

Draft Report — Committee on Graduate Education

“Recommendations on the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education at the University of Minnesota”

April 24, 2009

Committee Membership

Steven L. Crouch, Dean, Institute of Technology, Committee Chair

David A. Bernlohr, Distinguished McKnight University Professor and Head, Department of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, and Biophysics, College of Biological Sciences

Boyd D. Cothran, Vice President, Council of Graduate Students, Ph.D. candidate, Department of History, College of Liberal Arts

William K. Durfee, Vice Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee; Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology

Timothy J. Ebner, Professor and Head, Department of Neuroscience, Medical School

Lincoln A. Kallsen, Budget Officer, Office of Budget and Finance

Timothy J. Kehoe, Distinguished McKnight University Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Economics, College of Liberal Arts

Kristi L. Kremers, President, Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, Ph.D. student, Department of Educational Policy and Administration, College of Education and Human Development

Nita Krevans, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies, College of Liberal Arts

Mindy S. Kurzer, Professor, Department of Food Science and Nutrition, College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences, Director of Graduate Studies, Nutrition Graduate Program

Vince R. Magnuson, Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration, University of Minnesota Duluth

Jennifer J. McComas, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development

Robert B. McMaster, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education

James A. Parente, Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Henning Schroeder, Professor and Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, College of Pharmacy

Kathryn A. Sikkink, Regents Professor, Department of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts

Cathrine A. Wambach, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy, Associate Professor, Department of Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, College of Education and Human Development

Elizabeth V. Wattenberg, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Division of Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health

I. Executive Summary

Committee Charge

The Committee on Graduate Education was given its initial charge by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan on February 20, 2009. Originally, the charge was to make recommendations for implementing the plan for restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education at the University of Minnesota that had been announced to the University community on February 9. At the outset the committee was referred to as the Implementation Team, but this name was eventually changed to Committee on Graduate Education — hereafter simply “the committee” — to reflect an evolving revision of the original charge, including the option of recommending a streamlined version of the current Graduate School instead of a new Office of Graduate Education, as called for in the February 9 restructuring plan.

Meetings: Procedures, Consultation

The committee held eight two-hour meetings between February 27 and April 17. These meetings were devoted to interviewing key Graduate School staff, discussing issues that had been identified by one or more committee members, reviewing the current budget for the Graduate School, and considering options for restructuring. The last two meetings were dedicated to a discussion of the committee’s recommendations and review of the draft report.

Members of the committee consulted broadly with the University community through meetings with individuals, directors of graduate studies (DGSs) and their assistants, department heads and chairs, Graduate School Staff, and students. In addition, three open meetings were held: one on the West Bank, one on the East Bank, and one on the St. Paul Campus. The latter two open meetings were Webcast.

The committee approached its assignment by asking (or otherwise seeking answers to) the following questions:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current arrangement (i.e., the existing Graduate School operations)?
2. Which activities/functions of the Graduate School should be administered centrally, and by which office?
3. Which activities/functions should be taken over by the colleges?
4. Which activities/functions should be discontinued?
5. What activities/functions that are not currently being done should we be doing?

These questions were used to frame the conversations at the open meetings as well as to guide the committee discussion throughout its deliberations.

Based on the totality of responses and suggestions received by the committee, 15 specific recommendations were developed for consideration by the University administration. It is the committee’s understanding that the University community will have ample opportunity to comment on these recommendations before any decisions are made about the restructuring of graduate education at the University of Minnesota.

II. Recommendations

Based on conversations within the University community, as well as examination of administrative structures for graduate education at peer institutions, the committee concluded that a strong, central administrative entity is essential for oversight and support of quality graduate programs. At most universities this central entity is a Graduate School or a combined Graduate School and Office of Research.

The committee considered three possible organizational structures for administering graduate education at the University of Minnesota. The first of these is an Office of Graduate Education, led by a Vice Provost and Dean, and administratively housed within the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, as proposed in the February 9 restructuring plan. The second possibility is a recombination of the Graduate School with the Office of the Vice President for Research, led by a Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. Finally, the third possibility is a streamlined version of the existing Graduate School, henceforth called the “Graduate College” to differentiate it from the current Graduate School.

In discussing these possibilities, the committee decided not to recommend a combined Graduate School and Office of the Vice President for Research. The committee reasoned that the current Office of the Vice President for Research has done an excellent job of focusing attention on critical research-related matters such as technology transfer, regulatory issues, and expanded research opportunities, and the additional work associated with management of graduate education would inevitably detract from these efforts. In addition, it would probably be necessary to appoint a senior associate dean to oversee graduate education activities (as is done, for example, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Pennsylvania State University), so the leader of the office (the Vice President and Dean) would be more involved with research matters than with graduate student education. The committee does recommend, however, that certain current activities of the Graduate School most related to the research function of the University, including the Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship program and McKnight Awards be moved to the Office of the Vice President for Research.

The committee is divided on the question of whether the central entity responsible for oversight of graduate education at the University of Minnesota should be an Office of Graduate Education or a Graduate College (as defined above). In both cases the operations would be led by a Vice Provost and Dean who reports to the Provost and is responsible for oversight and leadership of issues related to graduate education. In the case of an Office of Graduate Education, however, the operation would be an administrative unit, parallel in structure to the existing Office of Undergraduate Education, and not an academic unit comparable to other colleges and professional schools. Resolving this issue will require University-wide consultation.

While the distinction might seem minor, some committee members (and many people in the University community) feel strongly that the presence of a Graduate College (School) gives graduate education at the University of Minnesota a more recognizable identity among peer institutions. Other members of the committee believe that the name and reporting structure are less important than the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the unit responsible for oversight of graduate education functions.

Regardless of the administrative structure adopted for graduate education at the University of Minnesota, the committee recommends that a strong component of faculty and student governance be maintained. Faculty and student governance is particularly important in relation to matters of program oversight and review, policy, and allocation of student and faculty fellowships. Either structure, however, will need to be efficient and accountable in delivering excellent graduate education. While the Graduate College/Office will need to be more flexible and streamlined than the current Graduate School, the committee recommends that experienced Graduate School staff should be employed in the new unit.

General Recommendations

Central Oversight. The Graduate College/Office should administer the following services and programs:

- Graduate fellowships
- Admissions
- Student services, including conflict resolution, and student records
- Communications/Web presence
- Governance: Policy and Review Councils, Council of Graduate Students (COGS)
- Temporary graduate faculty appointments
- Career services
- Postdoctoral services
- New Director of Graduate Studies orientation
- Interdisciplinary graduate programs and initiatives
- Commencement for programs overseen by the Graduate College/Office

Central Oversight. The following services should be administered by other central University offices:

- Diversity; Community of Scholars; DOVE Fellowships
- Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship
- Faculty McKnight Awards
- 21st Century Fund
- University Press

Central Oversight. The following programs should be added to the Graduate College/Office's portfolio:

- Advising standards and training programs for University faculty
- Metrics for measuring progress in excellence of graduate education

Either Central or Local Oversight. Terminal (professional) master's and applied doctorates:

- Optional college control for these degrees
- Optional campus control (Duluth) for these degrees

Local Oversight. The following services should be provided by colleges or programs:

- Development (in cooperation with the University of Minnesota Foundation)
- Student orientation
- Ongoing graduate faculty appointments (automatic with tenure line)
- Award degrees
- Program review

Specific Recommendations (see Section IV for details)

Central Services

1. University-wide faculty committees are especially important in the award of graduate fellowships and block grants. A faculty committee should be charged with reviewing the current allocation processes for these awards, with a view to maintaining merit criteria while making the processes more efficient, transparent, and accountable, and recommending how they should be administered. This committee should be convened at the start of Fall Semester 2009 and asked to submit its recommendations in time for the new allocation processes to take effect during the 2009–10 academic year, for awards made for 2010–11.
2. Work should begin as soon as possible on development of a Web-based graduate admissions system using program-specific “smart forms” that eliminate any duplication or unnecessary information in the admissions process and facilitates other process improvements. The key feature of the system would be a greater focus on the needs of individual graduate programs. Models for such a system are in place at both the Pennsylvania State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and these should be examined carefully before designing a system for the University of Minnesota. Ideally, ApplyYourself would be amended to facilitate such information. However, if ApplyYourself cannot be efficiently and cost-effectively updated, other systems should be considered when the University’s contract with the ApplyYourself vendor expires in 2012.
3. Work should also begin as soon as possible on evaluation of student services processes and development of a University-wide electronic system for initiating and/or revising, approving, and archiving student program plans, examination clearances, and other student records. (The committee understands that the Graduate School had started work in this area but suspended it because of other staffing priorities.) The Graduate College/Office should only be involved in reviewing forms, electronic or otherwise, where there are clear additions to value; primary academic oversight should be the responsibility of the Directors of Graduate Studies and the faculty.
4. The diversity functions within the Graduate School Diversity Office (GSDO) should be moved to the central University Office of Equity and Diversity (OED). Within OED, significant resources and efforts must be directed toward increasing diversity in graduate education, including an office and personnel dedicated solely to this goal. This office will

need to work closely with the Graduate College/Office, and an evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of the move should be conducted after the first full year of operation.

5. The committee recommends that the faculty awards programs currently administered by the Graduate School — the Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship program, and the Distinguished McKnight University Professorship and the McKnight Land-Grant Professorship programs — be transferred to the Office of the Vice President for Research. Involvement of University-wide faculty selection committees in the selection processes for these awards is crucial, and must be maintained.
6. Interdisciplinary graduate programs must be protected. The Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate College/Office should be responsible for facilitating conversations among the deans of units involved in all cross-college programs, resulting in formal memoranda of agreement regarding financial support for each program. Regular revenue streams and special funds are needed to support these programs, especially those whose students and faculty are on different campuses. Allocation of funds should be merit-based and competitive and the criteria for funding should be transparent. The Graduate School's Office of Interdisciplinary Initiatives should be maintained and supported by the new Graduate College/Office.
7. A centralized Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPDA) must be maintained based on the current and projected needs of the university. Postdocs are likely to play an increasing role in the research environment of the University in the future and a single-site organization is likely to be the best organizational structure. Moreover, the OPDA currently shares several structural functions with the Graduate School such that whatever unit manages graduate education should also include the OPDA.
8. Based on information for graduate school operations of comparable size at three peer institutions (Illinois, Penn State, and Wisconsin), the committee believes that it should be possible to reduce the staff complement of our current Graduate School by approximately 20 percent. A further reduction should be possible if terminal master's and applied doctorate degree programs are taken over by colleges. In suggesting this substantial downsizing, however, the committee wishes to emphasize that due regard must be given to maintaining acceptable levels of service to faculty, staff, and students in the graduate programs.
9. The quality and consistency of graduate and professional student advising, including supervision of research and teaching assistants, must be improved. The committee asks that the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate College/Office form a committee to study this issue further, work with Center for Teaching and Learning staff to help build curriculum, implement an advisor training program, create measures to evaluate the success of training, and continue to work with the Academy of Distinguished Teachers on this topic.
10. The quality of graduate education at the University must be measured and shared with the University community and administration. The new Graduate College/Office should be responsible for compiling these data in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). Suggested metrics are listed in Section IV, and are compiled primarily

from the two strategic positioning task force reports on graduate education (2006). Ultimately, it is the faculty members who are responsible and accountable for the quality of graduate education in their programs, and the compilation of these data is essential for demonstrating that quality is, in fact, being maintained.

11. Faculty governance over matters of graduate education via the Policy and Review (P&R) Councils should be maintained, with administrative assistance from the Graduate College/Office. However, the Council review process is considered cumbersome and is often an impediment to rapid and effective change. The functions and processes linked to the Councils should be streamlined by removing the most minor, routine items from the review process and using subcommittees and e-votes to speed evaluation of more substantial proposals.
12. The Graduate College/Office should be responsible for conducting an all-University commencement ceremony for the graduate programs it administers, but there should be only one such ceremony each year rather than the two ceremonies currently held by the Graduate School.

Decentralized Services

13. Colleges should have the option — but not be required — to administer terminal (professional) master's and applied doctorate degree programs in-house. Other master's degree programs (i.e., M.S. and M.A. degrees) are often preparatory to the Ph.D. and should be administered centrally by the Graduate College/Office.
14. Graduate degree programs at the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) should continue to be administered by a central authority on the Twin Cities campus, whether this is an Office of Graduate Education or a Graduate College. Terminal master's degree programs at UMD may optionally be administered locally.
15. Before any graduate program that is currently under the auspices of the Graduate School is moved to a college, an analysis should be performed of the implications this has for the college's cost pool charges. At a minimum, this analysis should include a review of the original fund transfers that central administration made to the college when the new budget model was adopted in 2005–06. At that time, revenue-neutral adjustments were made to each college's budget to pay the initial cost pool charges, based on the prevailing head count of students and Graduate Faculty.

