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Issues Raised in Correspondence

RECEIVED FROM TWIN CITIES CAMPUS

Graduate School Programs

- consolidation of graduate programs to promote efficiency
- flexible policies to guide the development of interdisciplinary programs
- professional degree programs
  -- differential admissions standards for practitioner-oriented versus traditional, research-based Graduate School degree programs
  -- access to research support and instructional guidance for students in practitioner-oriented graduate programs
  -- recognition for specialized degrees in the Graduate School bulletin and its forms
  -- intermittent programs
  - expansion of practitioner-oriented degree programs
- programs provide an environment and culture for the socialization of graduate students
- asymmetry between graduate programs and departments

Funding

- additional funding for minority graduate student recruitment
- additional funding for graduate student recruitment generally
- more equitable distribution of fellowship monies across graduate programs
- funding to support decentralized graduate activities, if some activities are decentralized
- better representation of faculty and graduate programs--including those in the humanities--on Graduate School committees that allocate funds
- funding for interdisciplinary programs
- compensation/staff support for Director of Graduate Studies

Admissions

- need for a more integrated approach to admissions--i.e., blanket admissions form (if rejected for Ph.D. degree, automatic consideration for master's degree)
- who controls admission/interprets the rules (faculty versus Graduate School staff)?
  -- experience and leadership potential versus grade point average
  -- foreign credentials review
  -- speed of response and request for expedition of outstanding applicants who are members of under-represented groups
  -- unnecessary complications for international students
  -- problems unique to part-time students

Procedures

- need for greater flexibility in credit transfer to the Ph.D. degree from Adult Special, CEE, and other non-traditional sources
- need to account for faculty involvement in dissertation advisement at the departmental level as relates to workload
- Graduate School versus program oversight of time-to-degree and termination from the graduate program
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Read from the 2000 Draft Report

Table 1: Final Exam Information

1. Exam Name
2. Exam Date
3. Exam Time
4. Exam Location
5. Exam Duration
6. Exam Format
7. Exam Language
8. Exam Access

Sample Information

Example:

Exam Name: Final Exam
Exam Date: November 15, 2023
Exam Time: 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM
Exam Location: Main Hall
Exam Duration: 3 hours
Exam Format: Multiple Choice
Exam Language: English
Exam Access: Open Book

Advisory:

Please review the exam information above and provide your feedback if you have any recommendations or concerns.
• appointment to the graduate faculty and review for continued membership should occur at the program level
• need for greater flexibility in awarding Graduate School Fellowships
• need for teacher training for graduate assistants; need to recognize the importance of teaching
• dissatisfaction with the program review process and external review
• ease of arranging examiners for non-traditional and highly specialized dissertations
• need for comparative information across departments and programs
• value of reviewing new and revised 8000-level courses
• ambiguity of 5000-level courses
• micromanagement

User-Friendly Graduate School

• concern about service-oriented handling of inquiries
• reducing bureaucratic "run-around"/inefficiency
• "rudeness"

RECEIVED FROM DULUTH CAMPUS

Graduate School Programs

• unique programmatic needs of the Duluth campus; program expansion
• infrastructure support
• role of the Associate Graduate School Dean at Duluth (need to clarify and strengthen)
• accreditation of professional degree programs
• coordination of CEE and day-school options for graduate training
• availability of DGS

Funding

• funding to support administration of Duluth graduate programs, especially if some activities are decentralized
• return of thesis credit tuition to programs
• compensation for DGS

Procedures

• dissatisfaction with the program review process and external review
• TOEFL as an indicator of TA language skills
• need for early evaluation of transfer credits
• thesis quality and format of the thesis

User-Friendly Graduate School

• need for better coordination between the Duluth and Twin Cities campuses with respect to student services
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Correspondence Inviting Input to the Review

1. Memorandum of July 31, 1992, to deans, department heads and directors of graduate studies (attached)

2. Memorandum and accompanying news release of July 31, 1992, from Ms. Vicki Field to Ms. Maureen Smith, Brief editor, and to editors of fourteen collegiate newsletters

3. Letter of August 11, 1992, from Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen to graduate school deans at seventeen select research universities (sample letter attached)

4. Memorandum of September 15, 1992, to all members of the graduate faculty (attached)

5. Memorandum of October 8, 1992, from Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen to members of the Policy and Review Councils announcing discussion of the Graduate School review at the November Council meetings (attached)

6. Memorandum of October 13, 1992, to individual budgetary college deans announcing an interview with a committee member and setting forth the issues (sample letter attached)

7. Memorandum of October 29, 1992, to the Graduate School staff with a list of questions for a meeting with the review committee (attached)
MEMORANDUM

July 31, 1992

TO: Deans, Department Chairs, and Directors of Graduate Studies

FROM: Paul E. Johnson, Chair, Graduate School Review Committee (624-6865)

SUBJECT: Input to Graduate School Review

Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen has named a University-wide committee to review the Graduate School with the goal of improving graduate education at the University of Minnesota through enhanced approaches and practices. The review is patterned after the Graduate School's ongoing program reviews and will include a self-survey document, which is being prepared by the Graduate School staff this summer, and its evaluation by the all-University committee in the fall. The product of the committee's deliberations will be a report that highlights the Graduate School's strengths and weaknesses, identifies issues, and makes recommendations. Yet to be decided is whether experts external to the University will be invited to participate. Other faculty members of the all-University committee are Bianca Conti-Tronconi (Biochemistry/College of Biological Sciences), Leo T. Furcht (Laboratory Medicine and Pathology), Paul Gassman (Chemistry), Craig E. Swan (Economics), Graham A. Tobin (Geography/Duluth campus), Richard A. Weinberg (Child Development), and Susan M. Wick (Plant Biology). Graduate student members are Michelle Englund (Home Economics Education [alternate]), Anne Sales (Health Services Research and Policy), and Gloria Warren (Home Economics Education).

