UBGS MINUTES

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

Present: Margaret Bull, Jay Caulfield, Ed Fallone, Robert Griffin, Stephen Guastello, Kim Halula, Arthur Hefti, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Mike Johnson, Stephen Merrill, Albert Rivero, James South
Excused: Ed Inderrieden, Sarah Knox
Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Tim Melchert, Craig Pierce

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

Reports:
Report from the Graduate Dean –
Dr. Hossenlopp reported that she attended a CTSI related meeting at MCW with other area graduate deans. Possibilities for developing collaborative graduate programs are being discussed.

Report from the Graduate Assistant Dean –
Mr. Pierce shared an application report. He also announced he will chair a committee gathering various enrollment data. A report will be presented to chairs and DGS’s in early April for systematic enrollment planning and trying to get an accurate count of funded graduate students.
Regarding the exit survey, the count is not yet high enough for ensuring anonymity for respondents by program. In the meantime Mr. Pierce is advocating aggregating the data by college.
Three INPR candidates are still planning to go ahead with presentations but none have submitted proposals yet.

Report from the Committee Chair –
Dr. Griffin had sent a couple of documents via email, one regarding shared governance, and asked whether the UBGS wanted to discuss it. Opinion was expressed that anything shared outside the board should be the final product in the interest of confidentiality. Other opinion was that the UBGS should wait to see what the Academic Senate (AS) comes up with before discussing.
Lastly, Dr. Griffin said the graduate student rep has a class conflict this term and cannot attend the meetings. A student from the grad student organization has expressed an interest in serving.

Unfinished Business:
Interdisciplinary Ph.D. (INPR) – continued discussion of changes
The procedure for reviewing an INPR proposal was discussed. It is the board’s desire to streamline the process and put a procedure in writing. Typically, the proposal first comes to the graduate school. Mr. Pierce and Dr. Melchert do look at the candidate’s committee and other components of the proposal to make sure all the requirements are fulfilled. The timing issue was discussed. Three copies are needed for the subcommittee first but Mr. Pierce recommended leaving the time frame for presenting the proposal to the full board open and managed by graduate school.

The proposal will continue to be read in detail by a 3 person subcommittee and any concerns conveyed to the candidate before he/she goes before the full board. The committee and Mr. Pierce discussed the rating scale (see below) that was proposed as part of the feedback from the
subcommittee to the candidate. The role of the subcommittee, versus the dissertation committee in assessing whether the proposal required major revisions was explored. The focus should be on the criteria for the interdisciplinary program, and whether the proposal is capable of successful completion. It was noted that option 3 is a recommendation by the subcommittee, allowing the candidate to go ahead with the proposal, as is, at his/her own discretion. There was one suggestion to reword the third ranking. Most members would prefer to keep final approval of the proposal with the full board.

*Proposal: Rating procedure for INPR subcommittee reviews*

A rating sheet should be prepared by the INPR subcommittee named by UBGS for summarizing the opinion of that subcommittee as to the readiness of the INPR Proposal for review and consideration by the UBGS. The rating sheet should use the following categories:

1) **Ready in current form.** The proposal is complete and compelling in the current form. Only minor editorial changes and corrections are needed. Any changes can be supplied through an addendum to the proposal.

2) **Ready after recommended changes.** The proposal would be anticipated to be complete and compelling after revisions based on the recommendations of the subcommittee are made. A summary of the recommendations and how the revised document reflects the responses to the recommendations should be provided to the entire board.

3) **A major revision is needed before review by UBGS is recommended.** The proposal has deficiencies that will require a major revision. Any revised proposal should again be evaluated by a subcommittee to determine if the revision has overcome the serious issues raised.

Use of a cover letter to the UBGS indicating what changes were made in response to the subcommittee was recommended and there was general agreement that this would be a good idea and should be included at the top of the proposal, going into effect next academic year. It was recommended that the subcommittee will give the summary to the full board.

A motion was made and seconded to make the change as discussed to INPR guidelines. A vote was taken and passed unanimously. Dr. Melchert and Mr. Pierce will revise the guidelines to incorporate these changes. Prof. Fallone offered to help. The revised guidelines will be passed on to the Academic Senate in May.

Finally, a question was raised about GRE scores: currently the GRE is only required for candidates who have less than 3.5, but should we always require GREs? This was not decided, and the issue is still unresolved.

**New Business:**

*Preamble to graduate learning outcomes, goals and objectives, and assessment tool (exit survey)*

A copy of the latest revision of the preamble was shared ahead of time. Ultimately this will be posted on the grad school website as well as the assessment site. It was pointed out that the preamble does not exactly match the outcomes. Because departments have their own outcomes, these need to be somewhat generalized. It was recommended to incorporate the idea of graduate students being prepared to be ethical professionals engaged in the life-long process of learning and professional development. This would tie in better to the outcomes. It was agreed that, although outcomes 3 & 5 are similar, they address different
issues and need to be kept separate. Dr. Griffin will make the changes recommended by the UBGS and submit the document to Dr. Meyer.

**Attendance policy** –

This document was submitted by Dr. Gary Meyer to solicit feedback from the UBGS with the intention of submitting it to the AS as a joint recommendation.

The board members discussed at length the tone of the policy and felt that the language of the policy could be better aligned with cura personalis. In addition, the fact that graduate students are often part-time, with work responsibilities that may lead to needing to miss class, seemed to create concerns if we focus on illness, university-sanctioned activities, or religious observances. While having a policy that pertains to graduate students seemed worthwhile, the committee members felt that it could be shorter and perhaps more general for the purposes of serving graduate students.

They also pointed out that the second bullet point (the one on the top of the second page) seemed a bit problematic from a consistency point of view since attendance isn’t taken. How are excessive absences determined?

**Other** –

Mr. Pierce shared that a government change in the definition of Satisfactory Academic Progress could affect student financial aid eligibility and deferment of undergraduate loans. The issue is largely the time to degree. Marquette has the authority to set the time to degree limits, but the government will terminate eligibility for loans after that. Marquette’s current limit is 6 years for both masters and Ph.D. While it’s not so much an issue at the master’s level, it could be at the doctorate level. If a student goes past the defined limit, there is an appeal process but it is very cumbersome and on a term by term basis. Mr. Pierce asked the members if MU should consider stating a higher time to completion for doctoral degrees. (Students must be registered at least half time in order to be able to get loans.) Mr. Pierce recommends an 8 year limit for doctoral degrees. While most members are agreeable that 8 years is sufficient, such a system would not distinguish between post-baccalaureate and post-master’s doctoral students. Also the DNP may be an issue for nursing students. A suggestion was made to put deadlines on milestones to help shorten the time to completion. It was also suggested to consider putting a time limit on post DQE.

It was made clear this does not affect the student’s ability to stay in school per se, just their ability to obtain or defer federal loans. Dr. Hossenlopp asked Mr. Pierce to provide a brief summery about this for the DGS meetings next week. UBGS will continue discussion on this topic at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.