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Approved Minutes of the September 9, 2010 UBGS Meeting


Excused: 

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Erin Fox, Tim Melchert, Craig Pierce

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. and the agenda was approved.

Reports:
Report from the Committee Chair
Dr. Griffin welcomed the new members and asked everyone to introduce themselves. He encouraged everyone, especially the new members, to feel free to contribute to UBGS deliberations throughout the year ahead.

Report from the Graduate Dean
Dr. Hossenlopp informed the members that the proposal that was removed from today’s agenda for the CTSI related program is still being refined and expects it to be presented in October. She also asked the members to inform her if there were any questions on the process for new program approval in general. One member commented that he was pleased to see the first draft of the proposal and thought it was helpful to be able to review the academic plans without considering the budget. Dr. Hossenlopp said she will be deconstructing this proposal in particular and using it as a case study for the future proposals.
Dr. Hossenlopp also informed the members that budgets are being discussed with similar concerns being found throughout campus. Big changes will not be happening this year but hopefully progress will be made nonetheless.
Dr. Hossenlopp mentioned that the DGS meetings were held this week and she hopes to get feedback on some of the topics that were presented as well as continued dialogue.

Report from the Graduate Assistant Dean
Mr. Pierce shared a summary of the last ten years of INPR students showing the percentage of admits that were graduated, among other data. He said there is about one inquiry a week about the program, although this information is not on the summary. There are currently seven potential students who would like to have their proposals considered this academic year. He also briefly discussed the issue of non-degree students taking more than 9 credits in that status, the excess which may not be transferrable into a degree program.
Dr. Inderrieden asked about the research qualifications of committee members and recommended taking presentations out as a way to meet the qualification of being research active. It was agreed to discuss this at a future meeting. Dr. Melchert stated that he will be reviewing the committee qualifications ahead of time for all candidates.

Unfinished Business:
Survey of Grad Students - questions for assessment
Dr. Caulfield reminded the members of the discussion last year regarding graduate outcomes and the survey questions to determine outcomes that the UBGS approved. The questions were included
in the last exit survey and the resulting data shared with the members today. This data can be used to make recommendations for accreditation.

The rate of response to the survey was considered good. Of the doctoral graduates, there were 33 respondents, or about 60%. 144 master’s graduates responded. The members were reminded that one of the concerns with using the survey as an assessment tool was whether there would be enough respondents. One member recommended that there should be more data points and Ms. Fox explained that when the grad school met with Institutional Research, Gary Levy stated they did not want a midpoint. Nonetheless, the members would like to see a more sensitive scale with more scale points.

One member wondered how anyone could respond “not at all” to any of the questions presented. There was also comment that it is not evident whether negative responses pointed to a single a program or not, but another member commented that this is meant to be a general survey for the university as a whole. With the help of Institutional Research, it is possible to separate the data into departments. However, it was pointed out that it needs to be gathered for enough years to have the aggregate data that would ensure anonymity of the students. Three years was suggested. A recommendation was made to trend the data and eventually share it with departments. It was advised that written comments should still be excluded due to the possibility of individuals being identified.

Regarding the “transformational” question, it was kept in the survey as an experiment to see what kinds of responses were received. Did any answers stand out enough to warrant further development of this question? Dr. Caulfield stated that since it was not part of the assessment data, it could be modified as deemed necessary. There were varying opinions on whether “transformational education” should be defined or not. The members were also reminded that when this was discussed last year, some wanted to see how the students viewed transformation and then possibly refine the question after receiving that input.

The survey is administered to students – via email on a scheduled date, generally within a month of graduation. Mr. Pierce asked if it would make sense to survey all students, not just graduates, at the end of each year, with an identifier of what year they were in. There was some concern about identity being obvious but Mr. Pierce said the data could be aggregated in the graduate school.

New Business:

Future agenda items: The members were asked if there were any issues they would like to see on the agenda this year. Suggested topics were:

- Focus on Graduate Education as an institution, how the community sees Graduate Programs and research. It was suggested that the UBGS might discuss among themselves what they want the Office of Marketing and Communication to say to the community about Marquette’s grad programs and research, and then invite a representative from the Office of Marketing and Communication to discuss this with UBGS.
- How the new President views the Graduate School – how can the UBGS communicate with him? Dr. Hossenlopp recommended that Tricia Geraghty meet with the UBGS to discuss this topic. Dr. Melchert also added that over the years the UBGS has focused a lot on housekeeping issues out of necessity. Now that a lot of loose ends have been tied up, the UBGS is in a much different position and may be better able now to address issues of image, marketing.
- Graduate Faculty – this is the time to be strategic due to the possibility of many retirements coming up. A strategic plan for hiring experienced faculty could help strengthen the Graduate School. Emphasis should be on hiring people who are not fresh out of grad school. Opinion was also expressed that it is an individual choice for faculty to be research active or not. Dr. Melchert mentioned that there is a possibility the NCA would require Graduate Faculty to be identified which makes this a topic that warrants more discussion. Dr. Caulfield stated it would also simplify the process for INPR candidates to have a listing of faculty (annually updated) who are willing and qualified to serve on INPR committees so that the INPR applicants would know what faculty they may approach, regardless of whether or not we have a classification of “graduate faculty”. Dr. Hefti suggested making a mandate that a UBGS member should serve on each INPR committee for the purpose of oversight/seeing it through to a degree. It was also suggested it would be helpful to know what INPR students do after receiving a degree, if they’ve had publications, whether they got employment with their new degree.
Direction needs to come from leadership, and so far, nothing has been heard regarding Graduate Education. The leadership needs to be made aware of what the Graduate Programs are accomplishing. It’s up to the President to make a budgetary commitment to promote Graduate Education. Dr. Hossenlopp also pointed out that there is no alumni award from Graduate Programs and this would be a good thing to initiate.

- Qualifications of dissertation directors.
- NRC assessment of graduate programs will be out soon and the data should be looked at and possibly discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55pm.