Most of the committee's work will be accomplished in the fall. Your comments on the issues identified below are invited over the summer, in order to gather important information for the committee's consideration as early as possible in the fall quarter. A wider invitation to offer input will be extended to all graduate faculty in mid-September. The graduate student organization, the Council of Graduate Students (COGS), will solicit student comment for the review.

Although the committee's charge is broad and encompasses virtually all aspects of graduate education and research at this institution, its deliberations and report will clearly focus on
graduate education. The committee's charge includes an examination of the following specific questions and issues:

- Are there models for effective relationships of the Graduate School and graduate programs to departments and colleges, especially in terms of decision-making processes about priorities and expenditures?

- What improvements can be made in the admissions process?

- What improvements can be made in the other support services provided by the Graduate School for graduate programs?

- What approaches are needed to support interdisciplinary graduate programs?

- Are special approaches needed for applied programs? If so, what are these? (Are there some post-baccalaureate professional degree programs not currently under the Graduate School's jurisdiction that would benefit from inclusion under the Graduate School umbrella? Which programs are these? Why or why not should they be included?)

In addition, the committee has identified the ongoing program review process as an issue in its deliberations. Of particular concern are the effectiveness of the process and the extent to which the reviews serve as a reliable indicator of program quality across the University.

You may send your written comments on these issues, and any others you wish to address, to me at the Department of Information and Decision Sciences, 395 Hubert H. Humphrey Center, West Bank Campus. If you have questions, I or other committee members would be happy to discuss them with you; do not hesitate to call any one of us. Your response by September 15 will greatly facilitate our work.

We very much appreciate your assistance in this important undertaking and we look forward to your participation. We will communicate again with you in the fall as the pace of the review accelerates.

PEJ/vf

cc: Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen
August 11, 1992

Dr. John H. D'Arms
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean,
Rackham School of Graduate Studies
University of Michigan
915 East Washington Street
Room 1006
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1070

Dear Vice Provost D'Arms:

We have embarked on a review of graduate education at the
University of Minnesota to identify policies and practices that
will improve our graduate enterprise. I have appointed a
University-wide committee to conduct this review and have asked
the committee to deliver its report and recommendations to me by
the end of the coming fall quarter.

Members have already determined that comparative data from some
of Minnesota's sister institutions would help the committee
complete its task. To facilitate the committee's work, we hope
that you might be able to provide us with the following
information:

1. A description (e.g., an organizational chart) of the
administrative infrastructure at your institution, showing how
graduate education and research are organized.

2. A description (e.g., an organizational chart) of your
graduate school governance structure.

3. A description of your graduate procedures with respect to
decision-making. Specifically, how are decisions made in each of
the following areas, and who has decision-making authority in
each?
   a. student admissions
   b. award of centrally budgeted graduate school
      fellowship support
   c. approval of student programs for graduate degrees
   d. membership on the graduate faculty

4. Information about your graduate school budget, including the
amount of funds from the general university budget. In addition,
it would be helpful to know the amount of graduate student
fellowship and faculty research funds that are budgeted centrally
in the graduate school. We will maintain the confidentiality of
any budgetary information you provide, and no data will be made public.

5. We offer a competitive first-year Graduate School fellowship, which graduate programs must follow with a guaranteed teaching or research assistantship in the student's second and third years. Please describe any multiple-year fellowship support that is awarded centrally by your graduate school (e.g., fellowship amount, process by which awarded, number of years over which offered, total amount available for distribution, source of funds).

6. Does your graduate school fund campus visits for prospective students? If so, what amount do you typically provide for this purpose? What is the total amount of such funding available?

Your response to these questions by about September 15 will be most helpful to our review committee. If you have any questions about the request, please call my assistant, Ms. Vicki Field (612/625-6532).

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Anne C. Petersen
Vice President and Dean

ACP/vf

cc: Professor Paul E. Johnson
MEMORANDUM

September 15, 1992

TO: All Members of the Graduate Faculty

FROM: Paul E. Johnson, Chair, Graduate School Review Committee (624-6865)

SUBJECT: Input to Graduate School Review

Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen has named a University-wide committee to review the Graduate School with the goal of improving graduate education at the University of Minnesota through enhanced approaches and practices. The review is patterned after the Graduate School's ongoing program reviews and includes a self-survey document, which was prepared by the Graduate School staff over the summer, and its evaluation by the all-University committee this fall. The product of the committee's deliberations will be a report that highlights the Graduate School's strengths and weaknesses, identifies issues, and makes recommendations. Yet to be decided is whether individuals external to the University will be invited to participate. Other faculty members of the all-University committee are Bianca Conti-Tronconi (Biochemistry/College of Biological Sciences), Leo T. Furcht (Laboratory Medicine and Pathology), Paul Gassman (Chemistry), Craig E. Swan (Economics), Graham A. Tobin (Geography/Duluth campus), Richard A. Weinberg (Child Development), and Susan M. Wick (Plant Biology). Graduate student members are Michelle Englund (Home Economics Education [alternate]), Anne Sales (Health Services Research), and Gloria Warren (Home Economics Education).

