University Board of Graduate Studies Minutes  
Thursday, November 3, 2016, 2-4 p.m.  
Raynor Library Lower Level, Conference Room C

Present: Allison Abbott, Kati Berg, Sumana Chattopadhyay, Sharon Chubbuck, Marilyn Frenn, Kim Halula, John LaDisa, Margaret Nettesheim-Hoffman, Michael O’Hear, Peter Staundenmaier (alternate for Alison Efford), Sheila Stover

Present, non-voting: Carrianne Hayslett, Jenny Staab (note taker), Carl Wainscott, Doug Woods

Excused: Alison Efford, Felissa Lee, Stephen Saunders

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. by Dr. Abbott.

Minutes of the October 6, 2016, meeting were approved via email by a majority of the Board.

REPORTS

Dean of the Graduate School – Doug Woods

- **Graduate School strategic plan.** The Strategic Planning Committee continues to meet and hopes by the end of next week to have a rough draft of the strategic objectives and the tactics associated with those objectives. An online survey will then be sent out to receive input from UBGS, DGSs, and graduate students, and the committee will use that feedback to finalize the plan. The goal is to have the plan completed by January 1, 2017.

- **Graduate student funding.** The data with which the graduate funding allocations will, at least in part, be determined was recently sent out to the faculty, the directors of graduate studies, and the department heads. Before any of the final reallocation takes place, they will know what number of assistantships they are likely to have or number of scholarship credits they will be able to give out at the graduate level. The applications for new or additional graduate lines are due to the Graduate School by November 22, 2016. The working groups hope to have a meeting late November or early December to review those lines and to make recommendations to me. Then hopefully by January 1, 2017, we will have all the additional allocations. The budget needs to be approved before we can release any lines.

- **Graduate student health insurance.** We had been informed that according to the Affordable Care Act, we were not allowed to provide subsidies for student health insurance plans, which meant we could not do what we had done historically. However, last week, the interpretation of the Affordable Care Act changed on this point. Before this change, we had worked with the Graduate Student Organization to survey the graduate students with assistantships. The students were asked if they would rather have a straight stipend increase for “living expenses,” or a smaller stipend increase with the addition of covering the cost of their Marquette Medical Clinic fee for the year. In either case, they would still need to find their own health insurance. They voted in favor of the straight stipend increase. The weekday following the close of the survey, the news came that the ruling regarding health insurance was overturned. It still seems better to go ahead with the stipend increase rather than make a contribution towards their
health insurance because of the inability to predict changes in health insurance costs for next year. We will still negotiate for a student health insurance plan to enable the students to choose between that plan or going on the Exchange. In the next couple of weeks, we are planning to have Common Ground Healthcare Coop give two educational seminars for graduate students and to be available to answer individual questions that the students may have.

Graduate School Associate Dean – Carrianne Hayslett

- No report.

Graduate School Assistant Dean – Carl Wainscott

- No report.

UBGS Chair – Allison Abbott

- No report.

BUSINESS

1. Cross-listed course language follow up. – Carrianne Hayslett

   There is a request for further clarity in the bulletin language for cross-listed courses. The bold, italicized portion of the text below is the proposed alteration for the bulletin:

   Cross-listed courses are two courses with closely-related content that have been approved at different levels of instruction (for example, undergraduate and graduate levels). Students in cross-listed courses are to be provided learning opportunities commensurate with the degree they are pursuing. **Accordingly, cross-listed courses should include learning outcomes that clearly describe and distinguish the expectations of undergraduate and graduate students. These outcomes may be overlapping and/or represent different levels of engagement with the same content, but they must be communicated explicitly for undergraduate and graduate students.** Courses may be differentiated through assignments (what students are producing as part of the course), assessments (how students are evaluated), and/or evaluation criteria (expectations for acceptable performance), all of which must be aligned with the learning outcomes. The learning outcomes and aligned assignments, assessments and evaluation criteria for each level of a cross-listed course must be included in the syllabus and clearly communicated to students. This policy conforms to the Higher Learning Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation, which obliges courses and programs to require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree awarded.

