UBGS MINUTES

To: UBGS Members
From: Jeanne Hossenlopp
Date: 2-3-11
Re: University Board of Graduate Studies
Approved Minutes of the February 3, 2011 UBGS Meeting

Excused: Margaret Bull, Kanoe Fish, James South, Craig Pierce
Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Erin Fox, Tim Melchert

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and the agenda was approved.

Reports:

Report from the Graduate Dean –
Dr. Hossenlopp confirmed that the UBGS meetings are open to faculty and administrators per the statutes. However, any INPR presentations will be held in a closed executive session. It was asked if students would be permitted to attend. The statutes do not address this but Dr. Hossenlopp proposed that if there was a particular agenda topic that may be of interest to students, the members may want to consider inviting them to attend sometime.

Report from the Graduate Assistant Dean –
Ms. Fox reported on behalf of Mr. Pierce who was absent today. She provided the members with a handout showing INPR proposals in the works and the status they are at. Ms. Fox also reported the results of the UPASS survey and explained that the UPASS will not be made available to graduate students, in part due to a low response rate to the survey and of those who did respond, the people in favor were only 14% of grad students. If the UPASS was made available to grad students all students in the selected category would have to pay the fee for it, whether they used it or not.

Report from the Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Programs –
Dr. Melchert presented an opportunity for a fellowship workshop for students with a purpose to increase the number of students receiving fellowships and scholarships. Additionally, a series of web pages to assist students in applying for fellowships have been designed. The first workshop will be held next week, Wednesday, February 9th, from 12:00 – 1:00 p.m., in AMU 163 for the Fulbright Scholarship. Dr. Melchert urged members to encourage students to attend.

Report from the Committee Chair –
Dr. Griffin read portions of a memo from Dr. Chris Krueger, Academic Senate Chair, regarding the privacy (or lack of it) of UAS business and emails. Dr. Krueger is soliciting advice on policy regarding this issue. Dr. Griffin will send the entire document to the UBGS for feedback and will put it on the next agenda if the members would like to discuss this.

New Business:

Next Chair of the Board –
Dr. Merrill, who is next in line to chair the UBGS, will be on sabbatical next year. Dr. Griffin asked the members for suggestions for appointing an interim chair. After brief discussion, Dr. Griffin offered to continue in the chair position for the next year and everyone agreed with this solution.

Discussion of possible changes or improvement to Interdisciplinary Ph.D. (INPR) program processes (see http://www.marquette.edu/grad/programs_interdis.shtml for current guidelines). Suggestions include:

- One page report from the dissertation review subcommittee that could be supplied to UBGS.
- Need for a checklist.
- Possibility of having a list of faculty who meet the qualifications to serve as dissertation director or committee member.

In discussing these suggestions members agreed that it would be helpful to Cc the full board on the subcommittee report that is sent to the candidate and chair, rather than writing a separate report for the members. The members would also find it helpful if the candidate, in consultation with the dissertation committee was asked to address questions and potentially make revisions recommended by the UBGS subcommittee when presenting the proposal to the full board. It was also recommended that the candidate should wait to supply the full board with copies of the proposal after any revisions are made following the subcommittee’s recommendations. It was noted that this may change the overall timeline.

It was discussed that the purpose of the subcommittee is for the proposal to be reviewed by three members whose expertise most closely matches the proposed course of study for any recommendations before going to the full board. It was also discussed whether the subcommittee has the authority to tell the candidate he/she is not ready to go before the full board with their proposal, but the advice of the subcommittee is a recommendation that the candidate can choose to accept or not. Members would like to have the duties and responsibilities of the 3 person subcommittee written.

A suggestion was made to add rating categories to the subcommittee report to indicate if the proposal is:

- Ready in current form
- Ready after recommended changes
- Major revisions are needed – no date can be set for presentation.

Dr. Merrill offered to draft and define these categories. Members agreed that a proposal could be presented to the full board if there were only minor changes (with those changes pointed out). However, if major revisions are necessary, the proposal should be reprinted before copies are given to the full board and the proposal is presented. This process is likely to take approximately 6 weeks.

The creation of a checklist for INPR proposals was suggested to serve the purpose of achieving some consistency among the proposals submitted. A template for proposals was also suggested.

The topic of having a list of faculty who meet the qualifications to serve as dissertation director or committee member was discussed. It was asked if it could be the responsibility of the department to assemble a list of their faculty meeting the qualifications. Another member felt that since the guidelines for dissertation committee members were recently updated, this may eliminate the need for discussing this at this time. The UBGS could wait to see if the updated guidelines have solved the problem.

After some discussion, members would like to see the process for INPR proposals include:

- Proposals should be submitted 2 months ahead of projected presentation date.
- The subcommittee recommendation will be submitted to the candidate and the full board.
- The rating category will be included in the recommendation, indicating the readiness of the proposal for presentation.
- Include indication that dissertation committee members meet qualifications.
- The proposal, with recommended changes made, if any, should be submitted to the full board 2 weeks prior to the presentation date.
Dr. Griffin asked the members for their opinion on the presentation of INPR proposals to UBGS ad hoc committees over the summer. It is preferred not to set a precedent to increase this occurrence. The graduate school will send the text from the INPR guidelines that mentions summer presentations around to the members for their consideration for a change in wording.

The meeting adjourned at 3:24pm