III. Committee Charge, Procedures, Consultation

Charge to the Committee

The Committee on Graduate Education was given its initial charge by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost E. Thomas Sullivan on February 20, 2009 (Appendix 1). Originally, the charge was to make recommendations for implementing the plan for restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education at the University of Minnesota that had been announced to the University community on February 9 (Appendix 2). At the outset the committee was referred to as the Implementation Team, but this name was eventually changed to Committee on Graduate Education — hereafter simply “the committee” — to reflect an evolving revision of the original charge.

A public announcement of the revised committee charge was made to the University community on March 4 in an e-mail message from Provost Sullivan to the Graduate Faculty, Graduate School Staff, and Graduate Students (Appendix 3). In this message, Provost Sullivan said that “... the committee has broad and flexible discretion to make recommendations regarding how to accomplish the restructuring within the context of its general charge to submit recommendations on all relevant issues, whether or not specifically identified in either the February 9 plan or the February 20 charge memo.”

A further evolution of the original committee charge was mentioned to the Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC) by both Provost Sullivan and President Bruininks on March 26. An excerpt of the minutes from that meeting of the FCC is reproduced in Appendix 4. Provost Sullivan indicated that “... where and how the pieces [of the current Graduate School] should go are open to discussion”; President Bruininks reiterated this point by saying that he was open to the possibility of a “leaner, meaner” Graduate School rather than an office of graduate education in the Provost’s Office, as called for in the February 9 restructuring plan. Subsequently, President Bruininks and Provost Sullivan told two of the committee members (Crouch and Parente) that the committee could consider a scaled-down, streamlined version of the current Graduate School among its options.

Committee Deliberations and Consultation Process

The committee held eight regularly-scheduled, two-hour meetings between February 27 and April 17. Provost Sullivan addressed the group at its first meeting, and President Bruininks joined the discussion at another. Parts of several of the meetings were devoted to presentations by invited guests and the remaining time was spent discussing issues that had been identified by one or more committee members, reviewing the current budget for the Graduate School, and considering options for restructuring. The last two meetings were dedicated to a discussion of the committee’s recommendations and review of the draft report.

Members of the committee consulted broadly with the University community through meetings with individuals, directors of graduate studies (DGSs) and their assistants, department heads and chairs, Graduate School staff, and students. In addition, three open meetings were held: one on the West Bank, one on the East Bank, and one on the St. Paul Campus. The latter two open meetings were Webcast. A listing of the individuals and groups consulted is given in Appendix 5.

Questions about the Handling of Current Graduate School Activities/Functions

The committee approached its assignment by asking (or otherwise seeking answers to) the following questions:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current arrangement (i.e., the existing Graduate School operations)?
2. Which activities/functions of the Graduate School should be administered centrally, and by which office?
3. Which activities/functions should be taken over by the colleges?
4. Which activities/functions should be discontinued?
5. What activities/functions that are not currently being done should we be doing?

A discussion of the committee's findings is presented below for several categories of activity currently handled by the Graduate School.

IV. Detailed Recommendations and Discussion

Graduate College/Office Services

1. Fellowships, Block Grants, and Other Student Financial Support

Of all the topics addressed by the committee, the Graduate School Fellowships and unit block grant programs generated the strongest views and most vigorous discussion, not only among committee members, but also by University faculty, graduate students and staff in public forums, private meetings, and one-on-one discussions. Clearly, this is one of the most critical functions of the current Graduate School, and serious thought must be given to the future of these activities. Opinions differed as to whether these activities should be positioned at the central or collegiate levels. For instance, some argued that the colleges have the best knowledge of departmental excellence, and the block grants should be administered at that level. Others argued for continued central administration for the purpose of monitoring overall quality.

These are large programs. In 2008-09 \$8.1 million was allocated for Graduate School Fellowships and \$4.6 million for block grants to units. These amounts exclude the additional \$2.3 million fellowship matching from the 21st Century match and \$1.8 million for endowed student fellowships. The Graduate School Fellowship plus block grant programs, totaling \$12.7 million, is the largest part (44 percent) of the entire Graduate School budget. The funding for the two programs comes from the Graduate School's central cost pool Operations and Maintenance (O&M) allocation, which is sourced from the collegiate units.

The programs are vital to the operation of many of our best graduate programs and are a critical source of support for a large number of graduate students. No consensus could be reached by the committee on the correct administrative home and process for fellowships and block grants. There was consensus, however, that whatever mechanism is put in place for allocation of these funds, it should be efficient and transparent and allow for accountability on the part of those making the decisions. There was also strong agreement that an all-University, merit-based fellowship program must be retained at some level.

The committee recommends that a new committee be formed specifically to examine fellowships, block grants, and other forms of student support. This committee should have, at a minimum, faculty and graduate student representation and should gather input from a broad range of University stakeholders. The committee should be given a broad charge to examine: (1) the optimal method to attract the best graduate students to the University of Minnesota; (2) the appropriate split of funds between the various fellowships (Graduate School Fellowships and Doctoral Dissertation Fellowships, for instance) and block grants; (3) the best method to award endowed fellowship funds for continuing graduate students; (4) the method through which fellowship nomination slots and block grant allocations are made; (5) methods to determine the short-term and long-term effectiveness of the fellowship program and block grants in furthering the goals of the University of Minnesota; (6) faculty and staff workload to administer the programs; and (7) the creation of methods to make the awards process and fellowship evaluation transparent to not only current faculty leaders, but future decision-makers as well.

The committee should be charged with producing a report containing recommendations by November 1, 2009 (if not earlier) to be implemented for the fall 2010 entering class. In

forming its recommendations, the committee should be cognizant of the annual calendar for the fellowship award process and the biennial University of Minnesota compact budget process.

2. Admissions/Transcripts/I-20s

Several years ago, the Graduate School adopted a Web-based application-for-admission system called ApplyYourself. A contract has been signed with the vendor for this software that runs through 2012. The committee heard mixed reviews about the use of this system by individual graduate programs. Everyone agrees that an on-line application system is important, but faculty and staff in some programs are frustrated by elements of duplication and redundancy that exist in the off-the-shelf version of the current system. It is possible to purchase program-specific application modules from ApplyYourself (Stanford University, for example, has done this), but two applications would then still be required, one for the Graduate School and one for the program.

The committee recommends that work should begin as soon as possible on development of a Web-based graduate admissions system using program-specific “smart forms” that eliminate any duplication or unnecessary information in the admissions process and facilitates other process improvements. The key feature of the system would be a much greater focus on the needs of individual graduate programs. Models for such a system are in place at both the Pennsylvania State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and these should be examined carefully before designing a system for the University of Minnesota. Ideally, ApplyYourself would be amended to facilitate such information. However, if ApplyYourself cannot be efficiently and cost-effectively updated, other systems should be considered when the University’s contract with the ApplyYourself vendor expires in 2012.

A separate question concerns the handling of applications for the professional programs currently administered through the Graduate School. Several colleges have expressed a desire to run these programs in-house, which would mean that the admissions process would be handled exclusively by the colleges. The committee believes that colleges should have the option — but not be required — to manage terminal (professional) master’s and applied doctorate degree programs in-house. Other master’s degree programs (i.e., M.S. and M.A. degrees) are often preparatory to the Ph.D. and should be administered by a central entity, whether a streamlined version of the current Graduate School or a new Office of Graduate Education.

Graduate programs at the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) should be handled in the same way as those on the Twin Cities campus. That is, UMD should have the option of administering professional programs locally but their other degree programs should continue to be administered by the central entity responsible for oversight of graduate education.

The authenticity of transcripts from international institutions is currently certified by experienced staff in the Graduate School. Transcript certification is an example of an activity that must be handled at a central level; colleges are not in a good position to take on this work. It might be possible, however, for the University of Minnesota to out-source some of this activity, but this suggestion would require an evaluation at a level that is too specific for the present committee.

An important attribute of the ApplyYourself student application system is that I-20 forms for international applicants are automatically processed as soon as the students have been admitted. The committee considered the possibility that I-20 forms might instead be issued by the International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) office in the Office of International Programs, but rejected this idea because of the efficient linkage that exists between ApplyYourself and the issuance of I-20 forms. This feature must be preserved in any successor to ApplyYourself.

3. Student Services

Included in this category are items such as degree program approval, degree program modifications, committee appointments, thesis proposal forms, preliminary and final examination forms, and degree clearance. The committee makes the following recommendations for student degree management:

- All degrees administered by the Graduate College/Office must use the single set of electronic forms being developed, and those forms should be as easy to use as possible.
- The Graduate College/Office should retain institutional oversight for degree programs meeting agreed-upon institutional rules and standards (e.g., number of credits in the program vs. outside the program).
- The Graduate College/Office should only be involved in reviewing forms, electronic or otherwise, where there are clear additions to value. Primary academic oversight is the responsibility of the faculty and DGSs. The College/Office's focus should be on emerging programs, interdisciplinary programs, and programs that have had difficulty conforming to established rules and standards.
- Any electronic system should leverage previous institutional investments wherever possible (e.g., UM-Reports, MyU portal, data warehouse, workflow, etc.).
- Students in all degree programs administered by the Graduate College/Office should be cleared for graduation by the appropriate DGS and the Graduate College/Office.

[Note: the Graduate School has been working on a Communication Mapping Project, which includes consulting with DGS assistants to create goals for conversion of student tracking to a paperless system. The implementation of a paperless system through the Graduate School Degree Management Project is currently on hold.]

In short, the institution must review the business processes surrounding student services, from admissions through degree clearance and graduation, and evaluate those processes for efficiency, effectiveness, and satisfaction from both the faculty and student perspective. The Graduate College/Office must then begin immediately to develop an all-University electronic system to implement these processes and modernize student record processing and storage (see Section 4, Student Records).

4. Student Records

The Graduate School Office of System Data Management (OSDM) has three significant institutional functions, along with administrative responsibilities. These are: (1) serving as the "owner" of data on graduate students and programs and recommending how best to capture,

store, and disseminate data on graduate students and programs for the University; (2) being the functional contact for enterprise-level applications related to graduate students, such as PeopleSoft student and HR applications; and (3) supporting process improvement and technology applications run by the Graduate School for the benefit of the University system, such as ApplyYourself for admissions, maintaining data for graduate student portals, maintaining lists of graduate faculty, managing Web surveys of graduate students and programs, and maintaining the school's Web presence. In addition, OSDM provides desktop support for Graduate School staff.

Graduate student records currently are maintained by the Graduate School for fifty years following the student's graduation date. Records also are maintained for students who matriculated, but did not complete degrees and for students who applied to the University but did not matriculate. These timelines have been established with the Office of the General Counsel. Records currently in storage and future records will need to be maintained by the Graduate College/Office. However, it is important to note that the General Counsel is willing to entertain slightly shorter storage timelines.

5. Conflict Resolution

At both the open meetings and meetings with units, the committee heard appreciative comments about the role the Graduate School staff plays in helping units address complicated issues presented by students. Since DGSs rotate in and out of their positions, they rely on the Graduate School staff to help them understand their options when they work with individual students to solve problems. The committee also heard students report that the Graduate School staff worked with them individually to solve problems encountered in working with their advisors and departments.

A 2007 survey conducted by the Student Conflict Resolution Center found that about 19 percent of graduate student respondents reported an experience of harassment (http://www.sos.umn.edu/stafffaculty/Survey_Summary_AcadInc_UMNTC.pdf). Among the students who reported harassment, 83 percent indicated that the incident interfered with their ability to work and 44 percent considered leaving the University. Most students did not report their experience to another faculty member for fear of retaliation of some kind. The results of this survey, as well as the Council of Graduate Students survey described on pp. 14–15 support the conviction of many faculty and students that the University should maintain central support for students who encounter problems within their programs. The committee recommends that an appropriately-sized staff be identified to continue this work in the new Graduate College/Office.

6. Communications/Web

Basic Web Services — The current Graduate School Web site is well-designed and easy to navigate. Top-level menus are customized for each category of user (applicant, current student, DGS, etc.). The site also collects and maintains up-to-date links with essential services outside of the Graduate School, such as the Graduate Assistant Employment Office (Office of Human Resources) and counseling services (Boynnton, University Counseling and Consulting Services). Admissions staff offer consultation services to programs to assist them in improving department or program Web sites as recruiting tools for applicants. The committee believes that

all these services should continue.