   **A motion** was made by Michael O’Hear and seconded by Sharon Chubbuck to approve the proposed language. There being no discussion, a vote was taken. The motion passed: 10 in favor, 1 abstention.
2. Credentials needed to chair a graduate student’s project/thesis/dissertation committee. – Allison Abbott and Doug Woods

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) requires accredited institutions to determine and evaluate minimal faculty qualifications in order to demonstrate that faculty have appropriate subject-matter expertise for teaching classes, supervising research and/or doing clinical/practical supervision. To be in compliance with HLC, Marquette University is making required qualifications explicit through documentation of credentials and/or tested experience at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Dr. Woods explained how the provost recently met with a workgroup to define Marquette’s faculty credential requirements based on HLC’s guidelines, and that the UBGS needs to agree on the language for the final version of the document produced by this workgroup. A discussion followed regarding three questions:

1) Should chairs of dissertation committees be required to be “active” scholars?
2) Should chairs of master’s project/thesis committees have different expectations on scholarly performance than those of chairs of dissertation committees?
3) How would we want to define “active”?

The general consensus of the Board was that Ph.D. advisors/dissertation committee chairs be required to be active scholars, but that individual departments could define what it means to be an “active scholar.” For master’s advisors/thesis directors, departments could determine whether they will require them to be active scholars, and if so, what that means. The Board was in agreement with the other points in the document.

The Board proposed the below language for paragraph “b” of the document. The added language is in bold italics. No change was proposed for paragraph “a.”

**Credentials needed to chair a graduate student’s project/thesis/dissertation committee**

a. The individual must have a terminal degree in the discipline for which they will serve as chair of a graduate student’s project/theses/dissertation committees. Terminal degrees in closely related fields will be accepted, but the home departments must determine the degrees that are considered closely related by disciplinary standards. Justification for this decision must accompany the person’s “Faculty Credentialing” document.

b. In addition, the individual must have engaged in active scholarship (e.g., either a book, peer-reviewed article, or disciplinary equivalent) in the last 4 years. Individual Departments can require more (but not less) stringent criteria must establish criteria which must be reviewed/approved by the home College Dean and Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education. Departments can specify different criteria for “active scholarship” needed to supervise dissertations vs. theses/projects. In instances where a project/thesis/dissertation committee is being co-chaired, at least one co-chair must meet this eligibility requirement.

The document regarding the credentialing at the graduate/professional level with the above proposed new language will be presented for a vote at the next UBGS meeting.
3. Dissertation Credits policy follow up. – Doug Woods

The issue being addressed is that students are allowed to take dissertation credits before they have been approved to do their dissertation. The Board discussed the proposal of striking the phrase: “before actually beginning work on their project,” from the two places listed below in the 2016-17 Graduate Bulletin.

1) Tuition Refund and Adjustment Schedule

   **Note:** Graduate students who enroll in, and pay for, thesis or dissertation credits before actually beginning work on their projects will not be entitled to a refund of tuition for these credits if, for any reason, they do not complete their programs.

2) Academic Programs Overview

   **Dissertation Credits**

   Students must register for 12 hours of dissertation credits and may enroll for these while working on their doctoral dissertation outline or dissertation. Each department determines the number of credit hours that a candidate may take during any one term. Students who enroll in, and pay for, dissertation credits before actually beginning work on their project will not be entitled to a refund of tuition of these credits even if they should subsequently drop out of or are withdrawn from their program.

   **A motion** was made by Kati Berg and seconded by Michael O’Hearn to strike out the language as indicated above from two different places in the bulletin.

   A discussion followed at which it was mentioned that eventually this issue will need to be revisited to see if, for example, the name “dissertation credits” could be changed to “research credits.” Changing the name, however, would involve changing a multitude of bulletins, webpages, and forms. So for now, striking the above-mentioned phrase from the bulletin will at least help. An explanation can be given to the Directors of Graduate Studies as an advisory note, that they could start referring to dissertation credits as “research credits.”

   A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously in favor.

