Present: Anja Bielinsky, Michael Bowser, Jarrod Call, Juliette Cherbuliez, Belinda Cheung, Shawn Curley, Vicki Field, Caroline Hayes, Kristin Kari Janke, Kimi Johnson, Jeff Kahn, Mike Kilgore, Joe Konstan, Greg Lindsey, Christopher Phelan, Henning Schroeder, Char Voight (staff), Pamela Weisenhorn

Guests: Nita Krevans, Alison Skoberg

1. The minutes from the October 5 provisional GEC meeting were approved.

2. The GEC approved moving forward with a Moodle site for communication and archiving; Graduate School staff will work to develop the Moodle site for the next meeting in December.

3. The Council reviewed the revised calls for DDF nominations and IDF applications and discussed the DDF process and criteria.
   a. The following changes were made to the IDF call:
      - Language referring to matching funds from the host institute or center were removed from #4
      - An item #3 was added requesting the student’s cv as part of the application materials
      - The number of anticipated awards was changed from 10-15 to 10 in recognition that fewer students will be funded without matching funds

Discussion IDF:
- Multi-year fellowships will be offered for the first time in 2011-2012. Students must indicate at the time of application whether they are seeking 1 or 2 years of support, though a request does not guarantee the funding for 2 years.
- Decisions will be based on the merit and rankings of the applicants with a cut-off in the number of funded fellowships dependent on the level of funding available.

b. The following revisions were made to the DDF call:
   - We have reconfirmed that the award is intended for a student in the final year of their program. The eligibility criteria no longer states “5th or 6th year” but “final 1-2 years” with an explanation required from a program if a student is in the 6th year or later.
   - Students cannot have incompletes/unfinished coursework.
   - The DGS, department head and associate dean must all sign off on the nomination.

Discussion DDF:
- The proposed process for the future is that allocations will go to the college and not the programs in the college with the number of allocations given to each collegiate unit to be based on the number of eligible programs within the unit. Once awarded their allocations, collegiate units will choose the manner in which they will allocate to departments/programs.
- GSFs will be managed completely within the colleges now and there is no reporting line to the Graduate School as there had been in the past.
- Will transferring the funding for DDFs to the colleges result in cost-pool charges to them and, if so, how should these costs be covered?
- Could we ask the student to include a short (1/2-page) research plan with a timeline so that the committee can use this to judge if a student will complete the proposed project in the time allotted?
- Should information on how well past DDFs have done (e.g., completion, placements) be part of the review committee criteria in evaluating nominees from specific programs? In other words, how well has the investment in the DDF paid off?

**DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS**

- **Decision:** Eliminate both the associate dean and the department head signature requirement from the nomination process.
- **Decision:** Add to the call for nominations the requirement that the student include a timeline and research milestones in the statement of scholarly interests.
- **Decision:** Because collegiate deans have not yet been consulted and because of the potential impact on programs of any substantial changes, committee members agreed that no substantial changes be made to the DDF process for 2011-2012 and that the issue be decided for 2012-2013 by the permanent GEC after consultation, or that Henning make an executive decision about changes for this year only with the permanent GEC making the decision for 2012-2013 and beyond.
- **Action Item:** Determine what, if any, cost-pool impact transferring fellowship funding will have on collegiate units; explore how the U-wide undergraduate research scholarships are budgeted to see if this could be a model.
- **Action Item:** Devise an algorithm to determine how nominations will be allocated to the colleges.

4. **Report from Nita Krevans, Chair, Graduate School Policy Review Committee and discussion**

   a. **Proposed Policy on Committee Membership – Role of Advisor:**
   - Some members of the FCC expressed concern about the use of non-faculty as advisors as allowed for by the current draft of the proposed policy on committee membership. However, a number of collegiate representatives have indicated that they need to retain the flexibility in the current proposed policy to best serve their students.
   - College representatives were polled to determine how many use non-faculty as advisors.
   - The Graduate School Policy Review Committee is considering tightening the requirement for Ph.D.s advisors (must be tenured or tenure-track to serve as advisor) and allowing for more flexibility at the master’s level. Exceptions will also be allowed with approval from the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education.
   - “Faculty” within the context of the draft policy includes adjunct faculty, with “adjunct faculty” defined as individuals with a U of MN HR appointment, including 0% appointments.

   b. **Proposed Policy on DGSs:**
   - The draft of the proposed policy currently states: 1) every program must have a DGS; and 2) the DGS must be a faculty member.
The committee is working to clarify language and other issues, such as what is meant by “every program.” This is not intended, for example, to apply to “first professional degree” programs (there is a defined list and these exempted programs would be listed individually under exceptions) or to preclude large programs from having a full-time P&A person acting supporting the DGS and performing appropriate duties as the designee of the DGS.

