University Board of Graduate Studies
Thursday, May 2, 2:30-4:00 p.m.
Raynor, Lower Level, Conference Room C

Minutes

Present: Ed Blumenthal, Drew Dentino (alternate for Dawei Liu), Scott D’Urso (vice chair), Marilyn Frenn, Kim Halula (secretary), Jim Hoelzle, Margaret Nettlesheim-Hoffman, Farrokh Nourzad, Michael O’Hear

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

Not present: Said Audi, Sharon Chubbuck (chair), Leah Flack, Dawei Liu.

I. Call to order. At 2:33 p.m. by Dr. D’Urso.

II. Approval of minutes. April 4, 2019, minutes were approved electronically by a majority of the Board.

III. Reports.

A. Graduate School Dean. - Doug Woods

   Enrollment updates (as compared with this time last year). For Fall 2019 term:
   • Matriculations: up 15% for first-year students.
   • Professional programs continue to stay strong.
   • Graduate School of Management is down 25% for new students, in part because the new Master in Management program hadn’t been open for registration.

   Doctor of Occupational Therapy (OCTH-OTD) program. It has been approved by the Board of Trustees and will start in the fall of 2020.

B. Graduate School Associate Dean for Strategic Innovation and Academic Program Development.
   - Carrianne Hayslett

   The group reviewing the Interdisciplinary PhD Program (INPR) assessment plan has met once. It will be meeting once more before making recommendations to this committee.

C. Graduate School Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Student Development. - Theresa Tobin

   Graduate student Career Development Bootcamp. May 20-24, 2019. It is now completely full, and the final touches are coming together.

IV. Business.

A. Action item: Interdisciplinary PhD program (INPR) revised concept paper for AE. - Carl Wainscott

   The student AE submitted this concept paper last month, and the UBGS feedback from the April 4 meeting was provided to him. He is now resubmitting it for UBGS review. An approval from this committee would imply that it looks like the idea has some promise, and that we would be looking forward to a full proposal. Both of his committee co-chairs have seen this and were OK with resubmitting it. There were changes made, but perhaps not as many as would have been expected.

   Comments during discussion included:
   • Concern that after the feedback from the April UBGS meeting, it came back with very little change.
   • It’s an interesting topic, something for a potential dissertation, but looks more like a semester project or a marketing study by the Athletics Department than a PhD proposal.
• If approved by UBGS, it should have an accompanying statement also provided to the co-chairs regarding needed revisions:
  o The courses listed don’t adequately support the kind of dissertation proposed.
  o The addition of a mixed-methods methodology course would be recommendable.
  o It needs to be more substantive, e.g. regarding the aims of the study.
• Concern regarding the delay that would be caused if it’s sent back again for revision.
  o It’s better to go through the normal process, than to make an exception acting out of urgency.
  o We could let the student get started but tell him we’d expect much more on aims and mixed-methods methodology. There should be a lot more detail about it next time it comes back.

Mr. Wainscott will provide the student and the student’s committee co-chairs with the feedback from this meeting: basically, that the concept paper needs to be more substantive and the coursework should include mixed-methods research methodology. The student will be allowed two weeks for revision and resubmission, so that we could use the current committee for review and an electronic vote. This will provide the student with the opportunity to have this approved before August, so that he could start registering for classes in the fall.

**Motion:** To send back the Interdisciplinary PhD Program (INPR) concept paper from student AE, asking that within two weeks the student resubmit the concept paper to be voted on by this body electronically. Made by Farrokh Nourzad, seconded by Michael O’Hear.

**Discussion:** Make sure that the INPR committee co-chairs see the comments from this committee.

**Motion carried:** unanimous - 9 in favor.

*See Addendum on page 5 for electronic voting results of the INPR concept paper.*

B. Action item: UBGS elections for chair, vice chair and secretary. - Scott D’Urso

  • Secretary: Michael O’Hear nominated himself. A vote was taken, and he was unanimously elected.
  • Vice chair: Ed Blumenthal nominated himself. A vote was taken, and he was unanimously elected.

Dr. D’Urso will email the full committee (to include those absent from this meeting) to seek input for the chair.


Dr. Woods introduced Jenny Alexander, Marquette’s director of purchasing, who has been leading a task force to consider book store contracts, because our contract with Follett is ending this summer. The goal of her presentation was to provide information and to plant a seed for our students to be more successful in the future.

The user group committee that is considering the options for book stores is made up of students, faculty and staff from the Purchasing Department. They’ve been learning about how our students access their teaching and learning materials and about the marketplace and have been developing a plan. They did a survey of students and faculty, which clearly showed that students still want a brick and mortar store. So, they’ve narrowed their evaluation to two suppliers: Barnes & Noble Education and Follett.

The committee is learning about how these companies partner with faculty and how they help faculty develop coursework. One of the goals would be that the company provide faculty with the ability to compare prices on new, used and e-source options for a book. Another goal would be to provide a faculty portal, so they can see what some of their peers are using and share information with them.

Ms. Alexander said there would be more information coming to the faculty and asked the group to please share their ideas with her or Dr. Woods.
D. Action item: UBGS statutes revision. - Scott D’Urso

There was a slight revision made since the last meeting to the statute language in the options. Almost all of the discussion centered around possible revisions to Statute #1, which currently states: [UBGS] Formulates policy on admission requirements, academic standards and procedures, theses and dissertations, probation and dismissal of students for academic reasons, and degree requirements.

The statutes subcommittee has proposed three options for revision to Statute #1.

**Option A** would acknowledge current practice while still maintaining UBGS oversight role. “UBGS recognizes that the faculty of professional programs not under direct oversight of the graduate school, including, to date, College of Health Sciences, Law School, selected programs in Dental School, and Graduate School of Management, formulate similar policies independently, with notification to UBGS of any substantive changes.”

