Graduate Education Council  
Meeting of  
Friday, January 20, 2012  
2:00-4:00 pm. 433 Johnston Hall  
Minutes

Present: Victor Barocas, Charlie Billington, Dick Brundage, Belinda Cheung (staff), Kathleen Conklin, Shawn Curley, Vicki Field (staff), John Goodge (via Skype), Kimi Johnson, Ameeta Kelekar, Mike Kilgore, Joe Konstan, Karen LaBat, Ann Masten, Chris Phelan, Tim Salo, Henning Schroeder, Frances Vavrus, Char Voight (staff), Elizabeth Wattenberg, Pamela Weisenhorn

Guests: Frank Blalark (ASR), Brad Bostrom (Graduate School), John Vollum (ASR)

Information and discussion
1. Orientation to the GEC (Henning Schroeder): Schroeder gave a brief overview of the history and charge of the GEC, noting that the bylaws and charge were in the meeting packet for members to review at their convenience.

2. Update on graduate education transition (Frank Blalark and John Vollum):
   a. John Vollum began with a brief update on the graduate education transition project in Academic Support Resources (ASR). ASR represents the student administrative processes perspective in the transition process. ASR is moving from paper forms to a digital format for things such as student milestone approvals. These forms will no longer be routed through the Graduate School because the processes and procedures are now controlled locally. There are 16 forms on the docket and ASR is hoping to complete 1 per month with the assistance of input from DGS assistants and groups such as the Registrar’s Advisory Committee (RAC).
   b. ASR is engaging colleges in best practices sharing to assist them with the work they will need to do to develop policies, processes and procedures that have now devolved locally.
   c. Frank Blalark updated the group on several issues:
      i. As part of the transition, all graduate programs were to be moved into an electronic system for catalog production and curricular review and approval. This will be new for spring in the form of a new online catalog.
      ii. Modifications of student systems reports have been finished along with the movement of graduate students into “affinities” with their collegiate units. Staff have been granted access to the Graduate School “drawer” in ImageNow. They are able to view the records now, and a second phase of the work plan will allow them to upload, edit files, etc.

Discussion and action
1. Terms of service for elected GEC members (Henning Schroeder): Because we are in a transition year, members elected in December 2011 will begin serving their terms in January 2012. In the future, terms will be aligned with the academic year. The next election will be spring 2013, with terms for new members beginning fall 2013. Members
elected in 2013 will all serve 3-year terms. Again, because of the transition from a provisional GEC to an elected GEC, one-third of the members elected in December 2011 will serve 1-year terms, one third will serve 2-year terms, and one third will serve 3-year terms. Schroeder reviewed with GEC members a handout outlining the proposed terms (1-, 2- or 3-year) for GEC members and asked for a motion to approve the terms. The proposed terms were unanimously approved by GEC members and will be posted on the GEC website.

2. Proposed meeting dates for spring: Council members were asked to please respond to Toby Greenwald as soon as possible with their availability for the proposed spring meeting dates.

Discussion

1. Update from the Graduate Education Policy Review Committee (Nita Krevans): Krevans gave an overview of the charge and history of the Policy Review Committee for the benefit of new GEC members. The committee was charged by the Faculty Senate to draft University-wide graduate education policies when collegiate status was removed from the Graduate School, resulting in the nullification of the Graduate School Constitution. Krevans reviewed the policies that have been approved to date and are now in effect, and the policies that are currently in the review process (admission, readmission, post-baccalaureate certificates). She noted that the timeline for required compliance with new policies may not align with the approval of the policy in cases where programs need more time to make adjustments (e.g., the requirement to use the central admission application system or to have approval for an exception to the requirement). GEC members provided input on the policies presented.

2. Update on restructuring of graduate education financing (Henning Schroeder):
   a. Schroeder gave an overview of the reform process that began in 2009 with the goal of improving the governance system with the establishment of the GEC. In addition to the GEC, there are several other stakeholder groups, including the collegiate representatives group which meets monthly, and the interdisciplinary collegiate representatives group which meet several times per year. These bodies are not part of the formal governance structure, but are consultative groups for the transition period. The second goal of the transition was to streamline the operation of the Graduate School for efficiency and cost-savings.
   b. Graduate education financing restructuring is still in transition. Questions remain regarding what should remain central versus decentral in terms of avoiding duplication and cost-ineffectiveness. One question has been what happened to former first-year fellowship and block grant funds? The $3.5 million from the first-year fellowships were moved from the Graduate School cost pool and directed to the individual collegiate units based on historical parameters (e.g., colleges that formerly had many fellowships received more funding relative to those that had fewer). The goal was to be revenue neutral. GEC members asked for clarification on the criteria for FY13 allocations and expressed concerns that allocating to the collegiate, rather than program, level would make it difficult to
track how funds were being spent. There was also concern about the difficulty of
decision making at the collegiate level in terms of deciding which programs to
support and at what levels. In addition, several Council members wondered why
there should be both a quality metrics process for allocating funds and the
budget compact process. The suggestion was made that the two be connected
in the future.