GEC members wondered if there was a need to have a University-wide policy on this issue or if collegiate units could devise their own policies and guidelines concerning the DGS and DGS roles and responsibilities. In the absence of a University-wide policy, what would be the impact in terms of graduate student grievances and other issues related to conflict resolution?

5. Determination of membership of permanent GEC (attachment: graduate and professional education organizational chart and selection process for graduate education councils elsewhere)

- Vicki reviewed with committee members the information she gathered on the membership and selection of membership of bodies similar to the GEC at some of our peer research institutions. There is variation in both the committee size and nature of members (e.g., some all faculty, some faculty and students, etc.).
- The following is the excerpt from the work group report recommendation on the GEC:

Excerpt on the GEC from the Final Recommendations on Graduate Education From the Academic Issues and Student Administrative Processes Work Groups Submitted to the Provost on 4/30/2010

Recommendation 4: The provost should charge the vice provost and dean of graduate education to streamline and transform the Graduate School’s six Policy and Review Councils and the Executive Committee into a single, elected Graduate Education Council. As a first step in this process, the vice provost and dean of graduate education should lead the formation of a provisional Graduate Education Council to meet regularly during the 2010-11 academic year. The provisional Council would be responsible for developing criteria and procedures for electing a permanent Graduate Education Council whose members’ terms would commence July 1, 2011, and assisting in the formation of the new Graduate and Professional Education Assembly (see Recommendation 6) as well as fulfilling the duties envisioned for the permanent Council described below.

The permanent Graduate Education Council, chaired by the vice provost and dean of graduate education,1 should meet regularly during the academic year to review and act on: a) proposals for new and changed Ph.D. programs, b) results of internal and external program reviews of these programs; c) the revision and updating of new graduate education policies, and d) providing input to the Graduate and Professional Assembly and its agendas. Other items for consideration by the Council could be submitted by the vice provost and dean of graduate education, did-rectors of graduate study, collegiate deans, or Council members. Agendas and minutes should be recorded and published to enhance transparency.

The permanent Council would be composed of about 15 faculty members from academic discipline-line areas or colleges affiliated with the Graduate School,2 at least one faculty

---

1 This leadership role is consistent with the University’s current practice of the dean chairing the Graduate School Executive Committee and also reflects the standard practice of many of the University’s peer institutions.

2 For example, if the Council’s faculty seats were allocated now by the proportion of disciplines represented by did-rectors of graduate studies in each of the current six Policy and Review Councils (total of 136), the distribution would be: Biological Sciences (3), Education/Psychology (1), Engineering, Physical, Mathematical Sciences (4), Health Sciences (2), Language,
member from an interdisciplinary program and designated as such, and several Council of
Graduate Students representatives. Faculty members would serve for three years on a
rotating, staggered-term basis. Thus, initially, one-third of the faculty members would be
elected for one-year terms, another one-third would be elected for two-year terms, and the
final one-third would be elected for three-year terms. In order to attract the broadest range of
candidates with the highest level of commitment to excellence in graduate education, all
faculty members should be eligible for election. The graduate student representatives would
be elected annually in April by students through the Council of Graduate Students’ executive
officer elections. A collegiate dean and a member of the Academic Health Center Academic
Council would serve as ex-officio members of the Council.

Discussion/Questions:
- Who would select/elect/nominate the members?
- On what basis would seats be earmarked or divided among collegiate units?
- Should collegiate units elect/nominate their own representatives and forward their
  results?

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS ITEMS

Decision: 1) GEC should have broad/diverse representation; 2) members should be
elected.

Action Item: Graduate School staff will provide data on the number of Ph.D. students (to
include all Ph.D. students) by college.

Next meeting: Friday, December 10; 9:00 – 11:00 a.m., 433 Johnston Hall

Literature, and Arts (2), and Social Sciences (3). If the seats were allocated by the proportion of certificates and master’s/doctoral
degrees conferred over the last five years, the distribution would be: Biological Sciences (2), Education/Psychology (2),
Engineering, Physical, Mathematical Sciences (4), Health Sciences (2), Language, Literature, and Arts (1), and Social Sciences