University Board of Graduate Studies Minutes
1/14/2016
Raynor Conference Center C

Present: Amy Blair, Gerry Bradley, Margaret Bull, Sumana Chattopadhyay, Sharon Chubbuck, Michael Johnson, Alison Julien, Stephen Merrill, Stephen Saunders

Excused: Robert Griffin, Kim Halula, Felissa Lee, Katie McKeown

Present (Non-voting): Carrianne Hayslett, John Jentz, Mary Wacker (note taker), Carl Wainscott, Doug Woods

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 pm by Dr. Johnson.

Minutes of the 12/10/15 meeting were approved via email by a majority of the Board.

Reports:

Graduate Dean – Doug Woods

Dean Woods provided a brief overview of his first nine days on the job, noting that time has been spent reviewing the budget and organizational structure of the Graduate School.

Funding was identified to provide a second four-year diversity doctoral fellowship. The Student Affairs and Higher Education class in the College of Education has agreed to work on a proposal from the Graduate School on ways to enhance climate in regard to diversity for graduate students on campus, and the Graduate School looks forward to receiving that feedback later in the semester.

Plans are being formed to launch strategic planning for the Graduate School in the fall of 2016, and Dean Woods will be working through spring and summer to better understand existing programs and collect data in advance of that process. He will look to the UBGS, as well as our DGSs, to provide data. A survey on recruiting practices and strategies will be distributed to the DGSs in the coming days to gather a snapshot of what we do now and who is involved in that process. The goal is to develop a more systematic approach to recruitment.

Dean Woods met with Kelley McCaskill from University Advancement to discuss the development of a fundraising plan for graduate education. Feedback was sought from DGSs via email to identify key themes for fundraising, and those have been forwarded to UA. Many cited the need for funds to support student travel and student research, as well as assistantships, stipends and other tuition support. UA has not actively reached out to graduate student alumni – and there are 23,000 alums in their database (including GSM alums). There is a need to get more involved in raising money for graduate student support, whether donations are made to programs and colleges or to the Graduate School. There will be follow-up on this process in the coming months.

There was also discussion about adding awards for distinguished graduate alumni at the annual University awards ceremony, beginning in April, 2017.

The Graduate School has been hosting and coordinating Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training for the last several years and will continue to do so, but with some changes. In the past, live seminars have been offered and videotaped to be put online in D2L. In the new model, we will utilize programming from the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI), where a large part of the training will be available online. In order to comply with federal regulations, graduate students must also have face-to-face instruction,
and the graduate school will offer seminars to meet that requirement. Dr. Hossenlopp and Dean Woods will continue to discuss this change.

The PFFP program will be modified a bit in the coming year. We will be surveying current faculty to see what input they might have in programming aimed at preparing future faculty. Much of what we offer now appears to be training for teaching assistants, not future professionals. We are lucky to have this program, and look forward to continuing to enhance it.

Dissertation Boot Camp is going on this week, and the capstone project of the week, the Pierce Prize competition, happens on Friday at 11:30. Participating students may opt to offer a two minute presentation of their work, and the winner receives a $300 travel voucher. Sixteen participants are signed up for the competition, and the Board is encouraged to attend.

**Graduate Associate Dean – Carrianne Hayslett**

The Graduate School met last week with a new INPR prospective student, who is working up a concept paper to be submitted prior to May.

**Graduate Assistant Dean – Carl Wainscott**

Plans are progressing to explore combining the biomedical engineering degree with the Medical College of Wisconsin program. In the planning process we have discovered that our grading scales do not match, and that our system of offering the A/AB rather than a plus/minus system is out of date with peer programs. The Board was asked if there would be support at Marquette to move to the plus/minus system – a change that would likely affect both graduate and undergraduate courses. The Board offered a consensus opinion that such a change would be favorably received at Marquette. The law school has already adopted the plus/minus as part of a larger revamp of their entire system. The Graduate School will continue to discuss this change, and will take a recommendation to the Academic Senate. Dr. Chattopadhyay offered to take the question to the UAS.