**Option B** would appear to codify the current de facto practice as official. “Faculty in programs not under the oversight of the Graduate School (including, to date, School of Health Sciences, Law School, selected programs in the Dental School, and Graduate School of Management) are responsible for similar formation of policy and authorization of policy changes specific to each unit, with notification to UBGS of any substantive changes.”

**Option C** would be to leave Statute #1 as it is. This would mean that UBGS would continue the current practice though not described in the statute. It would leave open the option of “taking back” the oversight/responsibilities of said programs.

Comments during discussion included:

- UBGS doesn’t have the power to change the statutes; UAS must do that.
- Regarding Statute #1.
  - It’d be good to know the original intent of the UAS when it gave UBGS oversight of the professional schools.
  - The stated UBGS charge seems clear already, even if that hasn’t been the practice.
  - Admissions policies are set independently by professional schools and in the Law School, e.g., are tweaked every year. Academic standards and procedures and degree requirements are handled internally by the professional schools.
- Regarding Option B.
  - A concern is that it would fundamentally change the role of UBGS and would be saying that not everyone is under the Senate. It would affect membership and college/school representation and could possibly mean professional programs pulling out of selective committees.
  - If we were to go forward, the Senate would need to look at the charge of UBGS. We would need to point out to the Senate that this would fundamentally change the oversight of the university. There would no longer be an oversight at the faculty level. Do the faculty want a core overlooking everything or would that be better done locally?
  - It would codify the existing practice of UBGS and separate UBGS from the immediate responsibility of policies of professional schools. It would be saying that one subcommittee doesn’t have that authority over the professional schools, but it would be implying that the Senate has that authority. So, UAS could request reports from professional schools regarding policy, admissions, etc., or they could also change this point and say that they want UBGS to have oversight in those areas. As long as this body retains authority in other areas, like approving programs of professional schools, the professional schools should be represented on this body and could be non-voting members with respect to Graduate School policies.
Comparative data regarding the practices at similar universities may be helpful in deciding. We can check if there are national guidelines, like from the Council of Graduate Schools, about this.

A reason to have a collective faculty is not only oversight, but also because collective information about a university helps all faculty to know what’s going on and to share best practices.

The Senate is not going to have any idea about weighing in on what’s being done at the Dental School. What’s important is that the accrediting body likes the way things are being done there. Option B looks good because it would codify what we’re doing now, which is working well.

The professional schools are doing well now. Heath Sciences has their own guidelines in those areas, and they are much stricter than what UBGS seems to allow.

It’s UBGS’s job to set the floor for this university regarding certain basic things like admissions standards. Any unit should be able to go above the floor.

How would anyone outside of Law know what the minimum LSAT should be? Or how would the Law School know about the GRE?

The Law School changes things every year and needs to respond very quickly to changes in the law school world, which is extremely competitive. It has plenty of oversight from the accrediting body and incentive to maintain rigor. It’s in the best position to make policy decisions quickly without having to take them to another body.

This option provides for accountability, and it would give professional schools the ability to move quickly.

Law, Dental, and Health Science are strong here now, but historically we know that it has not always been the case nationally. What if the standards go down here?

Motion: To recommend to the University Academic Senate (UAS) the following new language for UBGS Statute #2:

“At the request of the Assessment Committee or Director of Assessment, [UBGS] reviews reports on institutional graduate and professional learning assessments.”

Made by Michael O’Hear, seconded by Kim Halula.

Motion carried: unanimous - 9 in favor.

Motion: To recommend to the UAS the following new language for UBGS Statute #3:

“At the request of the Program Review Committee or Provost, [UBGS] appraises the quality of the graduate and professional programs.”

Made by Michael O’Hear, seconded by Jim Hoelzle.

Discussion followed regarding clarification of the purpose of this revision, which is to state that UBGS recognizes there’s another review process going on, and that UBGS will join in that process if the review committee asks it to.

Motion carried: unanimous - 9 in favor.

Motion: To recommend to the UAS the following new language for UBGS Statute #4:

“Makes recommendations for changes in existing graduate programs, expansion of programs, introduction of new programs and termination of programs.”

Made by Ed Blumenthal, seconded by Michael O’Hear.

Discussion followed regarding whether it would be a concern that UBGS, after being involved in the introduction of new programs, would not be involved in later program policy changes done locally in the individual colleges/schools. It was agreed that this is not a concern, because the changes would still go through the office of the vice provost for graduate and professional studies, currently Dr. Woods.

Motion carried: unanimous - 9 in favor.
Motion: To recommend to the UAS the creation of the following new UBGs Statute #5 and renumber the current Statutes 5-8 to 6-9:
“Operates as “department home” for Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program (INPR), in conjunction with the Graduate School, and considers for approval individual students Interdisciplinary Doctoral Programs.”
Made by Ed Blumenthal, seconded by Michael O’Hear.
Motion carried: unanimous - 9 in favor.

Dr. D’Urso tabled further discussion on the options for statute #1.

V. Adjourn. Motion made by Michael O’Hear, seconded by Farrokh Nourzad. Dr. D’Urso adjourned the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

___________________
Meetings for the 2019-20 Academic Year. Thursdays, 2:30-4:00 p.m. Raynor Conf. Room C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug 15, 2019 (2:00-4:00)</th>
<th>Oct 3, 2019</th>
<th>Dec 5, 2019</th>
<th>Feb 6, 2020</th>
<th>Apr 2, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

___________________

*ADDENDUM

A vote was taken electronically on the INPR concept paper for student AE and was approved. 6 in favor. 3 opposed. 3 no response.