University Board of Graduate Studies Minutes
of the 5/2/13 meeting

Present: Jay Caulfield, Robert Griffin, Kim Halula, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Ed Inderrieden
Mike Johnson, Maureen O’Brien, Albert Rivero, Daniel Rowe, Luke Samalya,
Stephen Saunders

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Craig Pierce, Mary Ann Lough (NURS)

Excused: Arthur Hefti, Doris Walker-Dalhouse

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

Reports:

Graduate Dean –

Dr. Hossenlopp reported that the strategic plan was endorsed by the Board of Trustees
(BOT) at yesterday’s meeting. The PowerPoint now posted on the MU website is what Fr.
Pilarz presented to the BOT. The theme of Academic Excellence is the first priority, while
remaining themes were listed in no particular order or priority. Planning for the next level is
now in the works.

It was also recently announced that the December graduation ceremony is being
eliminated. Dr. Hossenlopp asked members to consider whether hooding ceremonies should
be held in August and December for Ph.D.’s.

Graduate Associate Dean –

Dr. Gibson reported that he recently attended an Associate Dean meeting for research
at which the need for university wide training in academic integrity was discussed.

The Preparing Future Faculty program is going well. A meeting will be held at the end
of the year to assess if any changes should be made.

The Graduate Student Organization has had a change in personnel for the upcoming
year and is considering a name change to Graduate and Professional Student Organization.

Graduate Assistant Dean –

Mr. Pierce reminded members of the importance of meeting the enrollment goals set
for their departments. In answer to a question, the consequences of not meeting goals would
ultimately mean a loss in financial aid.

UBGS Chair –

Dr. Johnson reported that the Academic Senate approved the MEEN MS that was
reviewed by UBGS members last month.

After a search of past minutes, it was found that the UBGS procedure is to wait a
month before voting on issues related to new policies or changes in policies only. This is to
give chairs and DGS’s a chance to voice their opinions. Other business matters, such as
program changes and INPR proposals, can be voted on at the same meeting as their initial
discussion as long as the board has had time to review.
Business:

*NURS new certificate – Family Nurse Practitioner –*

Members reviewed the documentation ahead of time and Dr. Mary Ann Lough joined the meeting to explain the need and rationale for the new post-master’s certificate, which requires only one new 3 credit clinical course to be added in the summer of 2014. It is expected that this will add substantial net revenue. Dr. Hossenlopp added that this was discussed yesterday by the Academic Planning Team and shared some comments from that meeting. The proposal will go to the Academic Senate on Monday.

A motion was made and seconded to approve this proposal. There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken and passed unanimously (10 – 0).

*INPR program review discussion -*

Dr. Gibson described the history of the INPR and the need for a review of this program, which had previously never been conducted. It was also questioned whether an external review would be necessary. In preparation he looked at best practices from other institutions and described some of those to the members. The amount of workload for the UBGS, and the value of the degree were discussed. It was noted that student satisfaction would be difficult to determine due to so much variety within this degree, but the exit survey data could possibly be aggregated.

Dr. Gibson shared that one of the reasons for the INPR program was to give departments without PhD’s an opportunity to chair a doctoral degree. It has also encouraged faculty to reach out to other departments. Furthermore, the INPR has contributed to MU’s data used in the Carnegie classification. There was opinion that the INPR program could benefit from being better advertised. Dr. Johnson brought up the idea again for a faculty research center to assist candidates in finding committee members. He also asked if the INPR program should be pushed more, and Dr. Inderrieden pointed out that online degrees could be a possible source of competition. Dr. Hossenlopp asked members to consider programs that would have a strong faculty base that would be a good fit for the INPR. Other members discussed the importance that the dissertation should be publishable, and INPR students should be publishing, in order to be considered making a contribution to the academic field.

When asked if anyone thought the program should be discontinued, there was one opinion that it is not a positive thing when a PhD (Interdisciplinary) is earned through a non-PhD graduate program.

It was pointed out that most PhD programs (outside of STEM disciplines) have a research methods course and this should be required of the INPR programs, which, in fact, is stated on page 8 of the INPR guidelines.

Other considerations for changes to the INPR:

- Consider a model that would remove the UBGS review of INPR’s and instead vote on a subcommittee of the primary department, or “interdisciplinary center” to do that.
- Business, Management, and Communication are the biggest participants among INPR students.
- Add measures of success and value, such as publication (as a requirement?).
• Re-include the statement that this is not a traditional path to a Ph.D. and may not lead to employment (informed consent).
• Currently there is no follow-up after the DQE. A suggestion was made to have more UBGS oversight at this point.
• It is difficult to identify committee members – how can this be made easier?
• Require the student to meet with the committee once per year.
• Could departmental graduate committees provide some oversight (progress reviews).
• Create a template to track progress.
• Require one committee member to be from a PhD granting program.
• Although rubrics were presented, there is no plan for when and who will use them. A plan for use of the rubrics should be implemented.

Action items:
• Assemble comments, decide what to implement
• Consider how to market. A suggestion was made to feature the stories of successful INPR students on a webpage linked to the INPR info already on the bulletin and website.

Continued discussion of the INPR will be placed on the fall agenda after further review of the materials and today's comments.

Officer succession planning –
Dr. Johnson shared historical documentation of officer terms, which varied from year to year. Because there have not previously been any written operating terms, Dr. Johnson drafted some ideas. All members were asked to review these suggestions but no action is necessary at this time. This will be discussed again in the fall.
The election of new officers is not necessary for next year as all the officers voted in last year were enlisted for two year terms.

Future topics/priorities –
• Strategic planning
• A possible new format for meetings that would be larger and include DGS’s, and an hour on a specific topic.
• Dr. Johnson is meeting with the Committee on Teaching (CoT) chair and could possibly plan a joint meeting with UBGS/CoT for fall.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.