University Board of Graduate Studies Minutes
of the 3/7/13 meeting


Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Craig Pierce


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

Reports:
Graduate Dean –
Earlier today, Dr. Hossenlopp gave a presentation at the all-university advancement meeting on research and graduate education and will continue to follow-up with them on these topics.

Dr. Hossenlopp also discussed the PowerPoint emailed to all members, Graduate School Enrollment, Recent Trends and Potential Future Strategies. Enrollment trends and how they affect budgets was explained, along with how future enrollment is predicted, and how projections are different between undergrad and graduate. This information was also presented to the DGS’s this week for the purpose of tracking progress and brainstorming new ideas on enrollment strategies.

Graduate Assistant Dean –
Mr. Pierce thanked the members for helping to set enrollment goals and also reminded them that the graduate school has money available for recruiting.

UBGS Chair – no report

Business:
INPR subcommittee for new proposal –
Dr. Johnson read the abstract to members and asked for volunteers to serve on a subcommittee for a new INPR proposal. The review would be scheduled for the May meeting. Dan Rowe, Kim Halula, and Jay Caulfield volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

ADP (Accelerated Degree) policy revision –
Mr. Pierce explained the updates to the policy, beginning with some background information, and comparing the current policy with the proposed, newly revised policy. Approval of the updates is needed by the UBGS, UBUS, and Academic Planning Team (APT). He explained that because an ADP policy appears on the provost’s website, this would need approval by the APT, and would be added on to their posted policy as “section 6B” (programs that are not newly created).

It was discussed that as long as a policy is in place, it is not necessary for the UBGS to approve every ADP, though the revision does not specifically state this.
There was also some discussion about grades for transfer credits and what is acceptable, as well as some discussion about the number of credits that can be double counted.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision, a vote taken and the revisions passed unanimously.

*Joint Faculty Forum follow-up* –

Members were asked to consider the list of ideas that had been generated at the February 19th Joint Faculty Forum and how they could be consolidated into main themes. Themes pointed out were:

- A need to foster interdisciplinary research – how can the comments contributed make a case for more interdisciplinary research. MU could design an interdisciplinary program for sciences and humanities. (Example: Interdisciplinary program for technology) It was also suggested that *intra*disciplinary research (with other universities) may make more sense in some disciplines and would grow MU’s reputation.

- A need to be made known as a research university (Example: change branding from undergrad and basketball, to community and research)

- A need for faculty to get out of “silos”

- A need for incentive, other than tenure, to do research. There is no credit for doing research with undergrads. However, undergrads need to be educated about research, but not at the cost of graduate program research. It was suggested that more graduate assistantships would give grad students training opportunities for administrative experience and widen the circle of who is involved in research. MU should consider “best practice” for research and should establish quality requirements for undergrads to be involved in research. Faculty need protected time to do research. It was also pointed out that there seems to be inequality among departments for buy outs.

- A need to look at finance more creatively – in some cases more students (funded) would mean more research productivity. Tuition and enrollments need to be increased. Summer programs could be grown.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20pm.