For action:

1. Approval of the notes and minutes from the June 6, 2012, GEC meeting: the notes and the minutes from the 6.6.12 GEC meeting were unanimously approved.

For information

1. Announcements
   - The graduate version of PCAS is now active and available for submission of program changes and new programs.
   - As of two weeks ago, all new graduate education policies are in force and published in the University Policy Library. The work of the Policy Review Committee is now complete, although the Graduate School will continue to monitor policies affecting graduate education at the University of Minnesota.
   - The main UM website now features an article on graduate advising that cites the Spring 2012 Graduate and Professional Education Assembly, which focused on this topic.
   - This fall a search will be conducted for a Graduate School associate dean. The search committee comprises Shawn Curley, Wayne Gladfelter, Michelle Hamilton and Ann Masten.

2. Update on the graduate education transition
   The graduate education transition is in its third and final academic year. Academic Support Resources (ASR) Business Analysts will focus this year on the Academic Progress Audit System (APAS), creating tools to track and report courses and manage a checklist of graduate student milestones. Faculty roles will be included in the database, and an electronic Degree Program Form is being considered. The last piece in the transition process is automation work, moving paper processes to WorkFlowGen to shorten the turnaround time. GEC members requested and will receive from the ASR team a list of current forms and the status of their movement to electronic processes. ASR has started a “College Advisory Group” of senior level college administrators (below the dean level) who meet monthly for communication on student administrative processes.

For discussion

1. Fiscal Year 2014 Quality Metrics Allocation Plan
   There have been no changes in the plan between FY13 and FY14. The central allocations for FY15 must be decided and communicated quickly so programs and colleges can make their own decisions. For FY15, an extended metrics review team of collegiate representatives will meet 3-4 times to consider whether to retain or change the current list of metrics. The final plan for FY15 will be available in fall 2013.

GEC members recommended adding more data to the summary table of Quality Metrics Allocations to College. Information such as student enrollment in a program vs. the number who graduate, time to degree, program size, and whether external funding is available provide a more useful basis for opening a discussion. These funds are allocated to improve the quality of graduate programs.
make requests through the annual compact process for other money. The Provost intends to change the nature of the compact process in that regard. However, GEC members questioned whether the Quality Metrics funds should reward programs that can demonstrate past success (for instance, securing external fellowships) or help those needing improvement. Should there be a separate funding source for assisting new programs that have no track record? Members requested that Provost Hansen be invited to attend the next GEC meeting for a 30-minute conversation on these issues.

2. Possible Topics for Spring 2013 Graduate and Professional Education Assembly (GPEA)
Past Assemblies have addressed issues related to the state of graduate education in the US compared to other countries, program evaluation, and advising. For this spring’s Assembly, the Graduate School is considering the topic of graduate student placement and tracking, or international graduate educational collaborations.

GPEA topic suggestions from committee members:
1. Establishing and maintaining relations with graduate school graduates.
2. The general issue of the process or steps for students not making adequate degree process.
4. The purpose of graduate education: what are we training students for besides teaching?
5. How do we communicate to non-academic audiences?
7. The role and strengths of public institutions in graduate education and their relationship to the corporate world. Thinking about our strengths in relation to the outside world.
8. Communicating between University graduate research communities.
9. Placement, jobs, what constitutes research (where students will find jobs)?
10. Nurturing a sense of community among Ph.D. students at the U of M.
11. Fund-raising facilitated by alumni.
12. Comparison of programs at the U. Looking at common practices and differences—e.g., what does a dissertation look like in different fields?

3. Continued need for GEC Moodle site.
There is an archival record of all GEC meetings on a Moodle site where all meeting materials are posted. Initially, GEC members thought the site would be useful, but few have accessed it. The consensus of the group was to continue to update the Moodle site until January 2013 and to revisit its usefulness at that time.

4. Open discussion
GEC members discussed the current policy on the structure of dissertation preliminary oral exam committees—specifically, who must be on the student’s committee. Current policy stipulates that a student’s advisor must be on the committee, however in practice, some U of M programs do not allow this. Members discussed variations in the role and voting status of the advisor, whether s/he may participate remotely or must be present, and whether University-wide policy would need to be changed to allow programs leeway in determining their own approach.

On a unanimous straw vote, GEC members favored a proposal to allow individual graduate programs to decide the role of the student’s advisor on the preliminary oral exam committee and to determine what constitutes “participation” (as long as this is consistent with “participation” as defined in the policy appendix on conditions for remote participation in examinations).

Henning Schroeder and Nita Krevans (chair of the policy review committee) will consult with the faculty senate chairs before moving forward with any changes, including the possible removal of the FAQ attached to the current policy. The GEC may still have to discuss the number of voting members on a preliminary oral exam committee, which is not addressed in policy at this point.