GSO Committee Meeting Notes, November & December 2013

The following is our December update from our GSO student representatives to our faculty committees on campus. The purpose of having a graduate representative on our committees is to represent you, Marquette graduate students and to inform you to what is happening within the university.

If you have any questions or concerns about a particular committee, please do not hesitate to contact the Graduate Student Organization at gso@marquette.edu.

1. Financial Planning and Review Committee, Representative Arthur Mueller
   - The Budget for FY15 was sent to the Board of Trustees.
   - Reviewed specifics of the FY15 proposal.

2. University Board on Graduate Studies, Representative Kelsey Otero
   - Reviewed INPR Program
     o Currently operates under UBGS.
     o Discussed ideas to enhance the program (assessment, requirements). No current follow ups and programs will remain as is until further decisions can be made.
   - Factors for re-allocation of assistantships and credit resources
     o Ask Directors of Graduate Studies Programs to provide their list of rankings for determining assistantships/credit resources.
     o Draft to be sent out to gather feedback.
     o Working on a more formulaic way to determine the allocation.
     o Creative sharing of assistantships and credit resources is encouraged.
   - Enrollment management and new graduate/certificate programs
     o Dean Hossenlopp and the Graduate School looking at new programs that can boost enrollment at the graduate school level and allow the university to remain competitive or take advantage of a new area that is growing in popularity/need.
     o Ideas are welcome.
   - INPR Proposals
     o Reviewed proposals from two candidates for INPR degree status.

3. The Committee on Academic Policies and Issues, Representative Jakob Rinderknecht
   - The committee agreed on some changes of emphasis and expression in the university document guiding searches for deans.
• The issue of commencement will be discussed at the next meeting.
• As always, graduate students who are aware of issues which should be brought before CAPI are encouraged to contact me.

4. Library Committee, Representative Heidi Wacker
• Current Events
  o Raynor Memorial Libraries recently underwent an external review in November (6th-8th) and the report is due out November 27th.
  o Budget remains the main issue of concern.
• No one volunteered or elected a Chair to the board. Someone from the board volunteered to facilitate an electronic election process. Chair is needed by winter break
• There’s an opportunity to explore new ways of getting Raynor Memorial Libraries information out on campus.

5. The Committee on Diversity and Equality, Representative Dan Garcia
• Voted on Student Committee Member role
  o Student members will have voting power.
  o When discussing sensitive and confidential topics pertaining to faculty, staff, and university administration, students will be asked to step out until the conclusion of the discussion.
• New Professional Student Added
• Discussion of the Faculty listening session for diversity and equity topics and issues
  o Topics and issues were collected.
  o Will utilize the data to impact the measure of Climate Study.
• Preparation for the Student Listening session on 11/14
  o Undergraduate and Graduate student will lead the discussion.
• Climate Study working group discussion
  o Contacted various climate study consultants.
  o Collected data on pricing and is compiling a short list.
• Next meeting
  o Chris Miller, VP for Student Affairs, will attend.
  o Student listening session will be discussed.

6. Committee on Teaching, Representative Kathleen Hazlett
• Began with a reflection on the topic of excellence
  o “Excellence comes from a desire to make a positive difference.
• Way Klinger Teaching Enhancement Award applications have been received and sent out to committee members
  o Discussed the review and ranking process.
• Shaun Longstreet presented on peer evaluation (particularly peer evaluation of teaching)
  o Good peer evaluation should:
    ▪ Emphasize process
    ▪ Stress formative rather than summative feedback
- Offer administrative support for excellent in teaching
  - Justification for peer evaluation
    - Better faculty job satisfaction
    - Increased clarity on what teaching is
    - Improved student satisfaction
    - More competitive university
    - Accreditation demands
  - Plan moving forward: Check with various departments/colleges about their current peer evaluation procedures and work toward developing a standardized option for the university as a whole.

7. University Academic Senate, Representative James Lamb
   - Address from Fr. Wild
     - Positive contribution ($700K), but <1% contribution margin in Fiscal 13
     - University cost = $1 million/day
     - Stress-testing divisions/colleges to understand impact of potential budget cuts
     - The focus of all changes, moving forward, will be the impact on the student experience
     - Among the Catholic schools, we ranked fourth in fundraising last year (behind BC, Georgetown, Notre Dame)
       - We are anticipating a $10 million gift coming in this year
   - Chairperson’s Report- Dr. Marilyn Frenn
     - Moving forward with formation of group to discuss FemSex
   - Provost’s Report- Dr. Margaret Callahan
     - Received over 17,000 freshman applications so far (+17% vs. F13 YTD)
     - Graduate applications on about normal pace
   - Strategic Goal: Pursuit of Academic Excellence for Human Well-Being- Dr. Margaret Callahan
     - HLC requires yearly college/unit “Academic Program Review”
     - Goal: Top 25% in U.S. News & World Report
   - Enrollment Report- Dr. Margaret Callahan
     - 70% of revenues from tuition
     - Midwest expected to experience largest drop in college-bound high school graduates
   - Research in Action- Dr. Jean Hossenlopp
     - Carnegie classification rates universities which award PhDs
     - Current Carnegie classification: “Doctoral Research University” (lowest ranking)
     - Goal: Move up to “Research University/High Research Activity”
       - Most of our peers are in this group
     - We have been able to increase reported R&D expenditures, a key factor in Carnegie classification, simply by changing the way we report what we already spend