The committee began its work over the summer and will deliver its report and recommendations to Vice President Petersen at the end of the fall quarter. Your comments on the issues identified below are invited in order to gather important information for the committee's consideration early in the term. The graduate student organization, the Council of Graduate Students (COGS), will solicit student comment for the review. The committee will also hold open hearings with various Graduate School constituencies later in the quarter.

Although the committee's charge is broad and encompasses virtually all aspects of graduate education and research at this institution, its deliberations and report will clearly focus on
graduate education. The committee's charge includes an examination of the following specific questions and issues:

- Are there models for effective relationships of the Graduate School and graduate programs to departments and colleges, especially in terms of decision-making processes with regard to priorities and expenditures?

- What improvements can be made in the admissions process?

- What improvements can be made in other support services provided by the Graduate School for graduate programs?

- What approaches are needed to best support interdisciplinary graduate programs?

- Are special approaches needed for applied programs? If so, what are these? (Are there some post-baccalaureate professional degree programs not currently under the Graduate School's jurisdiction that would benefit from inclusion under the Graduate School umbrella? Which programs are these? Should they be included?)

In addition, the committee has identified the ongoing program review process as an issue in its deliberations. Of particular concern are the effectiveness of the process and the extent to which the reviews serve as a reliable indicator of program quality across the University.

You may send your written comments on these issues, and any others you wish to address, to me at the Department of Information and Decision Sciences, 395 Hubert H. Humphrey Center, West Bank Campus. If you have questions, I or other committee members would be happy to discuss them with you; do not hesitate to call any one of us. Your response by October 1 will greatly facilitate our work.

We very much appreciate your assistance in this important undertaking and we look forward to your response.

PEJ/vf

cc: Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen
October 8, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Policy and Review Council Representatives

FROM: Anne C. Petersen, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School

SUBJECT: Graduate School Review

As you know, I have appointed a University-wide committee to review the Graduate School with the general goal of improving graduate education. The review committee met on several occasions over the summer and is hard at work this fall. I have asked the committee to report to me by the end of the quarter.

A discussion of the issues related to the Graduate School review will be an important agenda item for the fall meetings of the Policy and Review Councils. Some of the salient issues were identified in correspondence graduate faculty members received from committee chair Professor Paul E. Johnson (Department of Information and Decision Sciences) in late summer. Graduate student representatives have been informed of the committee's work through the graduate student organization, the Council of Graduate Students (COGS).

Professor Johnson and/or other members of the all-University committee will meet with each Policy and Review Council next month to hear representatives' views and solicit Council input to the review process. Please think about the issues you believe are important to address in the review and come to your Council's meeting prepared to discuss these.

I look forward to the Council's productive discussion of the Graduate School review in November.

ACP/vf

cc: Professor Paul E. Johnson
MEMORANDUM

TO: Paul Magee, Dean, College of Biological Sciences

FROM: Paul E. Johnson, Chair, Graduate School Review Committee

SUBJECT: Meeting With Review Committee Representative to Discuss Budgetary College Role Relative to Graduate Programs

October 13, 1992

As you are aware, Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen has appointed an all-University committee to review the Graduate School with the objective of improving graduate education at the University of Minnesota. Over the summer, you were invited to provide input to the review process.

The review committee is presently exploring the possibility of fundamental changes in the relationship of the Graduate School to collegiate units in many areas in which the Graduate School currently serves as final authority. For instance, under one proposed model departments and programs would have final decision-making authority with respect to such things as graduate admissions, graduate faculty membership and student programs. (Under this proposed model, the large number of Graduate School programs—currently 173 degree-granting programs—would likely be reduced through program consolidation.) The Graduate School would retain authority in matters such as faculty research funding, graduate student fellowships, block grants and tuition fellowships. In addition, the Graduate School would act as an advocate for things such as increased resources for graduate student fellowships, as well as a critic and troubleshooter to ensure that the overall objective of high-quality graduate education at the University of Minnesota is being met.

The committee views the budgetary college dean as crucial to any recommendations to adopt a structure that would vest greater responsibility and authority for day-to-day operations of graduate education in the individual graduate programs. In this regard, committee member Professor Bianca Conti-Tronconi will be contacting you shortly to schedule a meeting for the purpose of learning your views on the following questions:
Decision-making authority

1) What are the functions of graduate education that you believe should be performed at the collegiate and departmental level and what should be reserved for the Graduate School?

2) Do you believe programs in which faculty in your college participate manage the admissions process effectively with present resources? If not, would you be willing to contribute funding to the admissions process?

3) Are there programs in your college that can be consolidated? What criteria would you use to identify such programs? How would program consolidation affect the programs' ability to manage the admissions process and your willingness to contribute funding to this process?

Program reviews

4) What is your view of the Graduate School's current program review process as a means of ensuring quality in the graduate education process? How effective have the reviews been for programs in your college? What improvements, if any, would you suggest?

5) How would you manage the review process for programs in your college, or for joint programs with other colleges in which your faculty participate? What information/resources would you require?

