Graduate Education Council
Agenda
Wednesday, May 19, 2015
1-3 pm, 300 Morrill Hall

Present: Jay Austin, Victor Barocas, Lyn Bruin, Phil Buhlmann, Belinda Cheung (staff), Liz Davis, Celeste Falcon, Michael Goldman, Ameeta Kelekar, Keaton Miller, Henning Schroeder (chair), Nicole Scott, Sabrina Trudo, Char Voight (staff), Betsy Wattenberg

Guest: Joe Shultz (Provost’s Office)

1) The Provost’s vision for aligning post baccalaureate education (Henning Schroeder, Joe Shultz). Henning Schroeder introduced Joe Shultz from the Provost’s Office and the issue of the proposed realignment of post baccalaureate education. Shultz stated that the Provost wants feedback on the proposal before moving forward. The proposal is a result of recommendations from the Special Committee on Graduate Education. There are many interpretations of what constitutes graduate education. The proposal seeks to gives a clearer focus and vocabulary. Shultz distributed a chart showing research-based programs on the left side that would be aligned with and served by the Graduate School. The right side listed programs that are more professional, typically governed by codes and standards guided by the industry. In 95% of cases, the alignment on the right or left side is very clear. In cases where there are questions, there will be a process of consultation primarily with the faculty who know the program best. The transition will begin in fall, though not all the pieces will be fully in place. Fundamentally, this will not change the day-to-day experiences for students or faculty.

Discussion Highlights:

• What are the implications for professional programs and the Provost’s role in governing these? There are some things that will span across both programs. There will also be a half-time special assistant to the provost to convene leaders of these programs and look at what policies do and don’t apply to them. Old “first professional” programs are currently not governed by any policy, but are there opportunities? How could U-wide policies be adjusted to meet the needs of these programs?

• There is a U-wide policy limiting non-tenure track faculty on teaching staff. Is that issue part of the discussion? Teaching faculty are either tenured or tenure-track or not. But especially in medical programs, law, there are many who teach who are practicing professionals, recent PhDs, faculty from outside. The policy tried to keep the minimum of 25% tenured or tenure-track to preserve teaching quality. However, for professional programs there are often very qualified people who don’t fit categories. The intention is not to draw a hard line or interfere in programming.

• The policy review subcommittee has struggled with if/how current policies apply to professional policies. It may be easier to have two sets of policies. The proposed model does not preclude establishing two sets of policies, but we do not want to remove policies if
a new one is not yet in place. A second set of policies should be created only where absolutely necessary.

- **Who decides which side of the chart a program falls into? What if there are different programs within a single department that would fall on opposite side of the column? How does this make things simpler for DGS? Doesn’t that mean he or she would have to keep track of potentially two different sets of policies and requirements and report to two different entities?**

2) **Graduate Student Fees and Living Wage** (Andrew McNally; Handouts: GA Salaries Minus Fees, Raising Minimum Net Salaries, Presentation on Livable Wage). Andrew McNally gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the issues of concern to students related to fees charge and a living wage. COGS’ goal is to educate faculty and highlight the key points of concern for students. COGS would like to see fees reduced (this is cheaper than raising salaries) to reduce livability gap. UMN has high fees (3rd) in the CIC, though this depends on the college. Minimum salary without fees and adjusted for cost of living makes UMN second to lowest in CIC. There is a gap of about $3400 between the minimum wage students earn and what the UMN believes students will have to spend per academic year. Students do work to pay off the gap, but this means they are extending their time to degree. Also, graduate students are not using all the services that fees pay for, such as RecWell and Career Services. Lack of a living wage hurts recruitment. COGS would like GEC input in this issue and assistance in getting some action.

3) **Academic and Professional Development**
   - **Professionalization Services for Graduate Students** (McNally, Nicole Scott; Handouts: Online articles: New Job on Campus, What Graduate Advisors Can Do to Help, Career Readiness, Professionalization and Career Development Resources for Graduate Students). Nicole Scott briefly outlined the issue: graduate students need a different type of career counseling and professional development than undergraduates. Advisors are especially not equipped to deal with non-academic career pathways. Some faculty are not taking on new advisees because they cannot provide them with the support they need. At the COGS General Assembly meeting a resolution on professional development was passed. We need to be doing more in this area. NIH and others are pushing for more professional development as a requirement for funding, so we need to make sure we’re keeping pace with our peers.
   - **Internship Pilot Program** (Schroeder; Handouts: Request for Proposals, Competition Results). Henning Schroeder informed the GEC about the pilot internship program and this year’s competition. Twenty-three diverse proposals funded. In the future, he is thinking we may accept program applications in addition to those from students in an attempt to make the effort more sustainable and build a pipeline.

4) **Update: GEC Policy Subcommittee (Liz Davis)** Policy: Liz Davis, chair of the subcommittee, reminded the GEC of the charge and the work that has been accomplished this academic
year. The subcommittee is charged with reviewing all 13 U-wide graduate education policies. The GEC has reviewed and provided feedback on the two policies that were the focus of this year: Credit requirements and application of credits. These still need to go before PCC and PAC.

5) Update: GEC Program Review Subcommittee (Ameeta Kelekar). Ameeta Kelekar, chair of the subcommittee, stated that the draft document before the GEC had not changed significantly since it was last reviewed in March. She asked GEC members to review the draft and send comments. The current criteria are a mix of qualitative and quantitative metrics. There was some discussion around the number of programs that would be “flagged” and the number of criteria of concern that would lead to this flagging. If we’re flagging 25% of programs that’s a problem. How many “flags” should indicate the need for a “closer look”? What do we mean by “a closer look”? A conversation? A report? There is no established procedure at this point to enforce. Could we give departments feedback every year on where they are on all 9 metrics? This would be non-judgmental. The next steps will be to present to the Provost.