Graduate Education Council  
Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, September 16, 2015  
1-3 pm, 433 Johnston  

Present: Jay Austin, Victor Barocas, Phil Buhlmann, Arlene Carney, Liz Davis, Celeste Falcon, Michael Gaudio, Mary Hermes, Emi Ito, Siddarth Iyengar, Deborah Levison, Liz Lightfoot, Linda Lindeke, John Rohde, Henning Schroeder, Alena Talkachova, Carissa Slotterback, Katie Thomas, Char Voight  

1) Welcome New Members and Introductions (Henning Schroeder; Handout: GEC Membership List, Fall 2015). Members introduced themselves and Henning Schroeder briefly reviewed the mission and charge of the GEC.  

2) Request for Volunteers for Fellowship Application Review (Schroeder): Schroeder asked for GEC volunteers for fellowship review. Alison Skoberg is in need of a group of 4-5 faculty she can call upon (primarily in the fall) to review fellowship applications. These competitions are typically small and do not involve many applications. GEC members will contact Char at the end of the meeting if they’re interested. We will also follow up with those GEC members who were not present.  

3) Policy Review and Academic Program Review Subcommittees Update (Schroeder, Liz Davis; Handouts: Charge Letter for Subcommittees):  

Liz Davis (chair) gave a brief update on the work of the Policy Review Subcommittee work last academic year. There are 13 policies that need comprehensive review. None have yet been passed through all the approval channels, but one is nearly ready to go before SCEP. Davis raised the issue whether policy revisions need to be voted upon by the full Faculty Senate. What is the role of SCEP/FCC vis-a-vis GEC? SCEP has requested that the full Senate see the policy revisions, though it was not clear if they expected the Senate to vote. Davis is not clear what the next step in the process should be given this request. Arlene Carney stated that undergraduate policies did not have to go through the full Senate. It’s useful to get previous meeting minutes for each consultative or voting body to understand what the process and protocol was for review and approval. Schroeder emphasized that the subcommittee focus should be on educational goals. Linda Lindeke suggested that perhaps additional people from the Provost’s Office, SCEP, the Policy Library be at the table too when the subcommittee is discussing policy revisions. It was helpful to have such representatives present when the original policies were written.  

DECISION/ACTION: The next step with the policy revisions will be to go to FCC. We will look at the Policy on Policies and consult with Michelle Gross to see if she can explain the rationale for full Senate review and voting. We will also develop a chart with our policies and the review and approval chain for GEC information.  

Academic Program Review: GEC members need to decide if Ameeta Kelekar and Phil Sellew can continue to serve on the subcommittee as ex-GEC members.  

DECISION/ACTION: The consensus was that they should be allowed to serve for the sake of continuity. A similar issue exists with the policy review committee, and the GEC also decided
that Dick Brundage could continue to serve. We will review the bylaws to see if they need to be changed to allow this.

4) External Examiners on Ph.D. Committees (Schroeder, Victor Barocas): Victor Barocas explained the issue. Although policy allows external examiners to serve on committees, they must be entered into PeopleSoft in order for this to happen. This results in non-paying appointments being set up to accommodate reviewers, which Barocas stated was often cumbersome and confusing. Other GEC members stated that they had not experienced the process as cumbersome. It involves setting up a sponsored x-500 account (no cost), that can be deactivated when no longer needed. There was some lingering question about whether merely setting up the x-500 would complete the process.

**ACTION:** GS staff will check with ASR to see what is required in order for an external reviewer to serve on a committee.

5) Update and Discussion: 2015 Internship Initiative and Input on 2016 Competition (Schroeder, Handouts: 2015 Internship Awardees, 2015 RFP for Internship Competition): Schroeder gave a brief overview of the initiative and the objectives. We received 50 applications, of which 23 were selected for the award. A survey will be sent to both interns and host site mentors very soon for their feedback. The application process was very simple and straightforward. For the second round, the Graduate School would like to extend the competition to include research master’s students.