6) What particular graduate programs in your college do you view as being of high quality? What measures do you believe should be used to judge graduate program quality?

Program structure

7) Are there special issues in your college with respect to interdisciplinary programs (majors as well as supporting minors)? How do you view these programs within your college? Are they successful? How would you provide funding for administrative costs for such programs if it were necessary for their survival?

Relationships with the budgetary college

8) How well do you believe the Graduate School has done in achieving the objective of high-quality graduate education at the University of Minnesota? Where in your experience
have been the major points of friction between the Graduate School and programs in which your college faculty participate? Where have you felt that the Graduate School has provided substantial benefits over what your college could provide?

9) If more responsibility is shifted from the Graduate School to the budgetary college deans, would you assume responsibility for the management of these resources based on the objective of high-quality graduate education? What steps would you take to ensure that programs provide adequate resources (both faculty advisors and fellowship/TA/RA dollars) to their students?

10) How would you describe the balance between graduate education, certain professional programs and undergraduate education in your college? Is graduate education (master's and doctoral) an important part of your collegiate mission? What proportion of your budget do you allocate for doctoral education? What proportion of this amount is for administrative costs for programs in which your faculty participate? How are graduate program administrative costs of your college funded? Do you provide any fellowship funding for graduate students?

Thank you for giving these questions some thought prior to your meeting with committee member Conti-Tronconi. If you would like to discuss the questions with me (624-6865) or with Professor Conti-Tronconi (624-6796; 624-3790) beforehand, please feel free to call.

We look forward to your input to the Graduate School review process.

PEJ/vf

cc: Professor Bianca Conti-Tronconi
Vice President and Dean Anne C. Petersen
October 29, 1992

MEMORANDUM

TO: Graduate School Staff

FROM: Paul E. Johnson, Chair, Graduate School Review Committee

The all-University Graduate School Review Committee very much appreciates the opportunity to meet with you and solicit your input to the Graduate School review.

We have prepared the attached list of questions to focus our discussion next Monday, November 2. While other questions will naturally evolve during our meeting, these should help get us started.

I look forward to our discussion next week.

PEJ/vf

Enclosure

cc: Members, All-University Graduate School Review Committee
October 29, 1992

Questions from the Graduate School Review Committee
for the Meeting with the Graduate School Staff

1. What things do you believe you do well? Which of your responsibilities do you view as being most important?

2. What do you perceive to be the most common problems encountered by graduate students as they move from admission to degree completion? What possible solutions would you recommend?

3. What areas or offices outside the Graduate School are perceived as creating problems for graduate students? What possible solutions would you recommend?

4. Would it be possible for the Graduate School to coordinate, or have more input to the workings of, some of the offices with which graduate students regularly deal but that are outside of the Graduate School (e.g., Student Accounts Receivable, Graduate Assistants Office)? Is a reorganization of some of these offices feasible?

5. In collecting data for this review, the all-University committee has discovered that some data it believes might be routinely reported is not now collected, or may not be reported consistently across programs. The committee would like to explore with the Graduate School staff how data with respect to graduate programs is best collected (for example, information about graduate student funding).

6. The Graduate School's Policy and Review Councils appear to be for the most part reactive committees that are engaged in routine matters such as course review and review of faculty nominations.
for Graduate School appointments. An important and regular responsibility of the Councils is the review and recommendation of proposals for new graduate degree programs and for the discontinuation of existing programs. The Councils do not appear to be involved in the ongoing review of programs with respect to program quality, however. Why is this so? What advantages do you perceive in regular Council review of programs?

7. What do you think about uncoupling tuition and instructional cost? What do you think would need to be done to break this link?
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Correspondence Received From The Twin Cities Campus

Faculty

John S. Adams
Professor
Department of Geography

Norma M. Allewell
Head
Department of Biochemistry

Ronald Aminzade
Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Sociology

C. G. Anderson
Professor
English

Anonymous
Mechanical Engineering

Mario F. Bognanno
Chair, Faculty Consultative Committee
Industrial Relations Center

Linda J. Brady
Associate Professor
Department of Food Science and Nutrition

Philip Bromiley
Associate Professor
Carlson School of Management

Kenneth N. Brooks
Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Forestry

Judith E. Brown
Professor
Public Health Nutrition

William J. Doherty
Director of Graduate Studies
Family Social Science

Ann M. Fallon
Associate Professor
Department of Entomology
Faculty (Cont'd)

Esther Gallant
Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Veterinary Pathobiology
(two letters were received)

Burle Gengenbach
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

Harold D. Grotevant
Professor and Head
Department of Family Social Science

J. Woods Halley
Professor
School of Physics and Astronomy

David A. Halvorson
Professor
Department of Veterinary Pathobiology

David W. Hamilton
Chair, Council of Basic Sciences
Department of Cell Biology and Neuroanatomy

Darwin Hendel
Research Associate
Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Peter Hudleston
Professor and Head
N. H. Winchell School of Earth Sciences

Susan Hupp
Associate Professor
Educational Psychology

Jean D. Kinsey
Professor
Agriculture and Applied Economics

Tucker W. LeBien
Professor
Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology

Richard W. Linck
Professor
Department of Cell Biology and Neuroanatomy

Jean A. Montgomery
Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Theatre Arts and Dance
Faculty (Cont'd)