At the moment the Graduate School home page is fairly low-tech; there may be a temptation to add more animation, etc., as the Web page becomes the only active “publication.” An upgrade to the Web page was placed on hold pending the current restructuring. The committee recommends that the upgrade go forward, but it is important to remember that international applicants — a key user group — often have limited bandwidth and display capabilities.

Communications, News, Publications — Graduate School news and announcements are presented prominently on the Web site home page. Budget constraints and the increasing consumer use of Web searches as a first contact option both indicate that Graduate School communications should go completely online, using the Graduate School home page as a base. Virtual publications (e.g., an online version of the magazine, as well as important reference publications such as the catalog) can be highlighted in the news/events feed and released simultaneously by University Relations to news media as appropriate. Current and prospective students should be offered an option of e-mail or portal-based subscriptions to a news feed and publications. The committee believes the Web site can continue, as now, to be maintained and updated using staff from admissions, data services, and student services, with oversight by the Graduate College/Office.

Alumni Relations — Institutions such as Michigan and Penn State use their Graduate School Web sites and publications to build community among graduate alumni and create a base for donations. Although graduate alumni tend to identify strongly with their programs, they are an important resource for graduate schools. Graduates with joint or interdisciplinary degrees, in particular, are likely to see the Graduate School as their intellectual home. Maintaining ties with alumni will not only promote loyalty and support, but will also give the university access to a large, diverse group of graduates who can be consulted and/or surveyed when evaluating the results of University-wide practices five or ten years in the future.

Coordination with University Relations — It is crucial for the Vice Provost/Dean to appoint a liaison to work with University Relations in developing major stories for national media outlets. Such stories span graduate programs, and would be appropriate for media ranging from the *Chronicle of Higher Education* to the *New York Times Magazine*. Examples include the 2008 Consortium on Interdisciplinary Inquiry and NRC Rankings — stories that extend beyond standard news releases. Achieving national exposure through these channels will increase student applications and the quality of graduate students, as well as aid in faculty recruitment.

Recommendation — One person in the Graduate College/Office should coordinate alumni relations and publicity. This person should serve as the liaison with both the University of Minnesota Foundation and University Relations while guiding content and presentation on the Web site.

7. Governance/Policy & Review Councils/Council of Graduate Students

The committee believes that it is essential to set and evaluate academic policies for graduate education through a student/faculty governance system. The current system offers

review by faculty and students (councils) and administrators (associate deans/deans, in consultation with senior staff). These different types of scrutiny perform several key functions:

- They ensure quality and consistency across units
- Reviewers and deans can identify opportunities for collaboration with other programs
- Deans can offer constructive feedback from their “knowledge base” of many other proposals

Thus, the committee proposes that the Policy and Review (P&R) Councils be maintained as a centralized review and oversight process, in conjunction with administrative review by the office of the Vice Provost/Dean. The committee also believes, however, that current processes can be substantially streamlined without diminishing their effectiveness. The Council of Graduate Students (COGS) should be maintained as a centrally chartered body of student governance that participates fully in the P&R Councils and their subcommittees.

The current system treats all policy changes or proposals equally. Routine matters (e.g., changes in course titles) go through the same full-review as dramatic shifts (e.g., options for jointly-authored dissertations). P&R Councils offer a broad consulting base across collegiate boundaries, and give student representatives and DGSs an important means of meeting with Graduate School administration and staff to discuss and vote on proposals. But the size and breadth of the P&R Councils makes it difficult for them to meet frequently. As a result, it can take months — many months — to approve new courses or programs, even when the proposals involve only minor changes. On the other hand, P&R Councils already use subcommittees (course proposal review) to prepare recommendations and summaries for the full meeting. P&R Councils frequently delegate approvals to these subcommittees when it is not possible to convene the full group in a timely way (e.g., summer).

The committee proposes that the P&R Council review process be streamlined, with a larger set of small subcommittees meeting on a rotating basis (as some grievance committees do now). These subcommittees, in conjunction with the Graduate College/Office, can be authorized to make recommendations for Council approval by e-vote, reserving full council meetings for issues which the subcommittees believe require extensive face-to-face discussion. Ideally, the committee envisions a submission-to-approval process of six weeks for proposals requiring no major revisions or discussion: two weeks for the subcommittee, three weeks for the graduate administration, one week for council e-votes. Proposals involving graduate programs from more than one council will still need to receive approval from multiple councils.

The committee proposes that the most routine matters (e.g., course title changes, program name changes which involve no accompanying revisions to degree requirements) be removed from the P&R Council review process altogether. These can be submitted electronically for approval by the collegiate dean/deans and the Graduate College/Office administration. [Note: the Graduate School planned to conduct a thorough overhaul of policies and procedures to reduce bureaucracy and speed processing of all types of requests and proposals. This was to include a revision of the Graduate School constitution to make governance more responsive.]

8. External/Temporary Graduate Faculty Appointments

A centralized mechanism is required for granting temporary graduate faculty appointments to adjunct faculty or faculty at other institutions for special cases where a graduate student would benefit from expertise for advising or service on a graduate student committee that is not available through the regular tenure-track and tenured faculty at the University of Minnesota. The committee recommends that the Graduate College/Office be given the responsibility for approving these appointments.

9. Advising

One of the five questions created by the committee to facilitate information gathering was: What activities/functions that are not currently being done should we be doing? An important area of focus is improving the quality and consistency of graduate and professional student advising at the University of Minnesota, including supervision of research and teaching assistants.

This topic was the focus of a report created by a sub-group of the Academy of Distinguished Teachers, the Responsible Conduct of Graduate and Professional Advising Working Group. The report, “Responsible Conduct of Graduate and Professional Advising,” was shared with and endorsed by both Provost Sullivan and Vice Provost and Graduate School Dean Gail Dubrow in Spring 2008. In addition, the survey of graduate students as part of the Graduate School’s Ph.D. Completion Project (76 percent of first-year grad students responding) found that advising was a negative part of the graduate school experience. The 2008 Council of Graduate Students (COGS) survey found that about 20 percent of graduate students reported changing their advisor (<http://www.cogs.umn.edu/survres.pdf>). In addition, this report suggests that lack of advisor evaluation results in DGSs not knowing the strengths and weaknesses of faculty advisors. The topic of harassment from faculty/advisors was addressed in a 2007 Student Conflict Resolution Center survey of graduate students (see p. 12) and the 2006 Graduate Student Support Task Force Report, part of the University’s strategic positioning process.

The quality of graduate advising is not uniformly or universally addressed in faculty evaluations, in post-tenure review, or in retention of membership on a graduate faculty. By improving advising, the University can position itself as an institution with one of the best climates for graduate students in the nation and world. Moreover, faculty, staff, and students will enjoy increased productivity, given that time spent on advising issues, including grievances and lawsuits, will decrease.

Highlighting major recommendations of the 2008 report here will aid in their implementation:

- Set University-wide standards for best practices for advising students
- Provide faculty with training that includes the following information:
 - Expectations for faculty advisors and student advisees;
 - Services and resources available to assist students and their faculty advisors;
 - Appropriate boundaries between students and faculty; and
 - Laws and University policies regarding students and their scholarship
- Initiate discussion among faculty and administrators regarding the consequences for advisors when their advising affects their students adversely

The committee recommends that the Provost or Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate College/Office form a committee to further study this issue, work with Center for Teaching and Learning staff to help build curriculum, implement an advisor training program, create measures to evaluate the success of training, and continue to work with the Academy of Distinguished Teachers on this very important topic. The committee recognizes the work of the Graduate School this academic year in addressing advising concerns, and recommends that this type of work continue. Specifically, DGSs received a set of memos and materials related to campus resources to handle harassment of graduate students.

10. Career Services/Workshops

Students and faculty also support continuing opportunities for graduate student career development. These opportunities are currently organized by the Graduate School and the Center for Teaching and Learning through programs such as Preparing Future Faculty. Students also voiced strong support for the Professional Development Workshops and Community of Scholars Program. The professional development workshops located in the Graduate School Diversity Office (GSDO) and the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPDA) have created synergy between graduate education for mainstream students, underrepresented students, and postdoctoral scholars. For example, the academic development program which provides support for thesis and dissertation writing grew out of dissertation writing workshops originally developed for underrepresented students in the Community of Scholars Program (COSP), housed in GSDO. The professional development workshops offered through OPDA also originated from COSP and now serve more than 1,200 postdocs and 10,000 graduate students. Throughout consultations, students expressed concern that relocating the GSDO's Community of Scholars Program away from the current Graduate School would make it more difficult to integrate diverse students into the broader Graduate School and University structure. The committee recommends these three offices continue to work together to provide career-oriented classes and workshops for both graduate students and postdocs.

11. Postdoctoral Affairs

In 2002, the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPDA) was formed and established a centralized office in the Graduate School to support the more than 1200 postdoctoral associates, postdoctoral fellows, and research associates at the University of Minnesota. The OPDA works closely with the Postdoctoral Association (PDA; a postdoc-managed organization) to promote scholarly productivity, facilitate networking and professional growth, identify best mentoring practices, and create a positive working environment. The University of Minnesota has recently been recognized as a "top-ten" place for postdoctoral researchers and the efforts of the OPDA and PDA have contributed to that distinction.

A strong case for a centralized OPDA within the Graduate College/Office can be made based on the current and projected needs of the University. Postdocs are likely to play an increasing role in the research environment of the University in the future and a single site organization is likely to be the best organizational structure. Moreover, the OPDA shares several structural functions with the Graduate School such that the Graduate College/Office should also include the OPDA. Workshops on grant writing, job search and interviewing, Preparing Future Faculty, conflict resolution, writing, speaking and English as a second language, networking,

financial management, appointments, taxes and visa issues are frequently shared between the OPDA and Graduate School. Decentralizing such information to colleges likely will result in a loss of services and opportunities. The OPDA is staffed with a half-time director and a quarter-time assistant. Organization of such individuals within the context of the graduate enterprise will provide for continuity and potentially job-sharing to realize some cost savings.

12. New DGS Orientation

The committee recommends that DGS assistants continue to receive orientation regarding policies and procedures from the Graduate College/Office. For new DGSs, the committee recommends that an on-line tutorial be designed. Further, an on-line “handbook” of Frequently Asked Questions should be designed, which could consist of the existing excellent resources found in the “Current Resources and News page” on the Graduate School Web site. In addition, the committee would encourage the practice of out-going DGSs to provide some guidance to new DGSs regarding department-specific policies and procedures as well as any idiosyncratic issues, such as grievances or academic integrity violations that are in-process or on-going.

13. Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs and Initiatives

The Graduate School currently is responsible for overseeing interdisciplinary graduate programs in addition to college-based graduate programs. Interdisciplinary graduate programs are those whose faculty members are not housed primarily within one department or college. Programs that are considered cross-college include 28 research-based graduate programs (four of which are cross-campus), five professional degree programs, 28 graduate minors that are unattached to a graduate program, and six post-baccalaureate certificate programs. In addition, there are eight graduate groups formed to stimulate new collaborations and discussions that may lead to new interdisciplinary graduate education initiatives. A number of these programs rely on Graduate School funding for support of administrative staff and other costs associated specifically with being a cross-college program (in 2008–09 there are eight graduate programs, eleven free-standing minors, and several new graduate groups).

The committee is acutely aware that the restructuring of graduate education at the University of Minnesota may affect these cross-college and cross-campus programs differently than college-based programs. Thus, special attention must be paid to the administrative needs of cross-college programs. In addition, the restructuring must be done in a manner that will continue and even increase incentives for cross-college collaboration, maintenance of cross-college programs, and development of new cross-college graduate programs and scholarship.

The committee recommends that the Graduate College/Office administer all aspects of cross-college graduate programs. This would include continued financial support; faculty governance; program oversight, approval, and coordination; admissions; student services; data management; graduate faculty membership; fellowship competitions; and commencement. A review should be undertaken to determine whether or not the current practices in these areas serve the needs of cross-college programs and to recommend improvements. In order to minimize the steps involved in program oversight, there should be one cross-college program policy and review council, with a mechanism to ensure and facilitate interaction with other programs and councils.