The first round was a student-driven process with student’s submitting their proposals directly. We would like to also extend the initiative to include proposals at a programmatic level (e.g., programs creating an internship pipeline). This would potentially be more sustainable and could attract external funding. For 2016, should we do one or the other? Also, the internships were research-based, not “shadowing” experiences. SCEP was adamant about keeping the research component.

**QUESTIONS:**
- How closely related to the dissertation research was the internship research proposal expected to be? It should support and complement the dissertation research, but it was not intended to be a linear relationship.
- Master’s degree students may not be engaged in research in the same way that doctoral students are, and the internship research may not be as closely tied to the thesis. Can we revise the RFP language so that it is more inclusive of master’s students? Perhaps have a separate call for master’s and doctoral students (GrAD group suggested this also), and a separate one for the program-based approach.
- Is this open to professional students? Schroeder stated that would depend on how we define “professional” in the new post-bac structure. He is less concerned with what program the student is from, and more interested in the quality of the proposal. The first step this year will be to open the competition to research based master’s.
- Did we consider IRB issues, intellectual property issues, 9-month contracts for faculty who are working with the students over the summer? We considered IRB and IP issues,
but not the 9-month faculty contract. We will survey advisors also to see, among other things, how much time they invested in the students related to the internship. We will also do more to communicate with the advisors about the IRB and IP issues so the burden is not solely on the student.

- The turnaround time was very short this year. Can we allow for more time? The call this year will be issued sometime in November, with applications due in late February or early March. This will allow much more lead time.
- Will we retain the priority for non-STEM fields? STEM fields were not excluded this round. Rather the intent was to support internships for students where there is not already strong programmatic support or a pipeline. The intent is to expand opportunities.
- Should the master’s and doctoral applications be reviewed by the same committee at the same time?
- Can we explore the possibility of awarding internship slots that programs could use as a recruitment tool? Barocas stated that being able to offer internship funding to a promising incoming student for their second year would help him attract the best students, particularly for non-standard internships (e.g., exploring policy).

DECISION: There was consensus that the research component should stay, and that we should not lose the student-driven component. However, we will explore the programmatic approach as well this year. We will create separate calls for each of the master’s, doctoral, and programmatic competitions. Master’s and doctoral applications will not be reviewed by the same committee.

6) Update on other APD initiatives (Char Voight, Handouts: 2015 Welcome and Orientation Program, Discovery Across the Disciplines, APD Flyer 2015-2016). Char Voight briefed the GEC on this year’s orientation, as well as some upcoming events and opportunities.

   a. 2015 Welcome and Orientation Program: There were approximately 1,200 master’s/professional and doctoral students at orientation this year. This is about four times the number of students who attended the first orientation two years ago. The model of splitting the day into two parts, one for each group, allowed us to serve more students. We will continue to offer orientation using this model next year, and hope to attract even more students.

   b. Preparing a Successful NSF Grant workshop (September 15 and 17): Scott Lanyon will be offering two workshops on grant writing, focused on the NSF. These are very popular with students, and have been shown to increase the numbers of students applying for the NSF and their success rates. He will also offer a general workshop in the spring.

   c. Discovery Across the Disciplines (October 15): The purpose of this event is to bring together students and postdocs with representatives from the University’s interdisciplinary centers and institutes. Center and institute representatives will be featured, and attendees will have the opportunity to explore the work of these units and network.

7) Possible topics for 2016 GPEA (Schroeder): Schroeder reviewed the potential topics listed below and asked for further suggestions.

b. Promoting Interdisciplinary in Graduate Education.

c. Building and sustaining diversity in graduate education; recognizing implicit bias.

Several members suggested that we identify the “theme,” or priority focus of the GEC for this academic year, and that this could then drive the topic for the GPEA. There was mixed support for different themes, with some GEC members preferring diversity and others preferring the future of the doctoral dissertation. The globalization of graduate education was also suggested as a topic. After discussion, diversity seemed to emerge with the most support.

It was also suggested that perhaps we should have a GEC member participating in the planning of all the major Graduate School annual events (e.g., Orientation, Discovery Across the Disciplines, GPEA, Career Networking Event). This suggestion had support from GEC members.