Fred L. Morrison
Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly Professor of Law
Law School

Wayne E. Potratz
Professor and Chair
Department of Studio Arts

John Riedl
Assistant Professor
Computer Science

Julia Robinson
Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Architecture

Dr. Ashley Robinson
Department of Clinical and Population Sciences
College of Veterinary Medicine

Donald Ross
Professor
Composition and Communication Program

C. Wade Savage
Professor
Department of Philosophy

Robert Scott
Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Speech Communication

Thomas W. Shaughnessy
University Librarian
Wilson Library

Larry Smith
Professor
Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics

Robert P. Sonkowsky
Professor
Classical and Near Eastern Studies

Tony Starfield
Professor
Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior

Bert Stromberg
Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Veterinary Pathobiology
Faculty (Cont'd)

Professor Michael G. Wade
Professor and Director
School of Kinesiology and Leisure Studies

David J. Weiss
Professor
Department of Psychology

Carol L. Wells
Associate Professor
Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology

Frank Wood
Professor
Department of Educational Psychology

Cheryl L. Zimmerman
Associate Professor
Department of Pharmaceutics

Graduate Students

Anonymous
Doctoral Candidate
(See also Appendix V)

Deans and Other University Administrators

Robert E. Anderson, M.D.
Vice President
Health Sciences

Corinne Dickey
Assistant Director
Carlson School of Management Ph.D. Program

Sandra R. Edwardson
Dean
School of Nursing

Harrison Fraker
Dean
Architecture and Landscape Architecture

Sally Jorgensen
Associate Dean
College of Biological Sciences

Harold A. Miller
Dean
Continuing Education and Extension

Donald R. Riley
Professor and Acting Associate Provost
Computing and Information Services
Correspondence Received From The Duluth Campus

Faculty

Carol Bock
Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of English

One letter authored by three individuals:

Christopher R. Carroll
Associate Professor
Computer Engineering Department

Dianne Dorlan
Associate Professor
Department of Chemical Engineering

L. Alden Kendall,
Head
Industrial Engineering Department

Lester R. Drewes
Professor and Head
Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

Thomas J. Farrell
Associate Professor
Department of Composition

Kristelle Miller
Associate Professor
Psychology and Mental Health

David J. Schimpf
Associate Professor and Head
Department of Biology

Fred E. H. Schroeder
Professor
Interdisciplinary Programs

Melanie Shepard
Head and Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Social Work

Paul Siders
Director of Graduate Studies
Department of Chemistry

Graduate Students
(See Appendix V)
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Meetings With Stakeholder Groups

Meetings with Policy and Review Councils

- Physical Sciences Policy and Review Council on November 5, 1992, attended by Regents’ Professor Paul Gassman
- Biological Sciences Policy and Review Council on November 6, 1992 attended by Professor Susan Wick
- Education and Psychology Policy and Review Council on November 9, 1992, attended by Professor Richard Weinberg
- Language, Literature and Arts Policy and Review Council on November 10, 1992, attended by Professor Susan Wick
- Health Sciences Policy and Review Council on November 17, 1992, attended by Professor Bianca Conti-Tronconi
- Social Sciences Policy and Review Council on November 18, 1992, attended by Professor Craig Swan

Meeting with Graduate School Executive Committee

- Meeting on November 24, 1992, attended by Professor Paul Johnson

Meeting with Duluth Campus Representatives

- Meeting with Duluth Graduate Faculty Council and budgetary college deans on October 13, 1992, attended by Professors Paul Johnson and Graham Tobin

Meeting with Graduate Students

- Open forum with graduate students on October 19, 1992, attended by Professor Johnson and Ms. Anne Sales

Meeting with Graduate School Staff

- Meeting of the Graduate School Review Committee and select members of the Graduate School staff on November 2, 1992

Meetings with Budgetary College Deans

- Professor Bianca Conti-Tronconi with College of Biological Sciences Dean Paul T. Magee on October 19, 1992; with College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture Dean Harrison Fraker and Professor Roger Clemence on October 21, 1992; and with College of Veterinary Medicine Dean David Thawley on October 29, 1992
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• Professor Leo T. Furcht with School of Dentistry Dean Richard Elzay on November 10, 1992; with Medical School Dean David M. Brown on November 11, 1992; with School of Nursing Sandra Edwardson on November 12, 1992; and with College of Pharmacy Interim Dean Robert Cipolle on December 7, 1992

• Professor Paul Gassman with Institute of Technology Acting Dean Gordon Beavers on October 21, 1992

• Professor Paul Johnson with Curtis L. Carlson School of Management Dean David Kidwell on November 10, 1992; with Law School Dean Robert Stein and Professor Fred L. Morrison on November 11, 1992; and with Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs Dean G. Edward Schuh on November 17, 1992

• Ms. Anne Sales with School of Public Health Dean Stephen Joseph and Associate Deans James R. Boen and Edith Leyasmeyer on October 22, 1992

• Professor Craig Swan with Continuing Education and Extension Dean Harold Miller on October 29, 1992, and with College of Liberal Arts Dean Julia Davis on October 30, 1992

• Ms. Gloria Warren with College of Human Ecology Dean Mary Heltsley on October 27, 1992

• Professor Richard Weinberg with College of Education Dean Robert Bruininks and Associate Dean Dale Lange on October 26, 1992

• Professor Susan Wick with College of Natural Resources Dean Richard A. Skok on October 15, 1992, and with College of Agriculture Dean Richard Jones on October 19, 1992

Meeting with Other University Administrators

• Professors Paul Johnson and Craig Swan with Assistant to the President David Berg, and Professor Stephen Hoenack on November 6, 1992
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Documents Provided to the Committee by Its Student Members

- Recommendations to the Graduate School Review Committee (attached)
- Summary of statements received from graduate students (attached)
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL REVIEW COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

The Graduate School Review Committee has spent much of its time and energy considering new structures and relationships between the Graduate School and the programs which deliver graduate education.