The committee recognizes that in some cases cross-college programs may prefer to be administered by one or more of the colleges in which their faculty are housed. Thus, the committee recommends that the graduate faculty, in discussion with their deans, may choose to be administered in the same manner as college-based programs, with one or more deans taking the lead. This discussion should be facilitated by the Graduate College/Office, although the decision will lie with the graduate faculty and deans associated with each program. This option should be open to all cross-college programs, although it is anticipated that it will most likely be taken advantage of by programs that involve two primary colleges.

The committee recommends that the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate College/Office be responsible for facilitating conversations among the deans of units involved in all cross-college programs, resulting in formal memoranda of agreement regarding financial support for each program. Regular revenue streams and special funds are needed to support these programs, especially those whose students and faculty are on different campuses. Allocation of funds should be merit-based and competitive and the criteria for funding should be transparent. The Graduate School's Office of Interdisciplinary Initiatives should be maintained and supported by the new Graduate College/Office.

The Graduate School currently has an Office of Interdisciplinary Initiatives (OII, <http://www.grad.umn.edu/oii/>) that oversees other interdisciplinary initiatives that are contributing to the development of new interdisciplinary graduate programs in emerging fields. The OII has developed an infrastructure for promoting interdisciplinary scholarship that goes beyond support of interdisciplinary graduate programs and minors and includes Interdisciplinary Graduate Groups, the Network of Interdisciplinary Initiatives, and the Collaborative Leadership Development Workshop Series. The committee recommends that the momentum developed by the OII should not be lost, and that this office should be maintained and supported by the Graduate College/Office.

14. Commencement

The Graduate School currently conducts commencement ceremonies twice a year for masters and doctoral students. The committee recommends that in the future a single ceremony be held in the spring for these students, organized by the Graduate College/Office.

15. Metrics

To measure the quality of graduate education, the committee recommends using the metrics originally suggested by the Graduate Student Support and Graduate Discipline Evolution Task Forces from the strategic positioning process (2006). The Graduate College/ Office should be responsible for compiling data in these areas and sharing the information yearly with administration and the broad University community.

- Total number of dollars for graduate fellowships
- Number of multi-year funding packages
- Percentage of graduate students on fellowships
- TA/RA salaries compared to top tier public research universities
- Track degree completion

- Track graduate placement
- Track student awards (from program level to central)
- Improve Ph.D. time-to-completion (University 8-year graduation rate). Completion data should be used as part of graduate program and department reviews and as a factor in fellowship and block grant allocation processes. The evaluation of such data should be sensitive to the differences across the disciplines and differences across the markets that students face. [Note: the Graduate School participated in the Ph.D. Completion Project, a pilot for a national study on reducing time to degree.]
- Faculty-to-student ratios in programs
- Block grants longer than current 2-year time
- Student satisfaction of mentoring/advising
- Dollars for graduate/professional education in compact process
- Dollars available for student funding for conference presentations
- Cost graduate students pay for health care premiums
- Interdisciplinary opportunities for graduate student (cross-program exchanges)
- Interest groups around interdisciplinary initiatives (communities of faculty and students)
- Interdisciplinary teaching opportunities for graduate students
- Joint faculty hires for interdisciplinary education
- Funding for interdisciplinary research initiatives (faculty and students)
- Review of the quality of graduate programs [Note: the Graduate School has been administering Web-based surveys of Ph.D. graduates to build a database for evaluating programs and practices (including developing the questions for national standards to be used in such surveys)]

16. Staffing Levels

In an effort to gauge where improvements in the efficiency of current Graduate School operations might be possible, information was collected from several peer institutions that have graduate programs of comparable size and diversity to the University of Minnesota's — the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. It is noted that the Graduate School operations at both Penn State and Wisconsin are combined with the office of the Vice President for Research.

The relevant data for Minnesota, Illinois, Penn State, and Wisconsin are summarized in the following table. The first thing to notice is that the numbers of students enrolled in Graduate School-administered professional programs at all four institutions are approximately the same. Minnesota has the most students altogether —10,680 (including 544 at Duluth) vs. 10,065 for Illinois, 9,300 at Wisconsin, and 8,500 at Penn State — but Illinois processes more applications for admission than Minnesota, Penn State, or Wisconsin: 18,300 in 2008–09 vs. 14,300, 14,000, and 17,000, respectively.

Not all aspects of the graduate enterprises at the four institutions are directly comparable, but some areas are. In particular, the staffing levels for admissions should reflect the numbers of applicants and those in student services should reflect the numbers of registered students. In this light, Minnesota has 21 FTEs (19 if allowance is made for seasonal help) in admissions and student services combined, while both Illinois and Wisconsin have 10 and Penn State has 12.

	<u>Minnesota</u>	<u>Illinois</u>	<u>Penn State</u>	<u>Wisconsin</u>
<u>Graduate program data -- professional programs</u>				
Number of programs	50	73	71	---
Number of students enrolled, 2008-09	3,083	2,910	2,815	---
Number of applications per year (est.)	3,300	5,300	3,500	---
<u>Graduate program data -- research programs</u>				
Number of programs	100	106	132	---
Number of students enrolled, 2008-09	7,597	7,155	5,685	---
Number of applications per year (est.)	11,000	13,000	10,500	---
<u>Graduate program data -- totals</u>				
Number of programs	150	285	203	154
Number of students enrolled, 2008-09	10,680	10,065	8,500	9,300
Number of applications per year (est.)	14,300	18,300	14,000	17,000
<u>Budget data</u>				
Total operating budget, 2008-09	\$28.4 million	\$8.5 million	\$14.0 million	\$3.9 million
Staff expenses (all Graduate School personnel)	\$4.6 million	\$2.2 million	\$4.3 million	\$3.4 million
<u>Staffing (FTE)</u>				
Admissions	14.6	6.0	12.0	10.2
Student Services (degree clearance, etc.)	6.5	4.0	joint with admissions	joint with admissions
Fellowship office	5.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
Diversity office	4.3	2.5	1.0	4.0
Finance and HR	3.5	2.0	6.0	18.8
Administration:				
Dean	1.0	1.0	0.25	1.0
Associate Deans	2.0	1.7	1.5	4.25
Directors	7.0	7.0	5.0	
Other	6.3	10.3	11.0	6.5
Total	50.2	37.5	37.75	46.75

Given that the numbers of students served and applications processed are roughly comparable for the three institutions, the question must be asked as to why Minnesota needs almost twice as many staff as Illinois, Penn State, and Wisconsin to perform these functions. Based only on this observation, the committee believes that streamlining of the current staff complement for the Graduate School should be possible without impacting the quality of our graduate programs. A reduction of approximately 20 percent should be possible, and a further reduction could be considered if terminal master's and applied doctorate degree programs are taken over by colleges.

In suggesting this substantial downsizing, however, the committee wishes to emphasize that no attempt was made to assess levels of satisfaction of services at any of the institutions (including Minnesota). It is important that due regard be given to maintaining acceptable levels of service to faculty, staff, and students in our graduate programs.

Services to be Moved/Combined with other Central Offices to Achieve Savings or Avoid Duplication

1. Development

The committee firmly believes that the Graduate College/Office should not have a separate development (i.e., fund-raising) operation. The colleges and schools (and academic departments) already work to build relationships with their alumni and to raise funds from companies and foundations, and duplication of these efforts by the Graduate School is at best counter-productive. It is important, however, that the University of Minnesota Foundation continue to solicit funding for general graduate education needs, beyond program-specific monies.

2. Diversity/DOVE

The committee recommends that the diversity functions under the auspices of the Graduate School Diversity Office should be moved to the Office of Equity and Diversity (OED). This office, under the direction of Vice President and Vice Provost for Equity and Diversity Rusty Barceló, is responsible for University of Minnesota system-wide equity and diversity initiatives and programs. Thus, addition of many of the Graduate School Diversity Office programs and initiatives such as recruitment and retention can be well-coordinated within this office. Specifically, the Community of Scholars Program and DOVE Fellowships should be moved to the OED. An additional advantage to integrating the Graduate School Diversity Office with the OED is the potential for synergies and enhanced programming. Another potential advantage is to provide a platform for encouraging undergraduates of color to pursue graduate school. Housing both undergraduate and graduate diversity efforts in the same office could facilitate the transformation from baccalaureate to graduate education.

The committee also strongly recommends that within OED significant resources and efforts be directed towards increasing diversity in graduate education. This should include a separate office and personnel solely dedicated to this goal. A critical factor in success will be for this office to work closely with the Graduate College/Office, the colleges, and individual graduate programs. As GSDO programs are moved to the OED, a thorough evaluation of the quality and effectiveness should be carried out.

3. Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship

The Graduate School currently administers a Grant-in-Aid of Research, Artistry and Scholarship program of approximately \$3.2 million per year. University-wide faculty selection committees review faculty grant applications and make recommendations for awards. The committee recommends that the faculty-driven, all-University nature of this competition be maintained, but that administration of the program be done by the Office of the Vice President for Research.

4. Faculty McKnight Awards

There are six categories of McKnight Awards at the University of Minnesota (see list at www.academic.umn.edu/provost/awards/mcknight/). Of the six, two are currently administered by the Graduate School: the Distinguished McKnight University Professorship and the McKnight Land-Grant Professorship.

The Distinguished McKnight University Professorship “recognizes outstanding faculty members who have recently achieved full professor status” while the goal of the McKnight Land-Grant Professorship is to “advance the careers of new assistant professors at a crucial point in their professional lives.” Both awards are prestigious and recognize outstanding University of Minnesota faculty. The awards are co-sponsored by the Graduate School and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

The committee recommends that the two McKnight programs currently administered in the Graduate School be moved to the Office of the Vice President for Research. The goal of this office is to oversee all aspects of research at the University of Minnesota and it thus would be a logical place to house an award program to support the research of outstanding faculty.

The committee feels strongly that the following two principles must be a part of the McKnight award program: (1) Selection committees are comprised of tenured University of Minnesota faculty chosen for their scholarly distinction, and (2) Professorships are awarded on the basis of scholarly merit and are restricted to regular faculty already employed at the university and are not to be used for faculty recruiting. The committee felt that no major changes were needed in the selection criteria or nomination process.

5. 21st Century Fund

The 21st Century Graduate Fellowship Endowment was started in 2000 when the Graduate School was combined with the Office of the Vice President for Research. The endowment was made possible by royalties from a licensing agreement with Glaxo Wellcome to market an AIDS drug developed by a University researcher. The 21st Century Graduate Fellowship Endowment is used to provide matching support for fellowship funds raised by graduate programs across the University. In 2004, when the Graduate School and Office of the Vice President for Research were separated, a decision was made to have the Fellowship Endowment administered by the Graduate School.

The committee recommends that the 21st Century Graduate Fellowship Endowment be administered by the Office of the Vice President for Research, where other funds derived from the Glaxo Wellcome licensing agreement also reside. The endowment reached the original goal of \$50 million (in the current economic climate, the amount is substantially less than this) but the opportunity to secure matching funds for new fellowship contributions in excess of \$25,000 has been continued by the University administration. At present, the eligibility for new contributions to receive the match is determined by the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School. The committee recommends that the Vice President for Research make this decision in the future.

6. University Press

The University of Minnesota Press, currently located within the Graduate School, is the University's scholarly publishing arm and is under the administrative and financial control of the University and the editorial control of a faculty committee. The committee recommends that it remain so. The Board of Regents 1981 policy specifies that the President or delegate will appoint the director and committee. Currently, the delegate is the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School. For reason of prevailing practice, continuity, and alignment, we recommend that the reporting structure of the Press should shift to the Office of the Vice President for Research.

During the consultation process, members of the committee met with the Director of the Press, the Chair of the Faculty Press Board, and the University Librarian, who all are in agreement on these general principles. The University Librarian further suggested that the Press would benefit from establishing a Strategic Advisory Board to consider avenues for aligning the Press with a mind towards the future. Considering the evolving nature of print media and the reality of new technological innovations, the committee recommends that the Press explore avenues of collaborations within the University, including possibly leveraging the Library's investment in electronic infrastructure.

