Minutes

Present: Anja Bielinsky, Michael Bowser, Jarrod Call, Belinda Cheung, Emily Combs, Shawn Curley, Vicki Field, Vicki Hansen, Mike Kilgore, Joe Konstan, Greg Lindsey, Henning Schroeder, Char Voight (staff), Pamela Weisenhorn.

Guests: Frank Blalark, Nita Krevans, John Vollum

Action

1. The minutes and notes were approved as amended (Joe Konstan should be listed as in attendance at the January 21 meeting).

Information

1. Communications regarding graduate education transformation:
   
   a. Henning reviewed with Council members the MOU template for intercollegiate interdisciplinary graduate programs and the email message that accompanied the MOU.
      
      ▪ Programs wishing to remain in the Graduate School for purposes of degree clearance/award must return a signed MOU to the Graduate School by March 31, 2011. Programs that do not meet this deadline will be assigned by the Graduate School to a single, collegiate administrative home due to the need to migrate student records.

      ▪ The signed MOUs will eventually come before the GEC for approval.

      ▪ It will be up to the programs involved to determine how they want to approach the process of writing the MOU. The MOU was sent to the collegiate deans and to the ID reps group. Henning will also send it to the DGSs of affective inter-collegiate ID programs.

   b. Henning reviewed the draft communications with students regarding a change in collegiate home with the GEC. A single, brief email welcome with the technical details concerning the change in collegiate home as an attachment to the email message will be sent to all affected graduate students.

   c. Frank Blalark reviewed the status of the project to incorporate graduate and professional level programs into PCAS. His discussion notes were also attached to a 2.15 memo from the Provost to college deans regarding graduate PCAS (Program and Curriculum Approval System).

2. ASR website for current information on Student Administrative Processes Project (Web site for current information: https://sites.google.com/a/umn/edu/graduate_education/home/processes or, go to www.grad.umn.edu, click on “Get updates and link to resources for the transition here,” click on “Graduate Education: Student Administrative Processes project website (ASR),” click on “Project work in progress” (project work in progress as of Feb 14, 2011, degree progress components)
Frank Blalark reviewed the web site, explained the various policies under examination, and told GEC members how they could view more detailed information on the web site. The intent was to balance people’s desire for detailed information while also not overwhelming people with too many details. The site allows people to drill down to very specific information if they wish.

**Discussion**

1. **Relationship of the GEC to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy; role of the Graduate and Professional Education Assembly**

Henning introduced the email from Tom Brothen requesting feedback from the GEC regarding the relationship of the Council to SCEP and the FCC. After an extended discussion, GEC members concluded that the final decision on the role of the GEC should be made by the Provost in consultation with the FCC and any other appropriate consultative bodies. GEC members will express their preference and recommendation that the GEC act as a provostal advisory body (represented by option #1 in the diagram below right). As a matter of protocol, the Senate and SCEP would receive courtesy communications from the GEC. Henning will communicate with the Provost to see how he views this issue.

Under the previous structure:

![Diagram of previous structure]

Possible Senate Structure with GEC:

![Diagram of possible structure]

2. **Draft charge for the permanent GEC/Bylaws for the GEC**

Following off the previous discussion of the scope and role of the GEC, Henning reviewed the draft GEC charge prepared based on feedback from GEC members and including their comments and questions. Pending the Provost’s decision on the appropriate role and reporting lines for the GEC, Council members recommended slight changes to the existing draft, which will be revisited after Henning’s conversation with the Provost. Council members did not arrive at a consensus on the issue of whether GEC membership should be open to tenured and tenure-track faculty or limited to tenured faculty. The GEC would benefit from broad representation and the diversity and freshness of...
perspectives potentially brought by junior faculty; however, concern was also expressed about the need to protect junior faculty from being pressured into assuming administrative responsibilities that would be too burdensome. The discussion was tabled until the next GEC meeting.

4. Update from the Graduate Education Policy Review Committee

Nita Krevans reported that the policy on eligibility to serve on graduate examining committees had been approved and was now posted in the U-Wide policy library. (see: http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/APPOINTGRADCOMM.html) She also informed Council members that Henning was in the process of sending a memo to the collegiate deans concerning the process for appointing DGSs. At this point, this will not be a policy but an administrative memo. The Policy Review Committee is divided on whether a policy would be appropriate, as is SCEP.

For discussion, Nita focused primarily on the application of graduate credit policy as the GEC had seen and given feedback on the credit requirements policy earlier and had not had time to give more specific thoughts on this portion. She explained that the seemingly “complicated” nature of the section on transfer of credits was necessary because it was intended to accommodate a broad and diverse range of situations, and to provide flexibility so that qualified students seeking to transfer to the U would not be discouraged to do so.

Based on feedback from the GEC, the draft policy will be revised to treat the transfer of credits earned as a non-degree seeking, non-enrolled student in the same manner regardless of whether the credits were earned at the U of MN or at another institution.

Joe Konstan also pointed out an inconsistency in language between the policy on eligibility to serve on graduate examining committees and the draft policy on the application of graduate credits. The latter allows for flexibility in recognizing non-US institutions as equivalent to accredited US institutions (where appropriate); however, the policy on committee eligibility as currently written does not recognize that a faculty member may have earned a Ph.D. or designated equivalent at a non-US institution that is judged equivalent to an accredited US institution. Assuming it was not the intention to exclude faculty who earned their degrees from institutions equivalent to accredited US institutions from serving, the language would need to be changed or the issue addressed in an FAQ or definitions section of the committee policy.

Nita also explained the difference between the ability to transfer course credits and the ability to have a requirement waived because the program judges that you have already met the requirement through previous coursework. The idea is to avoid situations where students have to essentially repeat coursework they have already taken just to meet a requirement.

Next meeting date:

Tuesday, March 22, 1:00 - 3:00 p.m., 433 Johnston Hall