The Council of Graduate Students supports changes in the structure of graduate education at the University of Minnesota, with the specific proviso that any new or altered structures do at least as good a job, and preferably better, of addressing the specific concerns of graduate students articulated below. We believe that one of the keys to high quality graduate education is the involvement of graduate students in policy making that affects the provision and monitoring of graduate education. Any system which facilitates this involvement will strengthen the processes and outcomes of graduate education at the University of Minnesota.

The graduate student members of the Graduate School Review Committee and the COGS Executive Committee recommend the following six strategies:

1. **Involve graduate students in decision making at all levels of policy and decision making.**

Currently, graduate students have full voting privileges on the Policy and Review Councils which are in theory the policy making bodies of the Graduate School. One of the problems which has been identified with the current system is that the Policy and Review Councils are not always active or effective in their role of making policy and reviewing programs. In addition, graduate students also frequently sit as voting members of the faculty committees within their departments or programs which make policy about graduate education within the department. This is not uniform, however, across departments and programs.

**Principle:**

Graduate students have important insights into their educational needs and as consumers must be given a significant voice in the process of evaluating and improving the quality of graduate education.

**Recommendations:**

Include student representatives as voting members in any decision-making structures at all levels, such as:

- **Departmental level:**
- Program review committees
-- Course review committees
-- Committees addressing reorganization, consolidation, or closure
-- Committees charged with formulating policies affecting graduate students, such as criteria for awarding traineeships, criteria for awarding assistantships, and program changes.

Graduate School level:
-- Policy and Review Councils (or their equivalent in any reorganized structure)
-- Graduate School Executive Committee
-- Any ad hoc committees and task forces

2. Formulate clear and consistent guidelines in the Graduate School for faculty, students and staff involvement in decision making.

The existing structures do not clearly articulate the processes and procedures by which decisions are made in the Graduate School. There is substantial ambiguity surrounding the various domains and purviews of the Graduate School staff, the graduate faculty, the Policy and Review Councils, the departments and programs, and students.

Principle:

In order to increase effectiveness, long-run efficiency, and satisfaction in this educational community, all stakeholders should be made aware of the formal mechanisms for involvement in decision making in the Graduate School.

Recommendations:

Faculty, staff, and student representatives should formulate preliminary guidelines, offer them for public comment, and publish final versions. Throughout the process, the guidelines should be accessible in libraries, departments, and through electronic bulletin boards. Guidelines for the following important areas are needed particularly:

-- creating new programs
-- eliminating, merging, and reorganizing programs
-- awarding assistantships and fellowships
-- admissions policies that attract and retain outstanding students
-- admissions policies that attract and retain students from ethnic and cultural groups underrepresented in the Graduate School.

3. Assess the impact of current and proposed policies on graduate students

Currently, policies and decisions affecting graduate students in every facet of their progress in graduate education are made at multiple levels in the University, from the Board of Regents through the Graduate School to the
departments and programs. Many of these policies appear to arise without an identified source or author, and their articulation and implementation have appeared arbitrary and lack accountability. Attempts to discover the source have been frustrating, and attempts to intervene or have input into the policy creation or implementation have often been fruitless.

Principle:

Essential to creating a more positive environment for graduate education is a more detailed understanding of graduate students and how university and Graduate School policies affect them. Ongoing involvement of student representatives in the decision making process, and objective, accessible data promote better understanding and projections of policy outcomes.

Recommendations:

Prior to any policy change or any new policy implementation, an assessment should be made, seeking student and faculty input, of the potential impact of this new policy or change on graduate students as a whole, as well as on subgroups of students. This assessment should be made not only for policies under the sole purview of the Graduate School but should be a routine part of all policy and decision-making at the University. In particular, the Graduate School should act as facilitator for this assessment in cases where policy implementation and change affect graduate students and graduate education. Particular areas of concern at this point are:

At the Graduate School level:
- retention of women and students of color
- admissions policy
- registration policy
- thesis credit policy
- full time student status
- time limits for degree completion
- mechanisms to monitor and communicate student status and progress

At the University level:
- Financial Aid
- Academic Affairs
- Student Affairs
- Registration and tuition
- Safety

Understanding the current and past population of graduate students will aid in these assessments. The Graduate School should develop a database of students' demographic characteristics and educational progress. This should include information on gender, marital status, race, age of dependents, length of time to complete degree, status (full/part-time), citizenship, and nature of financial support.
4. Clearly articulate a definition of graduate education and the role of graduate students in it that is not credit based.