Services to be Provided by Colleges/Programs

1. Student Orientation

The committee recommends that all new graduate students receive an orientation to the University and to their academic unit (e.g., college/department). The current University Orientation for Graduate Students is offered by the University Orientation and First-Year Programs. Orientation is spread over three days and includes a Welcome Day, writing workshops, a library orientation, and a campus tour. The committee recommends the academic unit deliver the Welcome Day information, including but not limited to the following:

- Resources
- Academic Integrity
- Advisor/Advisee Relationships
- Now That You're Working at the "U"
- Mini-workshops: Library, Parking & Transportation, One Stop Student Services, Responsible Conduct of Research
- Panel with Current Graduate Students

In addition, the existing “Getting Started” page is a good resource for new students. Finally, an essential element of Orientation would be an on-line “handbook” of Frequently Asked Questions and resource listing of where to find assistance with a variety of issues that graduate students are likely to encounter. It will be necessary for the Web resources related to the “handbook” and FAQs to be kept up-to-date. The writing workshops should be offered through the Center for Writing and the University Library orientation and campus tour could be offered either via existing University services or current graduate students within academic units. It should be noted that COGS currently publishes two handbooks that are given to every new graduate student at the Graduate School Orientation. Those handbooks are the “Graduate Student Survival Guide” and “Staying on Course.” These publications are updated annually and are available through the Graduate School and at <http://www.cogs.umn.edu/publications.html>.

2. Ongoing Graduate Faculty Appointments

The committee recommends that regular tenure-track and tenured faculty automatically be allowed to advise graduate students and serve on graduate student committees; no additional Graduate Faculty appointment should be required. Decisions to limit the ability of regular tenure-track and tenured faculty to advise graduate students and serve on graduate student committees should be made at the department or division level.

3. Award Degrees

Degrees at the University of Minnesota are conferred by the Board of Regents but academic units such as the colleges (and the current Graduate School) are responsible for managing and overseeing the process of awarding the degrees. If an Office of Graduate Education is established it is likely that this activity would devolve to the colleges, because that is where the undergraduate degrees are administered. An exception would be needed for interdisciplinary programs, which do not belong to a particular college and which would therefore have to be coordinated centrally. If a Graduate College is established, then this unit would administer all graduate degrees under its control.

Degrees housed in collegiate units should follow policies and procedures for degree approval and clearance similar to those of current professional programs (e.g., Law, MBA, etc.). In essence, the college is responsible for oversight of these degrees in all respects.

4. Program Reviews

Graduate Ph.D. and M.S. programs are reviewed periodically by the Graduate School in accordance with Board of Regents policy. Reviews for Ph.D. programs typically involve identification of an external review team (two or three faculty members), a self-study document, an on-site visit, a final oral and written report, and follow up meetings with requisite deans for post-review considerations. Master’s programs often have a modified streamlined version of such reviews involving a self-study document and internal review. Some reviews are carried out in conjunction with parent departmental reviews while others (e.g., interdisciplinary programs) are carried out with the sole purpose of evaluating the scholarly contributions of the graduate program.

Program reviews are work-intensive for both the program being evaluated and the Graduate School. An Associate Dean currently manages the reviews as a major responsibility. The results of the reviews are shared with the Provost, the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, the primary deans associated with the graduate program, and the faculty. It is not clear if there is a relationship between the funding a graduate program receives from the Graduate School (fellowships and block grant allocation) and the outcome of an external review. This raises questions among the faculty as to the purpose and motivation of such a review other than an administrative exercise.

In contrast, deans frequently use external reviews as a measure of scholarly reputation and accomplishment and can craft future financial policies and support for programs based on either strong or weak external reviews. Therefore, the case to carry out program reviews seems strong. The necessity to manage such an activity through a Graduate College/Office is less clear.

The committee therefore recommends that reviews of programs that are structurally and financially aligned closely with a department be de-centralized and managed at the school/college level. For interdisciplinary programs, the review process may be best carried out by the Graduate College/Office.

V. Concluding Remarks

Faculty, staff, and students are complimentary about the demonstrated expertise and professionalism of many of the long-time Graduate School staff. Service levels are high for some activities, and a great deal of assistance is provided to departments in helping to make graduate study a rewarding experience for most students. However, the committee also heard numerous complaints about inordinately long processing times for some documents, overly bureaucratic approval procedures, and especially a lack of transparency in the allocation processes for fellowships, block grants, and grants-in-aid. Fairly or unfairly, many faculty (and some staff and students) regard the Graduate School as a ponderous bureaucracy that is highly resistant to change.

One concern of some professional programs whose admissions currently are handled by the Graduate School is that the Graduate School's admissions process does not suit their needs and could be handled more efficiently and effectively by the programs themselves. The February 9 restructuring plan suggested that these concerns would be partially addressed by having the professional programs administered at the local level and redirecting the related savings from cost pool charges to the collegiate units. The committee wishes to point out that this suggestion is flawed in the following important regard: When the University's new budget model was implemented in 2005–06, revenue-neutral fund transfers were made to all units to pay for their cost pool charges, including the head-count charges for students in the Graduate School cost pool. The question then arises as to whether the funds used to pay these cost pool charges really belong to the unit.

Before any funds are redirected to collegiate units, therefore, an analysis should be done of the original revenue-neutral transfers and an assessment made of how the existing cost pool charges should be adjusted, if at all. The committee recognizes that the availability of adequate funding is an important component in the decision on whether or not a collegiate unit would choose to take responsibility for administering a graduate program, and this is why the recommendation was made to make this choice optional.

Appendix 1 – Original Committee Charge

Subject: Appointment of Implementation Team for Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence
From: Provost Tom Sullivan <provost@umn.edu>
Date: Fri, 20 Feb 2009 16:45:19 -0600
To: crouch@umn.edu

February 20, 2009

To: Twin Cities Deans
Department Heads and Chairs
Directors of Graduate Studies
Assistants to Directors of Graduate Studies
Graduate Faculty
Graduate School Staff
Graduate School Executive Committee
Graduate School Policy and Review Councils
Faculty Consultative Committee
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Graduate and Professional Student Assembly
Council of Graduate Students
Graduate Students
Executive Team

From: E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Re: Appointment of Implementation Team Regarding the Restructuring of the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence

Following for your information is a link to the memorandum appointing and charging an implementation team that is to provide recommendations regarding the restructuring of the oversight and support of graduate education to enhance excellence. Part of the implementation team's charge is to consult broadly as it considers and formulates its recommendations. Additionally, when I receive the team's recommendations by mid-April, I will post them for public comment prior to finalizing an implementation plan. I hope you will participate in this process and share your thoughts and insights as we formulate a more effective and efficient way to oversee and support graduate education. The reputation of our great university is built largely on the reputation of our graduate programs. We must find a way to oversee and support those programs in a manner that most effectively will enhance their excellence. With your help, I am confident we can accomplish this important task.

The implementation team charge and roster:

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/documents/implementationcharge.pdf>

The report "Restructuring the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence":

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/documents/gradschool021909.pdf>

The original announcement memorandum:

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/documents/GradSchlReorgmemo.pdf>

Questions and Answers:

<http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/documents/GradSchlReorgQA.pdf>

Please feel free to share your ideas with me at provost@umn.edu; I will pass them on to the implementation team.

ETS:srp

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

*Office of the Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost*

*234 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110*

*Office: 612-625-0051
Fax: 612-624-3814*

February 20, 2009

TO: Steven Crouch, Dean, Institute of Technology, Chair
David A. Bernlohr, Department Head and Distinguished McKnight University Professor,
Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, and Biophysics, College of Biological Sciences
Boyd D. Cothran, Vice President, Council of Graduate Students, Ph.D. student, Department of
History, College of Liberal Arts
William K. Durfee, Vice Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee, Professor, Department of
Mechanical Engineering, Institute of Technology
Timothy J. Ebner, Department Head and Professor, Department of Neuroscience, Medical School
Lincoln A. Kallsen, Budget Officer, Office of Budget and Finance
Timothy J. Kehoe, Director of Graduate Studies and Distinguished McKnight University Professor,
Department of Economics, College of Liberal Arts
Kristi L. Kremers, President, Graduate and Professional Student Assembly, Ph.D. student,
Department of Educational Policy and Administration, College of Education and Human
Development
Nita Krevans, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Classical and Near Eastern
Studies, College of Liberal Arts
Mindy S. Kurzer, Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Food Science and
Nutrition, College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences
Vince R. Magnuson, Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration, University of Minnesota
Duluth
Jennifer J. McComas, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of
Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development
Robert B. McMaster, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
James A. Parente, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Henning Schroeder, Professor and Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies, College of
Pharmacy
Kathryn A. Sikkink, Regents Professor, Department of Political Science, College of Liberal Arts
Cathrine A. Wambach, Chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy, Associate Professor,
Department of Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, College of Education and Human
Development
Elizabeth V. Wattenberg, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Division of
Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health

FROM: E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

RE: Implementation of the Plan to Restructure the Oversight and Support of Graduate
Education to Enhance Excellence: Recommendations due April 17, 2009

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the team responsible for recommending the implementation plan for restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education as described in the February 9, 2009 document that the University's Senior Vice Presidents and Twin Cities collegiate deans submitted to President Bruininks (enclosed).

The February 9 document identifies the new approach that the University will take to enhance the excellence of graduate education. The plan is designed to advance graduate education by providing a structure for oversight and support that better enables programs to thrive, and by conserving administrative fiscal resources in order to provide new and additional funds for investment in our graduate students and the excellence of our graduate programs. The plan describes the general structure of the new organization and the general roles and responsibilities of the graduate faculty, collegiate deans, and the new Office of Graduate Education. The implementation team is charged with formulating detailed recommendations consistent with the key aspects of this reorganization:

- Develop recommendations for how the specific functions and responsibilities currently carried out by the Graduate School should be reassigned. These recommendations should identify the functions and responsibilities that should be assigned to the Office of Graduate Education, the functions and responsibilities that should become the responsibility of colleges and graduate programs, and those that should be assigned to other University administrative units. These recommendations also should identify those functions and responsibilities that should be handled in a collaborative fashion across the University's graduate programs and which functions and responsibilities should be handled at the collegiate or program level.
- Identify the processes and activities that should be eliminated because they are duplicative, unnecessary, or contribute little to the quality of graduate education.
- Identify potential additional responsibilities collegiate units and graduate programs may face as a result of your proposed reassignment of functions as well as potential efficiencies, benefits, or cost savings to those units.
- Identify how a new Office of Graduate Education and its vice provost should help to enhance the excellence of graduate education, and specific responsibilities that should fall to this new office or be overseen by this new office.
- Identify the appropriate relative roles of the Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Education and collegiate deans with respect to terminal master's programs, entry-level master's programs, professional degree programs, applied doctorate programs, and Ph.D. programs.
- Estimate the number of employees you anticipate will be required in the Office of the Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Education and describe the roles they should play. Address any critical resource issues such as space and technology.
- Identify cost savings that can be achieved by reason of this reorganization both in the colleges and in the transformed new Office of Graduate Education.
- Establish the timeline that should guide the reassignment of functions and responsibilities and any changes in processes.

There is a broad range of consultation that will be required in order for you to make reasoned recommendations that you are confident will enhance excellence and achieve cost reductions. At a minimum, you will need to consult with faculty, graduate students, DGSs, DGS assistants, collegiate deans, current Graduate School staff, the Office of International Programs, the Office of the Vice President for Research, the Office of Equity and Diversity, the Office of Human Resources, the Provost's Interdisciplinary Team, Academic Student Resources (Registrar), Office of Admissions, coordinate campuses with graduate programs, the library, and the Office of Student Affairs. I encourage you to be broad, planful, and inclusive in your consultations. Additionally, once you submit your recommendations to me, I will post them for a public comment period. I may reconvene the implementation team to evaluate comments received and consider whether any recommendations should be changed.

I have asked Steve Crouch, Dean of the Institute of Technology, to chair the implementation team, and Dr. Katherine E. Himes from my office to serve as staff to the team to assist the team in its work. Katherine received her Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota in 2007 in Neuroscience; she brings with her valuable perspective as a recent graduate student herself.

I look forward to receiving your recommended implementation plan no later than April 17, 2009, and would appreciate periodic updates from the chair on the team's progress.

Thank you for your contribution to this important University endeavor.

Enclosures (4): Implementation Team List
Announcement Memorandum
Restructuring the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence
Questions and Answers

cc: Sharon Reich Paulsen, Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff

Appendix 2 – Restructuring the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence (Original Plan)

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

*Office of the Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs and Provost*

*234 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0110*

*Office: 612-625-0051
Fax: 612-624-3814*

February 9, 2009

TO: Directors of Graduate Studies
Department Heads and Chairs
Graduate Faculty
Graduate School Executive Committee
Graduate School Policy and Review Councils
Faculty Consultative Committee
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Graduate and Professional Student Assembly
Council of Graduate Students
Graduate Students

FROM: E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

RE: Restructuring the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence

I write to share with you a plan for restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education to enhance excellence at the University of Minnesota.