There is a need to provide more detail in student program requirements either in the bulletin or up front as students map their coursework. We may place our students at a disadvantage if we don’t clarify these requirements, and we need to deliver the program of study that is promised to our students. We may be able to turn on academic advising in CheckMarq to assist in this process, and Mr. Wainscott asked the Board if there would be departmental support for that move. CheckMarq could provide the benefit of students and advisors both having access to requirements and eliminating guesswork, and still allow departments the freedom to set requirements.

Some members of the Board were surprised to learn that this problem exists. It was agreed that clarity would strengthen the value of our programs. Challenges exist for smaller programs where student numbers dictate course offerings. Dr. Johnson suggested there might be existing mechanisms that would allow flexibility but that we could determine them farther in advance. Some expressed concern that CheckMarq would reflect a number of waivers – the technology has limits to how much can be modified. There are many programs with significant freedom to choose coursework beyond the basic core. Additionally, there can be a lack of consistency as advisors and courses change.

**UBGS Chair – Michael Johnson**

Dr. Johnson extended a welcome back to the Board.
**Business:**

1. **INPR Concept Paper: (attachment)**

This student was a Trinity fellow at Marquette. A faculty member has reviewed the project. She is exploring a few programs, MU is just one of them. As an alum, she holds Marquette in high regard and believes we can meet her needs. The Graduate School has no concerns at this time. Discussion. The board noted five different disciplines, cautioning that the project not become too large and shallow. At this stage it might be hard to put limits on which disciplines will be included. After discussion, the Board approved the concept paper unanimously.

2. **Program Termination Proposals:**
   - EDPL RESP Cert: Reading Teacher Certificate (attachment)
   - EDPL RETE Cert: Reading Specialist Certificate (attachment)

These termination proposals are for programs that have no students and are too costly and time intensive to keep on the books. Dr. Chubbuck noted that the language in the termination rationale is not accurate. Many students have gone through these programs, which were once embedded in a master’s program, therefore those students do not show up in this record. The look of these numbers does not accurately reflect the level of interest. The department made a decision to stop recruiting for these programs, but this is a state licensing program and there are many who have taken the courses. The department hopes to see the programs return in the future.

Dr. Chubbuck noted that the department would like to revise the master’s program in the future. The Board discussed the pros and cons of leaving a program on the books vs. proposing a revised program in the future and determined that it made sense to terminate at this time for both future planning and compliance with federal regulations. After discussion the Board voted unanimously to recommend termination of both certificate programs.

3. **Update on Incubator Discussion (Dr. Woods)**

Dr. Woods provided an update on the incubator proposal based on his reading of the December UBGS minutes and an initial document received from Dr. Salchenberger that serves as a starting point for planning. Dr. Woods prefers to view this plan as an incubator/renovator, noting that it may be more efficient to alter current programs than to create entirely new programs in some cases. Noting that the graduate programs need to generate more revenue, especially at the master’s level, Dr. Woods expects some version of this proposal to happen, and will keep the Board informed as updates are available.

4. **Efficiencies in the Graduate Education Process (Dr. Woods)**

Dr. Woods offered that the Graduate School needs to do more recruitment, but we currently do not have a recruiter, and no individual is currently in charge of recruitment. Dr. Woods reported that the roles and responsibilities within the Graduate School are currently being reviewed to find opportunities to increase efficiencies in the status quo. The staff has been asked to review current processes to reduce inefficiencies, and we also need to consider the procedures that govern graduate education campus-wide. The implementation of Slate CRM software will improve efficiency. Dr. Woods asked the Board to consider where we might be placing a burden on ourselves without purpose, and to look at policies to see if we are the most efficient that we can be. He asked the UBGS to convene a subcommittee to review graduate education policies and make recommendations, including the review of current forms. Dr. Bull and Dr. Saunders volunteered to serve. Dr. Woods also asked the Board to recommend any DGSs who might have opinions on this review.
New Business:

1. Graduate Assistant Funding: Where are we now and where should we go? (Dr. Woods)

Dr. Woods has spent time exploring how assistantships are allocated, and found that tuition credits and stipend money is distributed without clear determinations of how the resources are allocated beyond tradition. He is in the process of creating a database of stipends and tuition allocations and factors that might impact the allocations (undergraduate courses, number of students, graduate tuition and research revenue, mission). In the next six months the Graduate School plans to develop a new model to govern the allocation of revenue – a logical model that will be predictable for departments, can be used in goal-setting, and that advances the goals of the university. The model needs to be built from the bottom up.