The policies currently enforced for determining graduate student status appear to reflect an underlying concept of graduate education as primarily credit based. Status determinations at present are made solely on the basis of number of credits for which the student is registered. This often imposes significant hardship for graduate students, particularly those nearing the end of their courses of study, when they have completed course work and thesis requirements and the bulk of their time and effort is taken up with research activities. Graduate education, in contrast to undergraduate education, is not primarily a credit-based endeavor. Definitions of graduate students which rely on credit-based enrollment diminish the stature of graduate education and undermine the importance of research and the necessity of apprenticeship to the research process.

Principles:

COGS believes graduate education is a collaboration between graduate students, graduate faculty and the Graduate School which fosters the development of scholars and professionals. A graduate student is a person who pursues a graduate education. Graduate students should have the opportunity to develop unique relationships which foster intellectual inquiry and contribute to their discipline.

Recommendations:

Formulate and promote a definition and principles of graduate education which decouple the links that currently seem to exist between graduate education and credit registration and state clearly the importance of graduate education to the university. From this perspective, define graduate students' role in graduate education. Mechanisms for determining status as an active graduate student which clearly articulate and preserve these principles should replace mechanisms which are primarily constructed to promote administrative ease of processing.

5. Establish criteria for assessing the quality of graduate education.

At present, the only review process which appears to be in place for monitoring the quality of the graduate programs at the University are the infrequent external reviews which occur at episodic intervals, and provide widely varying assessments of programs which are difficult to use for comparative purposes. It is not clear whether ongoing reviews of existing programs is one of the functions of the Policy and Review Councils or not. As a result, there appears to
be no mechanism for ongoing, periodic, and consistent review of programs. This may be part of the reason for the proliferation of programs in the Graduate School.

Principle:

Criteria for assessing the quality of graduate education should be articulated and uniformly applied to all programs offering graduate degrees. Mechanisms for monitoring quality should be closely related to the policy and review structures of the Graduate School and should function at frequent and routine intervals. Any structures and procedures for monitoring program quality should include significant input from graduate students, who are the consumers of the educational processes being offered.

Recommendations:

Criteria for assessing quality should be clearly articulated and consistently applied. Quality criteria and mechanisms for monitoring quality should require input from graduate students, the Graduate School, faculty and external reviewers.

6. Create a Graduate School environment that encourages degree completion and fosters development of scholars and professionals.

Many of the issues identified in the preceding sections contribute to a feeling of anger and alienation on the part of graduate students who have had negative experiences as a result of "falling through the cracks" of the current structures and outcomes. In many cases, this has resulted in lengthening of the time to complete their degrees, and sometimes in failing to complete their degrees. While these are extreme results of problems in the system, and while the causes are often complex and not assignable to any single agent, it is clear that there are ways in which the Graduate School can assist in making the process simpler for graduate students.

Principle:

Given a definition of graduate education and the goal of producing scholars and professionals, the Graduate School should actively design an environment which furthers these ends.

Recommendation:

Clear and consistent guidelines and mechanisms for monitoring student progress should be developed within the Graduate School with input from students and faculty in order to encourage degree completion and foster
academic and professional development, particularly with respect to the following:

- recognizing student contributions to the educational and research environment
- rewarding faculty for teaching, mentoring, and advising
- monitoring the activities of junior faculty in particular, and rewarding them for mentoring and teaching functions
- selecting and training Directors of Graduate Study
- developing guidelines for advisor/advisee relationships
- improving mechanisms for grievance both within programs and with the Graduate School
- improving and enhancing the process for approving interdisciplinary minors and monitoring their progress.

We appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Review Committee and its deliberations. It is a positive indication of the Graduate School's movement towards greater involvement of students in decision making and we strongly encourage the development of this trend. We anticipate enhanced graduate education at the University of Minnesota as a result of the Committee's work.
Council of Graduate Students
Graduate School Review Committee

Summary of statements received from graduate students

Registration issues

-- Allow students at the "thesis credit only" stage or beyond to register by mail

-- Graduate School should send out all newly updated policies and information to graduate students or at least to the departments

-- Multiple comments indicating anger and distress over the range of issues involved in lower tuition charges for students at the end of their course of study:
  
  -- anger over the abolition of zero- or one-credit registration after required thesis credits have been completed
  
  -- anger over the subsequent abolition of the lower tuition rate ($30 per credit) for thesis credits after completion of the required thesis credits

Tuition/financial support issues

-- There should be an automatic tuition waiver for students who obtain outside support (e.g. fellowships, scholarships); present policy and actions seem to discourage people from applying for or accepting outside funding because their overall expenses would increase drastically without tuition waivers

-- "Financial aid-- does it exist? All that I am aware of are the few competitive scholarships"

-- Unclear policies about distribution of assistantships; lack of clear criteria for awarding them; questions about equal opportunity in applying for assistantships (one person reported having applied for "at least a hundred" assistantships, only to find that the posting did not reflect the reality of the situation; in fact, the positions were de facto filled before the positions were posted)
Teaching issues

-- Non-interactive teaching styles noted; lack of feedback from students; comment that while TAs are trained in teaching techniques that encourage student initiative, faculty seem to lack this training

Work environment issues

-- Working space is crowded and inefficient

-- Concern expressed about safety on campus, especially for graduate students who frequently have to work late at night

-- Safety issues in connection with research or assistantship work; one person in a biological science field reported being specifically told by a professor (her employer) not to wear gloves in the lab despite handling microbial products

Interactions with the Graduate School

-- "The Graduate School... hmm... some offices in an old dark building far away on the Minneapolis campus (I'm on the St. Paul campus--remember us?)"-- recommends satellite office of the Graduate School on the St. Paul campus; also asks "what exactly do you (the Graduate School) do for me?" and recommends better PR

-- Too much paperwork and "running between campuses"

-- "I was surprised to receive this form [requests for comments] because the Grad School has not played any real role in my graduate education. I am glad to see this attempt to relate to the students more... I have no idea what the grad school really does other than process paperwork which to me it seems the dept. or program already does. In other words, it is not clear to me why we have a separate Grad School."

