University Board of Graduate Studies Minutes
of the 12/5/13 meeting

Present: Jay Caulfield, Sharon Chubbuck, Ana Garner, Robert Griffin, Heather Hathaway, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Mike Johnson, Alison Julien, Maureen O’Brien, Kelsey Otero, Daniel Rowe, Stephen Saunders

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker)
Excused: T. Gerry Bradley, Kevin Gibson, Kim Halula, Craig Pierce

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and the agenda was approved.

Reports:
Graduate Dean –
Dr. Hossenlopp is currently looking at budget reduction scenarios. At this time it does not include graduate student financial aid. Enrollment reports are due next week. Any new ideas regarding grad student funding will be looked at in the spring. The Board of Trustees met yesterday and the dental program (Periodontics MS) was reviewed and approved.

UBGS Chair –
Dr. Johnson expects to meet with COR officers in January to plan another forum.

Business:

Factors and guidelines for re-allocation of assistantship and tuition credit resources

The tuition credit budget runs in the red every year, in part due to the difficulty in predicting usage of credits. Dr. Hossenlopp invited comments, questions, and suggestions from members:

• History – although the doctoral program is looked at as higher, the MA is a more vigorous program for the department. Dr. Hossenlopp responded that assessment of the balance of Ph.D.’s to master’s programs needs to be on a program-by-program basis.

• Math – what is the perspective on building more students, vs funding small projects, what is the metric being used? Dr. Hossenlopp responded that there are not set criteria now and this is why the discussion is being opened.

• Theology – (Fr. Mueller) – what are the measures of a thriving program, what is the connection of financial aid to a thriving program? It is likely this is needed more by some programs than others. If some departments have unused credits they should give them back to be used by a department that needs them.

• Determine at what level a program should be thriving.

• TA’s – grad school is being asked to subsidize teaching of undergrads in some departments.

• A suggestion was made to discuss this in cohorts and then come back together.

• How are undergrad teaching needs linked to teaching assistantships?
There is a core need to be able to serve grad and undergrad courses.
Offer incentives to move programs in the desired direction.
There is a general problem of not providing incentives (bring in more students, you don’t get more money).
Explain how prioritization is related to the strategic plan, emergent possibilities within the strategic plan.
Tuition credit cost understanding is needed.
Recommended writing a draft of suggestions to send out before meeting.
Startups in sciences- There is an expectation that people have grants to support grad students.
Ask DGS’s for a list of factors regarding assistantships and ranking of factors.
Offer incentivization, such as cost sharing back to a program.
Ask how do 5 year programs contribute?
Ask how does MU compare to peers, though peer group varies across disciplines?
In some programs people go into the job market after completing a masters, yet it is PhD’s that count towards the Carnegie classification.
Is it advantageous to build the PhD program, from a Carnegie standpoint?
Consider whether grants will fund tuition credits.

Ideas will be discussed at the next meeting before a draft plan is circulated.

Executive Session:

INPR proposal 1
The candidate and advisor were introduced. The candidate began by describing the proposed INPR and plans for the future. Members then had an opportunity to ask questions. There were several minutes of questions, answers, and advice from members. Some recommendations were made by committee members. After the candidate and advisor were dismissed the members discussed the proposal.
A motion was made to accept the proposal, and seconded. A vote was taken and the members agreed unanimously to accept this proposal. A list of recommendations will be sent to the candidate.

INPR proposal 2
The candidate and advisor were introduced. The candidate presented a background and overview of the proposed research. There were several minutes of questions, answers, and advice from members. Some recommendations were made by committee members. After the candidate and advisor were dismissed the members discussed the proposal.
A motion was made and seconded to accept the proposal. A vote was taken and members agreed unanimously to accept the proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55pm.