Dr. Woods would like input from the Board, the DGSs and deans, and asked for Board volunteers to serve as a subcommittee of the UBGS to work on a new funding model and make recommendations. Dr. Blair, Dr. Chubbuck, and Dr. Chattopadhyay volunteered to serve on this workgroup. The Graduate School hopes to begin these changes at this time next year, and will make an effort to communicate the metrics to departments so that they have time to respond and plan accordingly. Dr. Woods asked that this work be conducted in the spirit of what is best for the global goals of the university, while acknowledging that individual departments are more reliant on teaching assistants than others. The Board noted that those courses in the core that are taken by all students are currently reliant on teaching assistants, and that changes in allocations can have dramatic impact on curriculum.

2. Graduate School goals for 2016 (Dr. Woods)

Dr. Woods shared some goals that have been set for the calendar year.

a. Student survey of the graduate student experience. We need to know where we are before we can say where we want to go. The Graduate School is currently weighing the option of a self-prepared survey vs. a survey service that could provide us with national comparative data.

b. DGS and faculty survey. These two constituencies will also be surveyed, and results will inform the Graduate School strategic planning process.

c. Focus on recruitment. The Graduate School is reviewing how time is allocated within the department and how to focus on recruitment. The current budget is not adequate for recruitment, and we are in need of marketing expertise on staff.

d. Summer funding fellowship (attachment). The Graduate School is launching a summer doctoral fellowship with the goal of supporting graduate students for the purpose of seeking extramural funding sources. The ORSP will present instruction to these fellow on how to seek extramural funding, and there is an expectation that students in the program will have the summer to prepare funding requests. Each fellow will receive a $5000 stipend to write these requests. This is an investment in the graduate school as well as an opportunity for students to get experience writing grants. The Board is asked to review the proposal and offer feedback in the next week.

The Board expressed support of this project and suggested that it might become an expectation of the PFFP program in the future. The Board discussed the current PFFP structure. Brainstorming about changes included a possible division between the future faculty programming and future
professionals programming. The Board also discussed the current state of TA training. It was suggested that campus representatives involved with fellowship applicants (Dr. Pusejovsky, for the Fulbright program, as an example) might be good resources for reviewing this program. Mr. Jentz also noted that the Raynor Memorial Libraries house an excellent resource that tracks Wisconsin grants and foundations, and that Mary Frenn is the librarian coordinating that program.

e. Naming of Graduate student awards

Dr. Woods asked the Board to consider what sorts of alumni awards the graduate school ought to give out. Suggestions included separating awards for master’s and doctoral students, as well as alternating awards on a rotating basis through departments. The Dental School and the Law School currently have awards in place. It was suggested that the Graduate School review the best practices of peer institutions for more information.

Dr. Woods asked the Board for suggested topics to consider. The Board discussed the limitations of PeopleSoft, noting that at times this software dictates policy. A review of the software and its implications was recommended, or at least a means to track problems as a first step.

The Board asked about the incubator, noting that the incentive to grow doesn’t always result in rewards to the departments. Dr. Woods noted that the model being generated will address that. Dr. Johnson added that it will be helpful to make the incentives clear not just for incubated new programs, but for all programs. He noted that there is a need for transparency for new and renovated programs – acknowledgement that everyone gets the same treatment.

The Board also discussed the losses felt by departments a few years ago when scholarship funds were taken from departments and reallocated to undergraduate tuition. These changes rolled out over three years, and have now resulted in losses at the department level.

The next meeting of the UBGS is scheduled for Thursday, February 4. The meeting was adjourned at 3:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary C. Wacker