University Board of Graduate Studies Minutes
of the 3/6/14 meeting

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Kevin Gibson, Craig Pierce, Maggie Cinto (PFF)
Excused: Heather Hathaway

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

Reports:
Graduate Dean –
An update report on the strategic plan is currently being written and should be made public soon. Discussion continues with respect to tuition credit allocation differences among units. NSF R&D expenditures have been submitted with a record high which should bode well for MU in the Carnegie rankings.

Graduate Associate Dean – no report

Graduate Assistant Dean–
With no university commencement ceremony this December, a committee is being assembled for the planning of a hooding ceremony for doctoral students. Mr. Pierce asked for a UBGS representative and Dr. O’Brien volunteered.

UBGS Chair –
Dr. Johnson reported that the issue of revisions to the UBGS membership requirements are still on hold with the Academic Senate.

Business:

Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) – proposed changes –
Dr. Gibson explained the reasoning behind some needed changes which were outlined on a handout sent ahead of the meeting. Ms. Cinto, the PFF Coordinator, said that while the majority of participating students are from theology and philosophy, lately students from other disciplines have joined. A presentation of PFF is offered at orientation, but not all students are able to attend, and some contact Ms. Cinto at a later date to find out more about the program. Ms. Cinto is currently collecting data on where PFF students are employed after graduation.

One change to is to offer 3 tracks (as shown on the chart) to accommodate different career paths, keeping one for the preparation of faculty.

It was clarified that the program is also open to Master’s students. A suggestion was made to add a workshop on conflict resolution.
INPR – proposed changes –

Dr. Gibson presented some recommended improvements to the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. process as outlined in the attachments sent to members. The intention is to reduce a duplication of effort between the UBGS and INPR committee, and to allow for more flexibility.

Typically, a proposal is written, a committee assembled, and courses selected. It was pointed out that some faculty are not willing to chair a student’s committee without having them in a class first. Is there some flexibility to accommodate this? Dr. Gibson said this would be something to consider. Tightening up faculty commitment is recommended as a good idea.

It was recommended to include guidelines on what to look for in a research document. It was also advised that the candidate needs to clarify the disciplines and where the intersection of these disciplines are. Also, make it clear that these areas will be revisited and revised as it moves along.

Another change is that there would be no face to face with the UBGS. It was recommended to move up the UBGS approval of the committee, and agreed that it would not be a burden to the UBGS to evaluate the selected INPR committee. What would the UBGS role be in the case of a split committee? It would have to come back to the UBGS as the department, as with any other PhD.

It was also recommended to clarify the assessment points, and update the guidelines on committee selection.

Dr. Gibson will update the document based on today’s recommendations with the goal of the UBGS being able to review the revised guidelines this term. Dr. Hossenlopp reminded members that this is considered a program modification and must follow procedure.

Faculty Forum (March 27th)-

Dr. Johnson explained the goals of the faculty forum based on the themes. The forum will begin with a brainstorming session to seed ideas in the specified categories. From there, proposal ideas will be developed. Dr. Hossenlopp will be able to use this as a tool towards research initiatives. It may be advantageous to have ideas already in place for the future. Dr. Johnson asked people to send any other ideas for the forum to him soon. An invitation will go out after spring break. Members were informed that OMC is invited to attend and listen.

Grad Student Forum –

Dr. Johnson reported that a forum is also being planned for grad students. Representatives of the UBGS and COR will be invited to participate and listen.

IDP (Individual Development Plan) -

Dr. Gibson explained that any student receiving funding by the NIH is strongly encouraged to complete an IDP. The agency would like to see a mentor relationship between researchers and grad students. The document presented today is a template to be used as a starting place.

Dr. Bradley shared that he has developed an ILP (individual learning plan) with his students that has worked very well for identifying goals and weaknesses. He meets with the students every 6 months to review.
Dr. Hossenlopp added that the NIH recommendations are really requirements and are seen as a way to make sure students are getting mentoring that will help them think about their long term career plans. While this is required for students receiving NIH money, Dr. Hossenlopp is recommending that this be used for all students.

It was discussed that a student’s advisor, does not always serve as a mentor, and that a mentor is likely someone the student has a much closer relationship with, often by participating in faculty research.

Dr. Saunders added that his department uses a similar tool, putting the onus on the student to track their progress and career plan which he reviews annually.

Dr. Rowe also uses a tool for the purpose of students tracking their progress, and being aware of timelines.

Since there has been discussion on campus lately regarding where Ph.D. grads are going, this document would be useful in helping students with planning their careers. It was suggested to define sections to be used by advisor versus mentor.

*Marquette Doctoral Regalia* -

MU Ph.D. students and alums have recently pointed out that MU does not have branded institutional regalia. Graduates who go on to careers (typically academia) in which they will participate in occasions that require them to wear regalia have requested that MU create a branded robe. MU appears to be one of the few institutions that does not have a branded robe.

It was discussed that some schools give an option to wear a standard gown at no cost, or, if students wish, to purchase a branded gown. Members agreed that we should move forward with investigating this possibility.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40pm.