Present: Richard Brundage, Belinda Cheung (staff), Kathleen Conklin, Shawn Curley, Vicki Field (staff), John Goodge (via Skype), Kimi Johnson, Mike Kilgore, Joe Konstan, Tim Salo, Henning Schroeder, Char Voight (staff), Elizabeth Wattenberg

Guests: Brianne Keeney

For action:
Approval of the notes and minutes from the May 21, 2012, GEC meeting: The notes and minutes were approved unanimously

For discussion and action:
Proposals for new, changed, and discontinued academic programs (list of review subcommittee members attached)
1. Proposal to add a new interdisciplinary minor in Integrative Leadership for master’s and doctoral degrees: The subcommittee previously voiced some concerns and questions about the proposal. These have been addressed in meetings with the proposers. The target student population in the new minor are those in HHH, Carlson, CEHD, and Public Health, although the program will be open to any interested students. Richard Brundage on behalf of the subcommittee recommended approval. Brianne Keeney was available to respond to any additional questions. The GEC voted and the proposal was approved unanimously.

2. Proposal to add a subplan in STEM Education for the Ph.D. degree in Education, Curriculum and Instruction: Subcommittee members met with the proposers. Committee members chose not to revisit many of the questions they originally had when initially reviewing the proposal, but instead to focus on the macro level questions such as whether or not there is a need for such a subplan, etc. The subcommittee members determined there was a need, and recommended that the proposal be approved. The GEC voted and the proposal was approved unanimously.

For information:
Updates
1. Temporary replacements on GEC for 2012-13: The GEC is in need of several replacements for next year (Victor Barocas, Jigna Desai, Ed Schiappa, Chris Phelan). Discussions have been on-going about the process, but no decisions have been made. Potential replacements will be reported to the GEC at the next meeting in August. The consensus of the GEC is that they (GEC members) are available to advise Henning if and when he should seek their advice on replacements, but that he should name these.

For discussion:
1. Membership of the Graduate School Academic Grievance Committee: Joe Konstan is the chair of the grievance committee. He has met with an individual who has filed a grievance and will meet with the other party involved in the grievance complaint soon. The question was raised as to whether he wished to involve additional committee members in the process at this point. If the grievance proceeds to the point of a formal hearing, Konstan would estimate that this would come before the GEC in August or
perhaps early September. At the last meeting, GEC members agreed that the entire GEC would be available to hear grievances. There are not enough people to staff even 2 grievances per year if we use a completely volunteer approach (e.g., GEC members volunteering for specific cases). Can we simply adopt a model whereby the grievance committee is a committee of the whole with the stipulation that everyone is exempted from serving on the grievance committee for their first year of GEC service? It was agreed that this would be an acceptable approach. Students will be selected separately as representatives, and the GEC will ignore the "no service during the first year stipulation" with students to allow for flexibility and avoid a situation where there would be only one student who could act as a potential committee member. Language can also be added to say that, in unusual circumstances and at the discretion of the dean, invitations can be issued to former GEC student representatives if there is a conflict of interest with the current students on the GEC.

2. Results of the 2012-13 Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship competition and preliminary plan for next year: There was $2 million more in funding for the competition this year compared to previous years. The review committee did not use all the available funding for the fellowships because they did not believe the quality of the applicants/nominees outside of the top tier warranted the awards. The remaining fellowship funds will be used for travel awards for those who received DDFs. The recipients are aware of this, but have not had the details communicated to them as yet. This year there were 137 DDFs funded out of 271 nominations submitted. GEC members wanted to have more information on the decisions of the review committee not to award all of the funds. It was decided that the chair and/or representatives from the committee should be invited to a future GEC meeting to discuss this issue. It was also suggested that perhaps the committee could be asked to rank the nominees, but leave the decision about how far down the list to fund fellowships to the vice provost and dean.

3. Initial conversation about roles and expectations for GEC review of proposals for new and changed academic programs.

GEC members discussed the proposal review process in light of the recent experiences of several subcommittees. Subcommittee members asked for more clarity on the scope and process of reviewing proposals for new and changed programs and would like more guidance on this issue. For instance, should information on such things as the budget and the marketing plan be a part of the subcommittee’s review process, or should the review focus primarily on the academic merits and potential outcomes? It is not clear what the GEC has, or should have, to say around issues such as faculty staffing levels, financial sustainability, etc. The administrative issues could be considered separately for those proposals deemed to have enough merit to proceed in the process.

Several suggestions were made concerning the review process:

- As part of the process, the subcommittee should meet with the proposers first before presenting any recommendations to the GEC.
- The first meeting with the GEC should be without external visitors so that there can be a frank discussion of the merits of the proposal. Any issues that still remain open questions would then be passed on for consideration by the vice provost and dean, who would decide whether these were significant issues or not.
- A matrix outlining roles and responsibilities in the process should be developed.
- Previously, there was an associate dean in the Graduate School who would ensure that the proposal was ready for review by the P&R Councils. The GEC should explore how to restore this functionality in the review process.
- Reasonable deadlines for proposal submission should be established so that workload can be managed and the GEC does not have to rush the development and review of a proposal.
- If the purpose of the GEC review is, in part, to have an independent (outside the collegiate unit) review of issues such as conflicts, redundancy, etc., then this analysis should happen before the proposal comes to the GEC. An executive summary could be sent to the GEC as well as to the collegiate associate deans, so they are given advance notice and are able to raise any issues they may have with such things as duplication.
- “Administrative” and “academic” issues should be separated, reserving the administrative issues for the deans as this is their charge. However, there would need to be agreement as to what constitutes an academic versus an administrative issue (e.g., is a program name change academic or administrative?).

The GEC asked Graduate School staff to take the previous guidelines and formulate something new per the discussion.