changes that would normally come before the board would be with the UBGS. It was not clear from the meeting whether the segment of Part 2 from the Yardley Report for a specific program would be shared or a summary of that data. Dr. Wiener volunteered to get further clarification of this issue.

Report from the Assistant Graduate Dean

Mr. Pierce announced that a proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. (INPR) is being distributed to the members today with plans to present it at the November meeting.

It was also announced that the graduate school would like to make a submitted form, as well as a written letter of recommendation required for all programs in the application process. While both the form and letter would be required of the applicant, departments have the option of not using the form. There were no questions regarding this change.

Unfinished Business:

PhD Credit Requirements

A spreadsheet was given to all members showing a comparison of credit requirements of peer institutions in doctoral programs from data that was collected over the past year by a subcommittee. The data is clear that Marquette University is on the high side in credit requirements, a conclusion that has been

reinforced by external program reviewers. As a result of this information, a proposal has been written to change the bulletin wording on credit requirements. A document of the proposed wording was shared with board members, read, and discussed (attached).

Dr. Wiener reported that in discussions with the subcommittee it was discovered that different levels of credit requirements are desired by different programs and that a minimum was therefore proposed. There was some question from the UBGs on the small number of proposed requirements for the Physical and Natural Sciences. Dr. Noel explained that the credits in Biological Sciences is very laboratory intensive with a lot of research involved and thus has fewer academic courses. Dr. Harris explained that Biomedical Engineering also includes research and proposal writing and thus needs fewer academic courses. Based upon the current proposal, individual departments would still decide what number of credits their students need as long as they do not go below the minimum. A motion was made to accept this proposal. There was more discussion. This proposal has not yet been shared with the departments although the subcommittee was made of faculty from various departments. This topic was also discussed at the DGS meeting where it was generally agreed that a change needs to be made. There was still some concern about what the departments will think of this proposal. It was recommended to share the proposal with the DGS's, have them confer with their departments, and then give their concurrence. It can then be resubmitted to UBGs. A motion was made to table this until a paragraph describing this proposal can be shared with the DGS's, voted on, and passed.

BIEN Credit Reduction Proposal

Drs. Ropella, Jeutter, and Goldberg from the Biomedical Engineering department joined the meeting and described their proposal to reduce the number of credits for their doctoral program from 72 credits to 57. Dr. Jeutter discussed the main points of the proposal and the rationale for it. Dr. Ropella added that one of the main reasons was to target top students who are going to competitors with lower course requirements (and with lower tuition rates). Also, with the current requirements, GAANN students, who are fully funded for three years are barely into the research lab at the end of three years because of the heavy course load. A question was asked if the students would be competent researchers with a reduced load. Dr. Ropella answered that this change will help to make them become even more competent because they will have increased research experience. It was asked why the dissertation hours were left the same; it was felt there was no need to change, the dissertation seemed to be doable in the hours that are already required and the fact is, that many MU students actually spend more time than that on their own anyway. Raising the dissertation credits required would create a financial issue for students who are already dedicating time above the required credits. This proposal will be voted on after the next agenda item, also from Biomedical Engineering.

New Business:

Master of Engineering in Biomedical Engineering

Dr. Goldberg presented the proposal for a non-thesis Masters of Engineering which had previously been sent to all members. The department's industrial advisory board has indicated that there would be a lot of interest in this program. Students coming into the program will need to have one year of industry experience. There will be no funding such as assistantships, and students will not be drained from the current thesis based program.

It was asked: why not just use Plan B non-thesis option? The faculty would like to differentiate between those who have done a thesis and those have not by the degree. This will make the degree more competitive and attract part-time students who are employed.

In response to a question, it was discussed that if a master's student in this program wanted to continue with a Ph.D. that would be possible, and depending on their background, they may need to only take some supplemental classes before beginning the Ph.D.

It was asked if there was a projection of the expected number of students. Dr. Jeutter shared a budget detail that showed the projected growth in student population and tuition. It was asked if the number of students would be limited. The department would prefer not to put a limit on students accepted and hire an adjunct as needed.

It was asked if the bachelor of engineering is a thing of the past: Students reported that this was a disadvantage when applying for jobs so it was changed to a bachelors of science. However at the Master's level, the degree seems to be cutting edge.

The guests were dismissed and discussion continued. It was agreed that the proposal was well justified.

A vote was taken on the first proposal for a reduction in credit hours in the Biomedical Engineering doctoral program. The vote was unanimously in favor. The proposal passes.

There was some brief discussion of the ME in Biomedical Engineering and it was agreed that the outcomes and projections were well done. Dr. Harris confirmed that by his own investigation, the projections seem very attainable. The course offerings are already in place, and it will be advantageous to have students in industry. This program will make Marquette more competitive with MSOE. It is a plus that there will be no expenses incurred, making this a low risk endeavor. A vote was taken to accept this proposal and passed unanimously.