The reputation of a research university is inextricably linked to the reputation of its graduate programs. Excellent graduate programs enable a university to recruit and retain talented faculty and outstanding graduate students and affect its ability to secure external support to advance the research that leads to scientific, artistic, and scholarly breakthroughs.

Against this backdrop, the University of Minnesota, along with universities worldwide, needs to prepare to meet new and significant fiscal challenges. To meet these fiscal challenges while at the same time *enhancing* the University's excellence and international reputation requires that we become even smarter about the way we conduct our business. I believe, along with all of the collegiate deans, that we can approach the oversight and support of graduate education in a way that is more effective and efficient – in a way that better enables graduate programs to thrive and to excel, in a way that conserves resources that can be captured and redistributed to provide additional direct support of graduate education and graduate students, and in a way that promotes excellence in graduate education.

Under our plan, the Graduate School will be reconfigured from a free-standing administrative unit to which all graduate programs directly report, to an Office of Graduate Education within the Provost's Office that parallels the Office of Undergraduate Education. The Office of Graduate Education will be responsible for oversight, coordination, and leadership on issues related to graduate education, but ultimate responsibility and accountability for the quality of individual graduate programs will reside appropriately with the collegiate deans and the faculty. This model of collegiate responsibility and leadership with oversight and advocacy in the Provost's Office has been extremely effective over the past decade in greatly improving the quality of undergraduate education at the University of Minnesota. This model also is similar to the more decentralized models that Stanford University, MIT, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania employ for oversight of graduate education.

The specific details of the reconfiguration of responsibilities for graduate education have yet to be worked out. Within the next week I will appoint an implementation team to provide by April 10, 2009, recommendations regarding the specific reassignment of functions and responsibilities. The team will include collegiate deans, experienced directors of graduate studies, graduate students, and faculty. By July 1, 2009, the new Office of Graduate Education reporting lines will be effective, and by fall semester 2010, the entire new organizational structure, based on the recommendations of the implementation team, should be fully in place.

I invite you to review this important plan to enhance graduate education, along with a "questions and answers" document, at <http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/documents/GradSchlReorgreport.pdf> and <http://www.academic.umn.edu/provost/documents/GradSchlReorgQA.pdf>. If you have thoughts about this plan or suggestions regarding its implementation, please share them with me at provost@umn.edu.

ETS:srp

cc: Executive Team
Twin Cities Deans
Graduate School Staff

Restructuring the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence

In 2004, the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota unanimously endorsed the strategic goal to position the University as one of the top three public research universities in the world. Essential to meeting this goal is the continued nurturing and creation of world class graduate programs. The reputation of a research university is inextricably linked to the reputation of its graduate programs. Excellent graduate programs enable a university to recruit and retain talented faculty and outstanding graduate students and affect its ability to secure external support to advance the research that leads to scientific, artistic, and scholarly breakthroughs.

Against this backdrop, the University of Minnesota, along with universities worldwide, needs to prepare to meet new and significant fiscal challenges. To meet these challenges while at the same time *enhancing* the University's excellence and international reputation requires that we become even smarter about the way we conduct our business. Simply put, we must approach the oversight and support of graduate education in a way that is more effective and efficient – in a way that better enables graduate programs to thrive and to excel, in a way that conserves resources that can be captured and redistributed to provide additional direct support of graduate education, and in a way that promotes excellence in graduate education.

The plan outlined below seeks to meet the twin goals of: (1) enhancing graduate education by providing a structure for oversight and support that better enables programs to thrive and excel; and (2) conserving administrative fiscal resources in order to provide new and additional funds for investment in our graduate students and the excellence of our graduate programs. First, we briefly outline the objectives for graduate education and its oversight. Second, we provide some background regarding the current structure of the Graduate School and the way responsibility for graduate education currently is shared among the central administration of the University, the Graduate School, individual graduate programs, and the departmental and collegiate offices within which those programs reside. Third, we present the plan and set out a new administrative structure. Fourth, we outline the substantive benefits of the new structure along with the potential fiscal benefits. Finally, we propose an implementation timeline and creation of an implementation team to tend to the details of the restructuring.

Objectives

Graduate education has been and must remain one of the University's top priorities. From FY04-FY09, total annual resources (excluding carry-forward) for the Graduate School increased by \$10 million from \$17.8 million to \$27.9 million, including a 53% increase in the University's O&M support from \$12.8 million to \$19.6 million. During the same period, support specifically directed to graduate students through the Graduate School nearly tripled, increasing from \$6.2 million to \$17.7 million.

Continued investment in graduate education is critical, even in the face of current financial challenges. More specifically, the objectives of the University with respect to graduate education include the following:

- Continue to strengthen the quality of graduate education and the reputation of the University's graduate programs.
- Continue to increase support for graduate students, to help recruit the most outstanding students worldwide, and to assist them with timely degree completion.
- Become more effective and efficient in the administration of graduate education, eliminating duplication of effort and responsibility by providing coordinated services when economies of scale dictate that is the most effective solution, and decentralizing authority and resources where local control would be most effective.
- Maintain in the Provost's office an appropriate measure of oversight of and advocacy on behalf of the University's Ph.D. programs in collaboration with collegiate deans; delegate to collegiate deans responsibility for master's degree programs, professional degree programs, and applied doctoral programs.

Current structure

The Graduate School maintains the following administrative operation, staffed by over 50 FTE employees (see Appendix A) at an annual administrative cost of approximately \$4.5 million in salary and fringe: Admissions Office; Community of Scholars Program; Diversity Office; Faculty Grants Office; Fellowship Office; Interdisciplinary Initiatives Office; Policy and Review Councils; Post-Doctoral Affairs Office; and Student Services Office. (A brief description of each office is contained in Appendix B.) In addition to these offices, the Graduate School recently has created its own development office and has hired a communications professional to assist with communications efforts. The Graduate School also maintains a small office on the Duluth campus.

While the intent of the current structure is to oversee and promote the quality of graduate programs, to assist graduate students, and provide centralized services, the result is overlapping responsibilities and redundancies in a number of areas. For example:

- Responsibility for advancing the excellence of the University's graduate programs currently rests with the graduate faculty, directors of graduate studies, collegiate deans, and the Graduate School. The departments and colleges that house graduate programs provide the faculty, curriculum, facilities, research infrastructure, staff, and a large share of the total financial support that is dedicated to graduate students and graduate programs. The Graduate School provides additional resources, largely in the form of fellowships, block grants, support services, and coordination. Authority and responsibility for graduate education thus is divided between the colleges and the Graduate School. Collegiate deans make some decisions about allocation of resources; the Graduate School makes independent decisions regarding allocation of additional resources.
- Responsibility for admission of outstanding graduate students is divided between the Graduate School and individual graduate programs, with applicants currently needing to

file their applications both centrally with the Graduate School and locally with their program of interest.

- Responsibility for the support of diverse students rests with graduate programs, colleges, the Graduate School, and the Office of Equity and Diversity.
- Responsibility for international exchange programs overlaps between the Graduate School and the Office of International Programs.

Such divisions of authority and responsibility create ambiguities about accountability and undermine effective decision making and the setting and implementation of priorities. When the independent investment decisions of the colleges and of the Graduate School are not aligned, the effectiveness of both the central and the collegiate investments is undermined. Additionally, the overlapping of responsibilities between various Graduate School offices and other offices at the University creates opportunities for inefficiency, duplication of effort, and unnecessary administrative overhead, all of which draw resources away from direct investments in graduate education.

New Structure

The Graduate School will be reconfigured from a free-standing administrative unit to which all graduate programs directly report, to an Office of Graduate Education that parallels the Office of Undergraduate Education. As such, the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education will reside within the Provost's Office, and will be responsible for oversight, coordination, and leadership on issues related to graduate education. Ultimate responsibility and accountability for the quality of individual graduate programs will rest with collegiate deans and their faculties. This new structure will lead to improved communication between the Provost's Office and collegiate units and to increased harmony between graduate education objectives and collegiate objectives. This model of collegiate responsibility and leadership with oversight and advocacy in the Provost's Office has been extremely effective over the past decade in greatly improving the quality of undergraduate education at the University of Minnesota. This model also is similar to the models that Stanford University, MIT, the University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania employ for oversight of graduate education. For Minnesota, this is an opportunity to continue to be a leader among public research universities in employing innovative, efficiency-enhancing organizational change. Under this model:

- The Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education will provide oversight, coordination, and leadership on issues associated with the University of Minnesota's Ph.D. programs, approve changes to Ph.D. programs, promote and facilitate the evolution of new interdisciplinary programs, and serve as an advocate for graduate education.
- Collegiate deans will be responsible and held accountable for the quality of graduate programs that reside within their colleges. Deans will be responsible for graduate program curriculum, degree requirements, allocation of resources, the size of programs, and appointment of directors of graduate studies. Deans also will be responsible for, but may delegate to directors of graduate studies in consultation with their graduate faculty

and department chairs/heads, day-to-day administration of graduate programs, including authority to admit, reinstate, or drop students from a program, approve graduate committees and graduate advisors, clear students for degrees, etc.

- Professional degrees, master's programs, and applied doctoral programs outside the Academic Health Center will be the responsibility of collegiate units and campuses (as already is the case, for example, in law), but the Vice Provost of Graduate Education will review and recommend to the Provost action on proposals for new programs and changes to existing programs. For health professional programs, the current process in health sciences will continue.
- The Vice Provost of Graduate Education will collaborate with collegiate deans to help advance the excellence of graduate education at the University of Minnesota and to facilitate the effectiveness of graduate programs that span two or more colleges.
- The Vice Provost of Graduate Education will continue to oversee services that can more effectively and efficiently be provided in a coordinated manner (e.g., maintenance of a single on-line application, maintenance of official student records, etc.) The Vice Provost will collaborate with collegiate deans to determine which services are best provided in a coordinated fashion and which are best provided locally, in order to reduce duplication of effort, eliminate ambiguities regarding responsibility and accountability, and increase the effectiveness of services.
- Graduate education will be an explicit part of compact discussions between the Provost and the colleges that house graduate programs. Fellowships and block grants will be allocated by the Provost to the colleges as part of the compact process, and colleges will be held accountable through the compact process for effective use of those resources. Allocations will be subject to review and reallocation during each compact cycle based on collegiate performance on measures that track graduate program quality.

This reorganization will benefit directly graduate students, graduate programs and the colleges to which they will report, and the entire University:

- Graduate students will benefit from: increased financial support resulting from the capturing and reallocation of savings resulting from the reorganization; decreased transactions costs; and improved quality of graduate programs.
- Graduate programs and the colleges that house them will benefit from: increased responsibility and control; decreased transactions costs; and decreased cost pool charges.
- The University will benefit from the increased quality of its graduate programs and resulting enhanced reputation of the University as a whole, and budgetary savings.

Implementation Timeline and Plan

A small implementation team, consisting of a representation of collegiate deans, experienced directors of graduate studies, graduate students, faculty, and the Provost's Office will be formed to develop an implementation plan. New reporting lines will be effective with FY10 and the entire reorganization of structure and duties will be fully implemented by the beginning of fall semester 2010. None of these changes will affect the application and recruitment of graduate students who matriculate in fall 2009. Appendix C contains an outline of current Graduate School offices along with general thoughts regarding reassignment of office responsibilities. The proposed reassignment of functions and responsibilities contained in Appendix C is illustrative only; the implementation team will be charged to make organizational recommendations to the Provost by April 10, 2009.

Conclusion

The University of Minnesota rightfully should be proud of its graduate programs and the education it currently is providing to over 10,000 graduate students. The Graduate School and the University have worked diligently to improve the quality and prominence of its graduate programs and to increase resources available for the support of graduate students. We believe the restructuring of graduate education and its oversight described in this plan will align responsibility for graduate education in such a way as to promote the excellence of the University's graduate programs while at the same time freeing additional resources that can be directed to the increased support of graduate students.

