Graduate Education Council
Meeting of
Tuesday, January 28, 2014
2:00 – 4:00 p.m., 433 Johnston Hall

Present: Melissa Anderson, Victor Barocas, Phil Buhlmann, Kathleen Conklin, Liz Davis, Jigna Desai, Ameeta Kelekar, Tim Kehoe, Sally Kohlstedt (chair), Linda Lindeke, Ann Masten, Keaton Miller, Nicole Scott, Char Voight (staff recorder), Elizabeth Wattenberg

Guests: Andrew Hill (ASR), Stacia Madsen (GSSP), Erik Moore (UDC), Emily Ronning (Provost’s Office)

1. Academic advisement (Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Andrew Hill, ASR): Andrew Hill from Academic Support Resources provided the council with an overview of the Academic Advisement (AA) workflow project, which will automate a number of degree plan tracking/degree audit and clearance functions that are currently manual. AA is part of the ESUP project, so deliverables will be expected for October 2014. Because of the short time frame, ASR is initially working with CEHD as a pilot college. The variation in graduate programs and requirements at the graduate level require that AA be customizable and flexible, though not all the flexibility has been leveraged yet. Students will be able to access the system through self-service to monitor their own progress. There will be two levels of approval built into the system to ensure that: 1) the student’s degree plan is acceptable, and 2) they have met the requirements outlined in the degree plan. The first level of approval will likely be the advisor. The second may be the college. Approval can be programmed at the University level, the college level, and the program level. Once the pilot has progressed further, ASR can be invited back to give a demonstration of AA to the GEC.

2. Program approval public review period (Emily Ronning): At the Provost’s request, the University will be implementing a public review process for new and changed program proposals, effective beginning with materials on the docket for the May Board of Regents meeting. Prior to the Regents meeting, there will be a two-week public comment period during which a summary of the proposed program changes, a faculty contact (from the program), and information on the process within the college will be posted so that people know where to direct questions, comments and concerns. The role of the GEC with regard to review of new and changed graduate program proposals will remain the same. The GEC will review and comment on all such proposals before any public review period. The goal of the public review period is to foster a sense of collaboration and ensure that people feel informed about what is happening relative to graduate and undergraduate education at the University.

3. Proposal to discontinue the M.Aero.E degree (Emily Ronning, Karen Starry, handout: Proposal to discontinue the M.Aero.E degree). Enrolment in the M.Aero.E degree program has been declining, leading the program to propose discontinuation. A Plan C option will be added to the M.S. degree in Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, effective Fall 2014, as an option for students wishing to pursue this course of study. The GEC unanimously approved the proposal.

4. ProQuest embargo policy (Erik Moore, UDC; Stacia Madsen, GSSP): Erik Moore provided the GEC with a brief history of ProQuest and the University Digital Conservancy (UDC) in relation to the copy of record for dissertations and theses. ProQuest had been the repository of the copy of record, but they were allowing practices that did not align with University policy and best practices, such as allowing students to edit the dissertation, requesting a permanent embargo, or removing the dissertation completely. Partly in response to these concerns, policy changes three years ago now indicate that the copy of record is to be deposited with the UDC. This aligns with practices of our peer CIC institutions, which have also started working towards implementing an institutional
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Repository (this is UDC in our institution). The software that supports the UDC is being upgraded, and this may add some functionality that could change workflows in ways that meet obligations and are consistent with policy. However, the issue is complicated. There are concerns around managing open access, fulfilling University mandates, acknowledging variation across different disciplinary cultures with respect to open access. In the end, the UDC intends to help fulfill University policy.

GEC members (and the larger graduate education community) expressed some concern with the length of embargoes being approved, and the number of embargoes being requested. Stacia Madsen noted that the number of embargo requests, particularly two-year embargoes, increased when the UDC became the institutional repository. Advisors determine whether or not to approve initial requests. Requests for extensions come through the Graduate School for approval. GSSP would like guidance on how to advise students with regard to requesting extensions.

**Question:** Should the GEC form a subcommittee on the issue of embargo to discuss what is reasonable in terms of embargo length and guidelines for extensions? The subcommittee would work closely with Moore, Madsen, and others in GSSP/ASR. GEC consensus was that a subcommittee should be formed. Kohlstedt will solicit volunteers.

**Question:** What information is given to students through the advising process that alerts them to the kinds of issues they should consider when deciding whether or not to embargo and for how long? Can we present this to students right away so they have the information and don’t make errors? Could we make it a requirement that students at a certain point in their graduate careers attend a workshop on this issue? The Graduate School should consider how this information would best be presented, and where it best fits into the student experience.

5. **Statement on academic freedom and responsibility (Kohlstedt, handout: Statement on academic freedom and responsibility):** Kohlstedt reviewed the statement, informed people that it is available online on the Graduate School web site, and that it will be presented as part of orientation for graduate students.

6. **GEC election, Spring 2014 (Kohlstedt, handout: Proposed Election Procedures for the Graduate Education Council, UMN programs mapped to CGS “broad categories,” GEC membership according to CGS categories):** The GEC is being asked to revisit the election process to determine if any changes should be made for this spring. Stakeholder groups think it would be more effective to have a more competitive process. Many felt the past elections seemed more like appointments to the GEC than elections. The bylaws are silent on this question. Kohlstedt recommended that the GEC consider having an election with contestation that would also preserve broad representation. This would involve deciding what categories of expertise should be represented on the ballot. Pairs of candidates in these broad areas would then face off against one another. The proposed CGS overarching categories allow us to think about representation in an all-University way, not in terms of collegiate units.