Program Review Subcommittee

The current process for program reviews was discussed. This process has been questioned in light of the fact that the new program review process no longer involves the UBGS and thus goes counter to the concept of shared governance. To rectify this problem and involve the UBGS without overburdening the board, the idea of a subcommittee to take part in the program reviews was conceived. This would be comprised of 3 members of the UBGS and 3 members of the UBUS with alternating ex-officios of Peggy Bloom and Bill Wiener. This subcommittee would examine the reviewer's report and the department's report. A member could not serve on the subcommittee when his/her own program is being reviewed.

The value of this additional step for a subcommittee was questioned. Members of the UBGS felt that in the past there had been no follow through on reviewer recommendations and it is hoped that this step would give additional data and input, and a sense of accountability. Another value would be that the positive comments of the outside reviewers would be shared with more people. There is still concern however, that even with this added step, changes suggested by reviewers won't be implemented. On the plus side, the UBGS would be aware that an action plan has been submitted, a report of the data would be shared with the UBGS, and then another report of the outcome after the action plan is presented to the provost would be made available to the UBGS and UBUS.

Dr. Caulfield expressed concern because the subcommittee would be made of tenure track faculty and the College of Professional Studies doesn't have any. Thus the college would not be adequately represented. Dr. Wiener recommended that the description of the subcommittee should be left as is with the ability to make exceptions in such cases.

There was a question of reviews in relation to accreditations for some departments. A process has been put in place to have the program review occur in the months before an accreditation to catch any needed improvements before the accreditation.

There was some concern that due to a lack of university funds, a subcommittee won't have any impact on assuring that needed changes in departments will take place. Another viewpoint was that a subcommittee would add additional voices to encourage such action.

Dr. Rivero was concerned that the extra step of the subcommittee's review of departmental external reviews would delay the process of bringing those reviews to their completion. Dr. Wiener does not expect the subcommittee's examination of the review to cause any delays.

Dr. Griffin then asked the board to vote on the formation of a subcommittee for department reviews. The vote was, none in favor and six votes against. In further discussion, Dr. Taft shared that it would be advantageous from an Academic Senate point of view, to have the additional input of a review subcommittee, and that this would add to the accountability factor. Dr. Taft made a motion for a vote to reconsider and it was seconded. There was more discussion.

Dr. Noel asked for an amendment to state: The subcommittee and the full board will be informed of whether any action was taken on the recommendations of the reviewers and the action plan. This amendment was seconded and a vote was taken. Votes: 1 against, 11 in favor to accept this amendment. There was some more brief discussion. Another motion was made to vote again on the amended proposal for a subcommittee and seconded. A final vote was taken and the amended plan for a joint subcommittee passed with one against.

It was decided that the subcommittee members would be voted on electronically.

INPR Subcommittee:

It was agreed that the volunteers to serve on the INPR subcommittee for a proposal to come before the UBGS at the next meeting would be solicited electronically.

Yardley Report Discussion:

Dr. Wiener asked the members to share points regarding the Yardley Report (Part1) that they would like to be discussed with the Academic Senate. Various members made the following statements:

- ♣ Recommendations seem resource intensive and would be expensive to implement. Teaching loads are too heavy. How well positioned is the university to proceed?
- ♣ The Yardley Report was a waste of money in some ways but also useful. It confirmed that Marquette has a problem in articulating its position and who we should compare ourselves to. Budgetary practices are a mess and encourage predatory behavior. The move to focus on undergraduate education is a reflection of this and is evidenced by over duplication in undergrad programs. Arguments against this have been ignored but have been confirmed by Yardley.
- ♣ Yardley seems to be approaching Marquette's issues with a narrow mindset. The report doesn't seem to affirm that scholars can shape fields by their research. Yardley also did a poor job of research in comparing some departments (Pol Sci for instance) with peer institutions. There were inaccuracies in data and which was flawed by the presence of statistical outliers. The Yardley reviewers also seem to have an overall narrow mind set of understanding doctoral research. Their opinions should be taken with caution.
- ♣ Yardley captured that research strength is key to having strong research programs. The internal grants program has strengths to it and it is disagreed that most money should go to interdisciplinary research within Marquette. It is also disagreed that granting agencies prefer interdisciplinary research.
- ♣ It strongly believed that interdisciplinary research needs to extend beyond the campus to other institutions. Survival into the future depends on the research capabilities of the university. Yardley statements were found to be helpful and challenging to the College of Engineering (Biomed Eng).
- ♣ There is a disconnect between senior administration and faculty. In terms of collaborative processes, faculty would not like to see the lone researcher disregarded. Collaborative research does not work for every discipline.
- ♣ The Yardley report noted that diversity doesn't seem to be on the radar screen. The UBGS discussed the comment with various members of the board explaining how diversity issues have been addressed by their individual departments. Board members noted that the summary report did not disclose the data used by the researchers to support their conclusions. However, Board members agreed that diversity issues likely receive different levels of priority and attention from faculty and departments at Marquette University. That Marquette has low numbers of minority students may be true in select departments but is not true across the board. Diversity as a part of important goals didn't seem to come up in meetings with Yardley.
- ♣ It is agreed that the lack of health insurance and stipend levels are indeed huge issues for students and do influence students decisions not to apply to Marquette University.
- ♣ It seems that the research that went into the department specific reports was shoddy, although the conclusions were somewhat accurate. While some things were not easy to read, it was important to hear.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.