Appendix A

Graduate School Offices and Personnel

<p>Administration Dean Associate Dean Associate Dean Associate Dean Exec Office & Admin Specialist Exec Office & Admin Specialist (1/2) Exec Office & Admin Specialist (1/3) Director of Communications Student Office Support (student)</p> <p>Admissions Director Assistant Director Assistant to the Dean Admissions Officer Student Personnel Coordinator Senior Office Specialist Student Support Services Assistant Information Technology Specialist Office Support Assistant Student Services Specialist Exec Student Services Specialist</p> <p>Community of Scholars Program Coordinator (1/2)</p> <p>Development Office Development Officer Exec Office & Admin Specialist (1/3)</p> <p>Diversity Office Acting Director Assistant to the Dean Principal Office & Admin Specialist Coordinator, Writing Enrichment Programs Graduate Student Support (student) Graduate Student Support (student)</p> <p>Faculty Grants Office Director (1/2) Coordinator Exec Office & Admin Specialist</p> <p>Fellowship Office Director (1/2) Associate Director Exec Office & Admin Specialist</p>	<p>Finance and Personnel Associate to Vice Provost/Dean (½ GS; ½ OVPR) Senior Accountant Associate Administrator (½ GS; ½ OVPR) Executive Accounts Specialist (½ GS; ½ OVPR) Office Specialist (½ GS; ½ OVPR) Voucher Specialist (½ GS; ½ OVPR) Office Support Assistant (vacant) Executive Assistant (vacant) Student Worker</p> <p>Interdisciplinary Initiatives Office Associate to the Dean (1/2) Assistant to the Dean Exec Office & Admin Specialist (1/3)</p> <p>Policy and Review Councils Associate to the Dean (1/2) Exec Office & Admin Specialist (1/2) Administrative Fellow (student) Administrative Fellow (student)</p> <p>Postdoctoral Affairs Office Coordinator (1/2)</p> <p>Student Services Director Assistant to the Dean Coordinator, Grad Student Services Coordinator, Masters Degree Services Coordinator, Doctoral Degree Services Student Personnel Coordinator Student Office Assistant (student) Student Office Assistant (student) Student Office Assistant (student) Student Office Assistant (student)</p> <p>Systems and Data Management Director Information Technology Manager Analyst/Programmer Office Support Assistant Information Technology Professional Information Technology Specialist Principal Office & Admin Specialist</p> <p>UMD Graduate Studies Office Associate Dean Principal Secretary</p>
--	---

Appendix B

Functions of Primary Graduate School Offices and Programs

<p>Admissions The Office of Admissions collects and assists with processing all applications for admission and for readmission or change of status. Currently, applicants to graduate programs submit an application directly to the program to which the applicant is applying as well as directly to the Graduate School. The graduate program is responsible for evaluating the application and deciding on admission; the Graduate School assists with processing. The Graduate School also issues form I-20s for international students admitted to the Graduate School.</p> <p>Community of Scholars Program This program, which originated in what now is the Office of Equity and Diversity, is designed to assist underrepresented students through advising and mentoring services, academic seminars and professional development workshops, and by connecting students to the Twin Cities community through research and civic engagement opportunities.</p> <p>Diversity Office This office helps support the recruitment, funding, retention and graduation of a diverse student body.</p> <p>Faculty Grants Office This office administers internal faculty research grant programs, including Grants-in-Aid of Research, Artistry, and Scholarship Program, and the Distinguished Women's Scholar Award. The office also coordinates the internal selection of faculty proposals for competitive programs for which the number of nominations submitted by the University is limited.</p> <p>Fellowship Office The Fellowship Office manages competitions for and distribution of Graduate School Fellowships, Doctoral Dissertation Fellowships, and a variety of additional fellowships earmarked by funders for specific fields of study. The office also administers external programs</p>	<p>such as the National Science Foundation Predoctoral Fellowships, Fulbright Scholarships, and the Luce Foundation Scholarships. Additionally, the office manages two graduate international exchange programs, two competitive professorship programs, and a lectureship.</p> <p>Interdisciplinary Initiatives Office The office works with the Provosts' Interdisciplinary Team to help foster interdisciplinary inquiry by graduate students and graduate faculty.</p> <p>Policy and Review Councils The Policy and Review Councils advise the Graduate School Dean on academic matters related to the quality and review of graduate programs, including degree program proposals, faculty, courses, tuition, residency requirements, and advising. Each graduate program is assigned to one of six Policy and Review Councils, which are divided into the following subject areas: biological sciences; education and psychology; health sciences; languages, literature and arts; engineering, physical, and mathematical sciences; and social sciences.</p> <p>Post-Doctoral Affairs Office The purpose of this office is to help support post-doctoral fellows.</p> <p>Student Services Office This office advises students, staff, and faculty concerning policies and procedures, particularly those relating to academic issues. More specifically, the office is responsible for student academic matters, including: student degree progress issues; degree program and thesis proposal forms; examination committees; milestone exam authorization and scheduling; acceptance of theses and dissertations; degree clearance and award of degrees; separate Graduate School commencement ceremony; registration questions and requests; and maintenance of permanent student records.</p>
---	---

Appendix C

Proposed Relocation of Graduate School Offices and Responsibilities

<u>Current Offices</u>	<u>Proposed Relocation of Responsibilities</u>
Administration	Provost Office, with substantial downsizing
Admissions	Local with some assistance from Provost Office
Communications	Discontinue
Community of Scholars	Office of Equity & Diversity with Local
Development	Local with assistance from UMF & MMF
Diversity	Office of Equity & Diversity with Local
Duluth	Local, except Ph.D
Faculty Grants	OVPR
Fellowships	Provost Office and Local
Finance and Personnel	Discontinue (some FTEs to OVPR and Provost)
Interdisciplinary Initiatives	Provost Interdisciplinary Team
McKnight Program	Provost Office
Policy and Review Councils	Local with Provost Office oversight and assistance
Post-Doctoral Affairs	Local
Student Services	Local with some services in Provost Office
Systems and Data Management	Downsize to one data person in Provost Office
University Press	Library and Provost Office

Restructuring the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence

Questions and Answers about the Plan

What is the purpose of this plan?

The restructuring is designed to enhance the excellence of graduate education at the University of Minnesota by increasing support of graduate students; creating a more effective and efficient administration of graduate education; eliminating duplication of effort and responsibility; clarifying authority, responsibility; and decision making, and decentralizing authority and resources where local control would be most effective.

What is the new organizational structure?

The Graduate School will be reconfigured from a free-standing administrative unit to an Office of Graduate Education within the Provost's Office that parallels the Office of Undergraduate Education. The Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education will be responsible for oversight, coordination, and leadership of issues related to graduate education.

Who is responsible for graduate education under this new model?

The graduate faculty and deans of the colleges that house graduate programs are responsible for the quality of graduate education. The Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education will provide oversight, coordination, and leadership associated with the University of Minnesota's Ph.D. programs, approve change to Ph.D. programs, promote and facilitate the evolution of new interdisciplinary programs, advocate for graduate education, and monitor the quality of graduate education throughout the University.

How does this reorganization affect master's, professional degrees, and applied doctoral programs?

Professional degrees, master's programs, and applied doctoral programs outside the Academic Health Center will be the responsibility of collegiate units and campuses. For health professional programs, the current process in health sciences will continue. The Vice Provost of Graduate Education will review and recommend to the Provost action on proposals for new programs and changes to existing programs.

Are there any other top research universities configured in this fashion?

Yes. Most notably, Stanford University, MIT, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Chicago have successfully employed more decentralized models that parallel the University of Minnesota's new structure for graduate education. Under this plan, and consistent with prior strategic positioning changes and reorganizations, the University of Minnesota will continue to be a leader among public research universities in employing innovative, efficiency-enhancing organizational change.

What happens to graduate fellowships that are currently administered by the Graduate School?

Funding for graduate students will increase as a result of cost-savings from this reorganization plan. Fellowships and block grants will be allocated by the Provost to the colleges as part of the compact process.

How will this plan protect interdisciplinary programs that cut across collegiate lines?

The Vice Provost of Graduate Education will work with the graduate faculty and deans of graduate programs to ensure the excellence of programs that span two or more colleges and to facilitate the interdisciplinary evolution of new programs.

How will this new structure help advance the diversity of graduate programs and provide support for graduate students from underrepresented groups?

The graduate faculty, directors of graduate study, deans, and Office of Equity and Diversity are all responsible for advancing the diversity of the University's graduate programs and ensuring the success of graduate students from underrepresented groups. The Diversity of Views & Experiences (DOVE) Fellowship will continue as will the University's commitment to ensuring student success.

How does this new structure advance Strategic Positioning?

The strategic goal to position the University of Minnesota as one of the top three public research universities depends crucially on world class graduate programs. The reputation of a research university is inextricably linked to the reputation of its graduate programs. Excellent graduate programs enable a university to recruit and retain talented faculty and outstanding graduate students and affect its ability to secure external support to advance the research that leads to scientific, artistic, and scholarly breakthroughs. The reorganization will enhance graduate education by providing a structure for oversight and support that will better enable programs to thrive and excel and by using existing fiscal resources to provide new and additional funds for investment in our graduate students and the excellence of our graduate programs.

How will the many details be worked out?

The Provost shortly will appoint an implementation team that includes representation of collegiate deans, experienced directors of graduate studies, graduate students, faculty, and the Provost's Office to carefully work out the details of the reassignment of functions and responsibilities under the reorganization.

What's the time line?

The Provost will ask that the implementation team provide its recommendations by April 10, 2009. The new reporting lines will be effective with FY10 and the entire reorganization of structure and duties fully implemented by the beginning of fall semester 2010. None of the changes will affect the application and recruitment of graduate students who matriculate in fall 2009.

Will this change drive work down to colleges and departments without additional resources?

The implementation team will work out which services can more effectively and efficiently be provided in a coordinated matter across the University and which are best provided locally, in order to reduce duplication of effort, eliminate ambiguities regarding responsibility and accountability, and increase effectiveness of services. Savings resulting from the reorganization should lead to a decrease in cost pool charges to collegiate units and should assist the colleges in the management of new responsibilities. Colleges and departments also should realize savings due to decreased transactions costs.

How much will this reorganization save?

The financial savings will depend on the details that are worked out by the implementation team.

Where will the saved money go?

Financial savings will be used for graduate fellowships, assistance to colleges to manage new graduate education responsibilities, and assistance in budget reduction.

Does this change affect the recruitment of the class entering in fall 2009?

No. None of the changes will affect the application and recruitment of graduate students who matriculate in fall 2009.

How does this change affect graduate students?

Graduate students will benefit from increased financial support (due to reallocation of savings resulting from the reorganization); decreased transaction costs; and improved quality of graduate programs.

How does this change affect graduate faculty and DGSs?

Graduate faculty, directors of graduate studies, and collegiate deans will have increased responsibility and control over their graduate programs; decreased transaction costs; and more resources for graduate student support.

Will this change affect the Graduate School's commencement in Spring 2009?

No. The Graduate School's spring 2009 commencement will take place as scheduled on Friday, May 8th.

Appendix 3 – Revised Charge to Committee

Subject: Restructuring Graduate Education
From: Provost Tom Sullivan <provost@umn.edu>
Date: Tue, 03 Mar 2009 23:59:00 -0600
To: crouch@umn.edu

March 4, 2009

TO: Graduate Faculty, Graduate School Staff, and Graduate Students
FROM: E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
SUBJECT: Restructuring Graduate Education

As a follow up to my earlier announcement about restructuring the oversight and support of graduate education at the University of Minnesota, I want to respond to the questions and concerns that I have heard.

We currently face a sense of urgency as we plan for substantial impending budget cuts. If this sense of urgency appeared to compromise my commitment to consultation as we begin to chart a new course for the oversight and support of graduate education, I regret that misunderstanding. Graduate education is a valued attribute of this University, and we all share ownership in its ultimate impact and success. We all know that the reputation of a research university is inextricably linked to the reputation of its graduate programs.

The February 9 plan, "Restructuring the Oversight and Support of Graduate Education to Enhance Excellence," which was endorsed by the president, was intended to establish a commitment to restructuring graduate education and to provide the outlines of what that restructuring might look like. The dual purposes of the restructuring effort are to conserve fiscal resources and enhance excellence, to be accomplished by streamlining administration, reducing overhead, eliminating redundancies, and aligning responsibilities and accountability for graduate programs. The plan was designed to be a starting point for a broader conversation across the University community. Decisions regarding the contours of this general plan have yet to be made, and will be made only after broad and deliberate consultation.

To this end, I appointed a team of graduate faculty and students, directors of graduate studies, members of the Graduate School Executive Team, chaired faculty, members of faculty governance, department chairs, and collegiate deans, to drive this conversation and to gather diverse perspectives and experiences as we develop a shared vision for restructuring graduate education at the University. I have emphasized that the committee has broad and flexible discretion to make recommendations regarding how to accomplish the restructuring within the context of its general charge to submit recommendations on all relevant issues, whether or not specifically identified in either the February 9 plan or the February 20 charge memo. And as we did with the 35 strategic positioning task forces, there will be a public comment period and

widespread discussion of the committee's recommendations before any final directions are determined.