A nominating committee will be constituted comprised of several outgoing GEC members, with perhaps one or two additional people. In addition to vetting the nominees submitted, the nominating committee will also recommend to the GEC how the broad categories should be represented (e.g., should Business Administration be grouped with another category, etc.).
Other issues to consider in terms of representation include: differences in programs with self-paying versus fully supported students, with full-time versus part-time students, with mostly master’s students, etc. The bylaws also specify that we need inter-collegiate and a systems campus representative.

7. Report from the Chair (Kohlstedt):
   a. Update: Special Committee on Graduate Education: Kohlstedt informed the GEC that the report has been made public. It is on the Provost’s web site and will be on the Graduate School web site as well. She will start a preliminary discussion with FCC this Thursday. Please send any thoughts and input on the report. This will be an agenda item for further discussion at the next meeting.

   b. DGS Update (Save the Date: Update for Directors of Graduate Studies): Colleges vary in terms of what they are offering for new DGS orientation. The associate deans for graduate education believe it would be valuable to have the Graduate School offer an Update that would be open to current as well as new DGSs. This will be held on March 4. Graduate School staff no longer know all the DGSs, nor do the DGSs know the staff and staff responsibilities. There will also be a half-day orientation for new DGSs in the summer.

   c. Graduate Student Orientation: Morning of August 26\textsuperscript{th}, 2014. Kohlstedt and Melissa Anderson reviewed the approach of a two-part orientation. The first part would focus on information and resources valuable to new graduate students, such as financial management, advising, etc. This will be followed by event at the beginning of spring term that will go more in-depth on some key issues.

   d. Graduate School Strategic Plan (handout: Graduate School Strategic Plan: 2014-2019): The version of the plan circulated to the GEC has also been given to the Provost, who has shared it with her staff. GEC members should review the plan and provide any feedback to Kohlstedt. GEC members wondered how the Graduate School strategic plan fit with the Special Committee Report, and the Strategic Plans of the President and Provost. We will be better able to answer this question once those processes are completed and the plans released. The Graduate School plan represents what Kohlstedt and her staff believe they can achieve in the timeframe outlined. The Special Committee Report seems to indicate the desire to do more and better, but there is nothing in the report that would lead us to believe it would fundamentally change the direction of what is outlined in the Graduate School strategic plan. It may simply require some reprioritizing. There was a question as to extent will the Graduate School plans to collaborate with COGS in achieving different goals in the plan. Kohlstedt will review the plan with Graduate School staff and determine where COGS should be involved with implementation.

   e. Spring 2014 GPEA (handout: draft description of GPEA): Kohlstedt reviewed the general themes of the Spring Graduate and Professional Education Assembly with GEC members. Themes include teaching and learning with digital tools and resources, creating a digital professional presence/identity, and trends in digital education and research.
f. Academic program organization (handout: PeopleSoft academic structure overview):
Kohlstedt briefly reviewed the current method of organizing academic programs at the University, and queried the group as to whether or not this was a rational way to organize programs. The question is partially based on the concern that those programs currently classified as “first professional” are not covered by University policies related to graduate education. Should they be? They are also not part of the graduate education cost pool. The new IPDES categories place all master’s degrees in one category and group all doctoral degrees. This seems to be the way things are trending nationally. Is this something that would work for our organization? Feedback from GEC members is welcome.

g. 2014-15 DDF nomination slot distribution and changes to the nomination procedure language (handouts: Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship College Nomination Summary, Proposed Changes to DDF Instructions for 2014-2015): Kohlstedt reviewed the DDF nomination slots allocated to colleges for 2014-15, as well as the revised language in the instructions. Ann Masten noted that using the language “will be expected to graduate within 18 months” rather than “will be expected to have defended their dissertation” to refer to which students are eligible for the fellowship excludes all the advanced students from her program because they are required to do an internship while ADB (so will not graduate within the 18 month time frame). This is an unintentional exclusion, and the Graduate School will follow up with appropriate administrators to make sure they are aware that these types of students are eligible.

h. Recruitment fellowship proposal (handout: Description of Recruitment Fellowship Program proposal): The goal of the proposal is to increase the capacity of colleges to take risks with recruitment fellowships through creation of a central risk pool. Buy-in has not been as strong as had been hoped for, but the hope is still that the proposal (and establishment of the risk pool) will move forward. This may also create capacity to ask for more money in central pool. How can we do this in a way that encourages programs to take more risks in order to recruit exceptional students? It does involve having to change the culture around risk-taking.

i. FY15 Quality Metrics Allocation Plan (QMAP) process (handout: December 3, 2012 memo on FY15 QMAP process): Money has been allocated to the colleges based on the process outlined in the December 3rd memo. Kohlstedt is meeting with the collegiate deans to discuss academic analytics and how/why funding was allocated as it was this year. She will be reporting to the Board of Regents on graduate education on February 14th, and would like to show that the Graduate School is being strategic in terms of how it is investing money in graduate education programs. This item will also be on the agenda for the next GEC meeting in order to allow for more discussion.

8. Strategies for “reforming” graduate education (handout: Shifts at Hopkins): This agenda item was tabled for discussion at the next GEC meeting.