-- "From my experience, basically graduate students do most of their work on their own. So the least interference the better for them to achieve their academic goals."

-- Lack of advocacy or ombuds function in the Graduate School to assist in resolving problems in the departments or programs
Lack of advocacy on the part of the Graduate School to assist in resolving problems with other administrative units; probably most frequently cited are problems with employment and resolving payroll and other problems with the Graduate Assistant Office

**Admissions issues**

-- Too much red tape; staff at Graduate School perceived as "unpolite" during contact over admissions issues-- recommends training for staff on interpersonal communication

**Program issues**

-- No contact with the DGS since admission to the program
-- DGS has made personally denigrating comments which reflect at best insensitivity to someone from a background different from his own
-- Inadequate training of DGS's and advisors

**Advising issues**

-- Several comments on the impersonality and/or absence of advising

Comments from one student:

"My grad school experiences have been positive-- from admissions, thesis requirements, program structure, etc. My major advisor has been excellent-- supportive and available-- as has been my experience with our DGS."

"I am in the Computer Science department. I'm pursuing my degree while working full-time and have repeatedly found the University to assume that I am on campus during normal business hours for registering, getting signatures, etc. Worse yet, departmental offices are not open late enough to overlap with night classes so even if I am on campus once a week, I can't get at my mailbox.

More significantly, I have been forced to take a number of day classes. While my employer is supportive it makes it very difficult for me,"
especially since I have to drive 20 to 30 minutes each way for a little over an hour and a half of class time.

Considering the fact that the University arbitrarily doubles our tuition, and adding in the fact that many graduate students are in a situation similar to mine, I feel the University could easily do more to compensate for these circumstances."

"
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Universities Surveyed for Information About Their Graduate Schools

University of Arizona, Tucson
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Indiana University
University of Iowa
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Michigan State University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Northwestern University
The Ohio State University
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
University of Texas, Austin
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
APPENDIX VII

Follow-up Memorandum from Graduate Student Committee Members

The final report of the committee to review the Graduate School was submitted to Vice President Anne Petersen on December 16, 1992. Contained in the report are several recommendations that, if adopted, would require changes in the constitution of the Graduate School as well as the constitution of the Council of Graduate Students (COGS). In early January, the faculty members on the committee were asked by Vice President Petersen to respond to a memorandum she had received from the three graduate student members outlining their concerns with respect to two such recommendations. The students asked that the memorandum be included as an appendix in the copy of the report that is distributed to the University community. Based on a poll of the faculty members of the committee the chair agreed to include the memorandum as Appendix VII of the committee’s report.
TO: Anne Petersen, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School
FROM: Michelle Englund, Anne Sales, Gloria Warren, Graduate Student Members of the Committee to Review the Graduate School
DATE: January 13, 1993

SUBJECT: Recommendations 9 and 12 of the Committee to Review the Graduate School

As members of the Committee to Review the Graduate School, we have repeatedly voiced our strong objections to Recommendations 9 and 12. These recommendations give the Dean of the Graduate School the power to select graduate student members of the newly constituted Policy and Review Councils and Graduate School Executive Council. Under the current policy, the Council of Graduate Students elects these students.

Graduate students cannot be represented by students who are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Dean of the Graduate School. They can only be represented by students elected by and responsible to graduate students.

This proposal is contrary to the democratic principles that educational institutions foster. It violates both the letter and the spirit of the Graduate School constitution and the COGS constitution.

The Graduate School constitution states:

Each Policy and Review Council shall be composed of: . . . graduate student members in the ratio of one student to three faculty members, with a minimum number of three students, who shall be chosen by the Council of Graduate Students in accordance with its bylaws. (Article V, Section 2.b)

. . . (COGS) shall be the chief instrumentality for achieving participation by graduate students in the affairs of the Graduate School, and shall nominate graduate student representatives to all appropriate councils and committees of the Graduate School and to other University groups. (Article V, Section 7.c (2))

COGS holds elections, which are widely publicized, to fill graduate student positions on Policy and Review Councils and all other councils and committees that have positions for graduate students. In practice, "nomination" by COGS to a Policy and Review Council,* or to any other body, equals election. "Nomination" of graduate students to the Graduate School Executive Committee is provided for in the COGS constitution. The COGS president and 3 of the 6 student Policy and Review Council chairs (on a rotating basis) are the 4 members who represent graduate students.

We request that this letter be listed in the Table of Contents and included in the Appendix of the final report. Please notify us regarding the above requests by January 19, so that we can inform COGS representatives at our next General Assembly meeting on January 20. We would be glad to meet with you to discuss this matter further.

* Nominee must be a graduate student enrolled in the Graduate School program represented by the Policy and Review to which he/she was elected.

c. Members of the Committee to Review the Graduate School