I also want to emphasize that if we need more time beyond the fall 2010 projected implementation date set forth in the February 9 memo, we are prepared to take the time--we are more committed to moving forward with a promising strategy than meeting a deadline.

We all are committed to sustaining the accomplishments that have been made in graduate education to date, and to further enhancing the quality and excellence of graduate education in the face of these challenging economic times. We all also are committed to ensuring that this restructuring, and other crucial efforts to move the University forward in these times of fiscal challenge, will be accomplished through an open and inclusive process that ensures thoughtful and informed recommendations.

cc: Executive Team
Twin Cities Deans
Department Heads and Chairs
Directors of Graduate Studies and Assistants
Faculty Consultative Committee
Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Regents Professors

Appendix 4 – Minutes of Faculty Consultative Committee; March 26, 2009

Subject:
Faculty Consultative Committee 3/26/09
From:
garye <garye@umn.edu>
Date:
Tue, 31 Mar 2009 13:34:52 -0500
To:
SEN-MINUTES1@LISTS.UMN.EDU

[In these minutes: (1) Faculty Senate docket; (2) health-care savings plan; (3) discussion with Provost Sullivan (salaries and benefits, graduate education, metrics and measurement, smoking policy); (4) Senate clerk and parliamentarian; (5) Policy on Reorganization and the Graduate School; (6) discussion with President Bruininks (the budget and federal stimulus funds; the Graduate School; Regents scholarship program; student financial aid); (7) discussion with Board of Regents Chair Dr. Patricia Simmons (Board of Regents work plan and other matters)]

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents. If you have comments or suggestions about items reported on in these minutes, please use your "reply" key and the message will be forwarded to the appropriate individual(s).

Minutes

Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, March 26, 2009
1:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Emily Hoover (chair), Gary Balas, Susan Berry, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Shawn Curley, Dan Dahlberg, William Durfee, Janet Fitzakerley, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Kathryn Hanna, Caroline Hayes, Brian Isetts, Judith Martin, Michael Oakes, Nelson Rhodus, Martin Sampson, Cathrine Wambach

Absent: Becky Yust

Guests: Provost E. Thomas Sullivan; President Robert Bruininks, Vice President Richard Pfitzenreuter; Board of Regents Chair Patricia Simmons

Other: Associate Vice President Sharon Paulsen (Office of the Provost); Kathryn Stuckert (Office of the President); Cathy Gillaspay (Board of Regents office)

1. Faculty Senate Docket [Text deleted]

2. Health-Care Savings Plan [Text deleted]

3. Discussion with Provost Sullivan [Selected portions of text deleted]

Provost Sullivan joined the meeting at the end of the discussion about the health-care savings plan. [Text deleted]

Provost Sullivan moved next to comment on five items that Professors Hoover and Durfee asked him to discuss.

First, are there other big proposals that he might consult about with the Committee? He said there are no big restructuring proposals on the academic side. There are proposals within the colleges, but those are not from his office. There may also be restructuring proposals elsewhere in the administration, but he is not directly involved in those, either. So there are no proposals like those being take up at Arizona State University, Professor Martin asked? There are not, the Provost said.

Second, with respect to the Policy on Reorganization, he and the President are committed to sharing with the Committee all major changes. In the case of any changes that involve sensitive personnel decisions, he will discuss the changes with the Committee leadership.

Third, he and the President attended a recent meeting of the task force dealing with changes in the structure of graduate education (on which two members of this Committee serve, Professors Durfee and Wambach) to further clarify the committee's charge.

He reported that the committee has been told that their work is to make recommendations regarding how to implement a restructuring in a way that best serves the purposes of enhancing graduate education's excellence, eliminating redundancies, and conserving fiscal resources to protect our investments in student support, faculty research, and interdisciplinary programs. Within the context of that charge, the committee has been told that it has flexible, broad discretion to give recommendations on all relevant issues.

Professor Chomsky later commented that people have the impression that people still have questions about the charge to the task force. Is it, "the Graduate School is disbanded and where are the pieces going?" or is it a reorganization and the task force charge is more open-ended? That is not clear. Provost Sullivan said that the President has made the decision that what exists today administratively is not working as it should to be effective; everything else is on the table. Where and how the pieces should go are open to discussion.

Professor Curley suggested that the name of the task force be changed so that it is not simply an implementation committee.

[Other text deleted]

4. Senate Clerk and Parliamentarian [Text deleted]

5. Policy on Reorganization and the Graduate School

The Committee agreed that it wished to discuss at its next meeting the Policy on Reorganization, inasmuch as the policy is cited in one of the motions before the Faculty Senate on April 2. It also concluded it wished to review the minutes of the meetings that included discussion of the development of the policy. Professor Martin said it was her recollection that the policy was directed at curricular units, not the administration.

Professor Durfee asked what outcome the Committee expected from a discussion.

6. Discussion with President Bruininks [Selected portions of text deleted]

Professor Hoover now welcomed President Bruininks and Vice President Pfutzenreuter to discuss the University's budget and how it may be affected by federal stimulus funds. [Text deleted]

Professor Durfee asked the President to let FCC know what decisions have been made about the Graduate School and what he would like to see from the task force. The President said he knows this issue has raised a lot of concern—and that is understandable as graduate and professional education is one of the most important aspects of the University. But it is necessary to make changes that improve and advance graduate and professional education while not eroding it in any way. There will be a lot of further consultation about these issues and no final decisions have been made. The bottom-line issue for him is that the University has made an extraordinary investment in graduate education in the last several years—and the most ardent advocate for those investments has been Provost Sullivan, who worked particularly hard to put increased funding into student fellowships and grants. He said he will be dogged on this point: when funds are taken out of the Graduate school, they will not come from student fellowships or assistantships, from seed money for faculty research, the McKnight program, or from the promotion of interdisciplinary research and education. The bite will come out of administrative costs and he will insist that there be an examination of transactional costs. At the same time, there should be no effort to try to fix things that are working well (e.g., peer-review in the McKnight program). About 75% of the graduate/professional degrees granted by the Graduate School are terminal Masters' degrees granted by professional colleges; those programs need to be close to their fields and accreditation requirements. The same is true for professional doctorates. This is not a new idea, the President said; a task force in 2004 urged that these questions be examined but nothing has happened. In this environment, when budgets must be cut, it is necessary to ask how students can be better served. So his goals are to cut administration, protect faculty interests, do things at lower cost, move some degrees down to the units, and reduce transaction costs while not giving more work to the units. He said he has a high regard for the Graduate School and its history and dedication, and his plea is that if this is one of the most important things the University does, it can do them better. He noted that the University recently received very high marks for its postdoctoral programs. What provided the high ranking? The quality of the experience in the academic departments, interaction with faculty, and support in their field of study. What provided was ranked lowest? The all-University support. Postdocs will be more important in the future and the University must be sure it improves its programs.

What if the task force recommends a leaner, meaner Graduate School rather than an office of graduate education in the Provost's office, Professor Durfee inquired? That should be open, the President said. There have been ideas suggested from a number of sources; it is necessary to step back and see if there is a better way to do things. He added that the changes may not be effective

July 1 of this year, but be implemented during the next year.

Professor Curley asked what the process will be once the task force makes its recommendations. They will be open and public, the President said. They will not be implanted unilaterally; he will want to talk with the academic leadership about them, including this Committee and the deans and chancellors. It is his vision to strengthen the alignment of graduate and post-graduate education with the research mission of the University, which would be a big win for both.

[Other text deleted]

7. Discussion with Board of Regents Chair Patricia Simmons [Text deleted]

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

Appendix 5 — Individuals and Groups Consulted by One or More Members of the Committee

Individuals at the University of Minnesota

Noro R. Andriamanalina, Director of Academic and Professional Development, Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, Graduate School
Douglas M. Armato, Director, University of Minnesota Press
Nancy (Rusty) Barceló, Vice President and Vice Provost of Equity and Diversity
Brad Bostrum, Director, Systems and Data Management, Graduate School
Robert H. Bruininks, President
Carol A. Carrier, Vice President, Human Resources
Steve Cawley, Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Gail L. Dubrow, Vice Provost and Dean, Graduate School
Douglas Ernie, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Vicki L. Field, Associate to the Dean of the Graduate School, Director of Interdisciplinary Initiatives, Graduate School
Shirley N. Garner, Associate Dean, Graduate School
George D. Green, Associate Dean, Graduate School
Robert J. Jones, Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration
Lawrence M. Knoop, Jr., Associate Dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota-Duluth
David J. Langley, Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
Wendy Pradt Lougee, University Librarian
Meredith M. McQuaid, Dean, Office of International Programs
Derek A. Maness, Assistant to the Director, Graduate School Diversity Office
R. Timothy Mulcahy, Vice President for Research
Jean M. O'Brien, Chair, University Press Board and Associate Professor, Departments of History and American Indian Studies, Chair, Department of American Indian Studies
Michael R. Rollefson, Director of Finance, Graduate School
Wayne Sigler, Director, Undergraduate Admissions
Myrna G. Smith, Director, Faculty Research and Graduate Fellowships, Graduate School
Karen K. Starry, Director, Graduate Student Services and Programs Office, Graduate School
E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Julie A. Tonneson, Budget Director, Office of Budget and Finance
Dean Tsantir, Director, Admissions, Graduate School
Char Voight, Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School, Assistant Director of Office of Interdisciplinary Initiatives, Graduate School
Susan N. Van Voorhis, Director of Academic Support Resources and Registrar
Patricia Jones Whyte, Directory, Graduate School Diversity Office

People at Other Institutions Consulted via Telephone or E-mail

Martin Cadwallader, Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Debasish Dutta, Associate Provost and Dean, Graduate College, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Chris M. Golde, Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Education, Office of the Vice Provost for

Graduate Education, Stanford University
Judith D. Kornblatt, Senior Associate Dean for Graduate Education, Graduate School, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Eva J. Pell, Senior Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, Pennsylvania State University
Victoria E. Rodriguez, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Texas at Austin
Debra Stewart, President, Council of Graduate Schools

Groups at the University of Minnesota

Open Meetings (March 11, March 25, and March 30)

Twin Cities Deans Council

Senate Committee on Equity, Access, and Diversity

Faculty Consultative Committee

Academy of Distinguished Teachers, Twin Cities

Postdoctoral Professional Association

Council of Graduate Students (COGS)

School of Public Health

1. Dean
2. Senior Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Associate Dean for Education
3. DGSs
4. Educational Operations Committee (this includes student services staff and DGS assistants)
5. Educational and Policy Review Committee
6. Graduate students were invited to two meetings

Institute of Technology

1. Department heads
2. Directors of Graduate Studies and assistants
3. Graduate students (all were invited; one student attended)

Humphrey Institute

1. Associate Dean
2. Staff, including alumni relations officer, finance officer, student affairs officer, student services staff
3. Faculty
4. Students

College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences

Three meetings with DGSs, students, and DGSs of interdisciplinary programs

School of Nursing

One meeting was held that was attended by Faculty, student services staff, an associate dean, a former dean, the DGS, and adjunct faculty

School of Pharmacy

One meeting was held to which DGS's, DGS assistants, department heads and graduate students were invited. In addition, all faculty and graduate students were encouraged by email and personal communication to share their view on graduate education and the restructuring of the Graduate School, either by feedback to the implementation committee member (Henning Schroeder) or directly emailing the committee.

Medical School

College of Design

Carlson School of Management

Law School

College of Liberal Arts

1. Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education met with DGSs and their assistants
2. Town hall meeting for graduate students
3. Town hall meeting for faculty and staff
4. Survey of DGS assistants led by Colleen Hennen, Administrator in American Studies
Kara Kersteter, DGS Assistant in Economics after consultation with a number of other
program administrators in CLA
5. Council of Chairs
6. Meeting with DGSs of creative and performing arts programs along with Associate Dean
(CLA) Jo-Ida Hansen.

College of Biological Sciences

College of Veterinary Medicine

Dental School

University-wide consultation with DGSs from interdisciplinary graduate programs,
graduate minors, and graduate groups.

Chairs of the P&R Councils were offered the opportunity to arrange a meeting with their P&R
Council and committee members

Health Sciences Policy and Review Council

Language, Literature and Arts Policy and Review Council, Special Meeting, March 10:

Summary notes shared that evening with committee; council's letter to President

Bruininks also posted and discussed by the committee on March 27.

Basic Sciences Policy and Review Council