4. Residency requirement follow up. – Doug Woods

Doug introduced the proposed new language for the Graduate Bulletin regarding the residency requirement. The new language is in bold italics in the below text:

   The residency requirement is designed to immerse doctoral students in the campus community of scholars. It must be satisfied in the department in which the student is seeking a doctoral degree. Plans for the residency must be included on the Doctoral Program Planning Form. The residency requirement is met when a student completes **one of the below three options:**
1. Nine credits of course work, or its equivalent per term, for two terms within an 18-month period, or alternatively, completes at least 6 credits of course work, or its equivalent per term, for three terms within an 18-month period. The credit load necessary to meet the nine- or six-credit requirement may be met by course work alone or course work in conjunction with dissertation credits.

2. **Alternative requirements as defined by the department in which the student is seeking a doctoral degree.** Alternative requirements by the department must be filed with and approved by the dean of the Graduate School.

3. **In exceptional situations, waivers may be granted on a case-by-case basis with the recommendation from the department in which the student is seeking a doctoral degree and with the approval from the dean of the Graduate School.** In such cases, the department must make a credible case that the student has obtained the intended impact of the residency requirement (i.e., creating an immersion in the campus community of scholars) and state the experiences through which that impact was achieved.

During the discussion that followed, it was brought out that there was a need for new language, because simply meeting the requirements the way they have been being presented does not necessarily make someone a member of the “community of scholars.” Someone could fulfill the letter of the law without fulfilling the spirit of it. The proposed new language captures and formalizes what has already been happening and gives more flexibility to our programs.

**A motion** was made by Michael O’Hear and seconded by Marilyn Frenn to approve the new language for the residency requirements. There being no discussion, a vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously in favor.

5. **Grading system policy change – Doug Woods**

The University Board of Undergraduate Studies recently voted in favor of a change to the grading system policy. The proposal is to change the practice of using AB and BC to that of using + (plus)/-(minus). Not included in the proposal is D minus, so the grade immediately below D is F. The plan is that the proposal would go into effect in fall 2017. If the proposal passes here, a joint motion will go to the Academic Senate.

During the discussion, the question came up of why there is no D minus, and that it could be advantageous to have it.

**A motion** was made by Michael O’Hear and seconded by John LaDisa to approve the proposal for the revised grading system with the suggestion of adding a D minus. There being no discussion, a vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously in favor.
NEW BUSINESS

1. INPR outline – Carl Wainscott

Mr. Wainscott explained that since early 2015 we have been working with this applicant to try to develop a program of study. Yesterday we received a final piece, so we will move forward with what we have in place. During the discussion that followed, it was brought out that one of the courses in the plan of study is no longer offered and that a methodology course needs to be added.

A motion was made by Michael O’Hear and seconded by Kati Berg to approve the content of the INPR with the stipulation that the course issues identified be addressed. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken. The motion passed: 10 in favor, 1 abstention, none opposed.

2. Minimum time requirement for UBGS members to review INPR documents – Carianne Hayslett

In May of 2016, the UBGS voted in favor of requiring that INPR outlines be sent to the UBGS members a minimum of 30 days prior to the UBGS meeting. This was done because of the very lengthy documents which had been submitted in the past. Now however, because of a new system in place, documents are much more streamlined. It would be helpful to the students if the Board did not require so much time to review their documents.

There was a general consensus among the members of the Board that two weeks is a sufficient amount of time, but that the INPR outlines should not be sent out to the Board unless they are complete.

3. Writing support for graduate students – Marilyn Frenn

As an addition to the agenda, Dr. Frenn asked if departments have found that there are sufficient writing resources or helps for our graduate students. Ms. Nettesheim-Hoffman mentioned that she has worked in the Norman H. Ott Memorial Writing Center as a tutor. She noted that there has been a focused effort on getting graduate students to come to the Ott where several graduate student tutors are available. Dr. Hayslett added that other available resources include Dissertation Boot Camp and workshops for those who mentor students in writing.

Adjournment: There being no more discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Scheduled meetings for 2016-2017 Academic Year

Thursdays 2-4 p.m.
Meetings will be held in Raynor Library Lower Level, Conference Room C, unless otherwise indicated.

December 1, 2016        February 2, 2017        April 6, 2017

Respectfully submitted,
Jenny Staab