

**Report of the Committee to Review  
the Graduate School**

**Fall 1992**

**University of Minnesota**

# Report of the Committee to Review the Graduate School

Fall 1992

## Committee Members

Bianca M. Conti-Tronconi  
Professor  
Department of Biochemistry (CBS)

Leo T. Furcht  
Professor and Head  
Laboratory Medicine and Pathology

Paul G. Gassman  
Regents' Professor  
Department of Chemistry

Paul E. Johnson, Committee Chair  
Carlson Professor of Decision Sciences  
Information & Decision Sciences

Anne E. Sales  
Graduate Student (COGS Representative)  
Institute for Health Services Research

Craig E. Swan  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Economics

Graham A. Tobin  
Professor  
Department of Geography - Duluth

Gloria Warren  
Graduate Student (COGS Representative)  
Home Economics Education

Richard A. Weinberg  
Professor and Director  
Institute of Child Development

Susan M. Wick  
Associate Professor  
Department of Plant Biology

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Introduction .....	4
Strengths and Weaknesses.....	6
Recommendations.....	7
Discussion .....	9
Appendix I: Issues Raised in Correspondence .....	20
Appendix II: Correspondence Inviting Input to the Review .....	22
Appendix III: Correspondence Received from the Twin Cities and Duluth Campuses .....	23
Appendix IV: Meetings with Stakeholder Groups.....	28
Appendix V: Documents Provided to the Committee by its Student Members .....	30
Appendix VI: Universities Surveyed for Information About Their Graduate Schools .....	31
Appendix VII: Follow-up Memorandum from Graduate Student Committee Members.....	32

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In spring 1992, Vice President for Research and Graduate School Dean Anne C. Petersen charged a committee of graduate faculty and graduate students to review the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota with the goal of improving graduate education.

In fulfilling its charge, the committee has attempted to formulate a coherent set of recommendations that foster excellence in graduate programs without simply proposing the addition of resources. These recommendations reflect a belief that graduate education is fundamentally a process between faculty and students, and that a Graduate School should act to support and enhance this process. From its analysis of data, which included input from faculty, graduate students, and administration, as well as information provided by graduate schools at peer research institutions, the committee concluded that the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota has evolved a regulatory stance toward graduate education that creates frustration for faculty and students alike.

The committee believes it is both timely and appropriate to give faculty greater authority in the central functions of graduate education. Its recommendations therefore make the faculty action the final action in several areas, while leaving administrative processing in the Graduate School.

The committee's recommendations should entail no additional burden or cost for graduate programs. As faculty are given more authority over graduate education, however, they must also accept greater responsibility for ensuring its quality. Thus the committee recommends vesting authority for evaluating the quality of graduate programs in newly constituted Policy and Review Councils that spend less time on routine processing matters and more time on substantial issues of graduate education.

Increasingly, graduate schools at major research institutions have become a focus of advocacy and leadership for high quality and innovative graduate education. The recommendations contained in this report are made with the intent of encouraging such a role for the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota.

## INTRODUCTION

For the past century, graduate education and research have been fundamental to the University of Minnesota. They have been both a source of strength and at the core of contributions the University has made to the social, cultural and economic development of the state. At a time when knowledgeable leaders are forecasting a significant reduction in the number of research universities, it is in the best interest of the state and the University that the Graduate School take steps to insure that Minnesota is not only among the surviving institutions, but that its programs of graduate education and research continue to be vital centers of national leadership.

It is in this context that Vice President for Research and Graduate School Dean Anne C. Petersen this past spring appointed a committee to review the Graduate School. In her letter Vice President Petersen raised five questions:

- 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 strong applied programs? If so, what are these?

Following Vice President Petersen's charge, the committee met over the summer to develop a work plan and procedures that would allow broad opportunity for faculty, students and staff to bring issues to the attention of the committee. Subsequently, announcements about the committee's composition and charge were featured in relevant university news outlets, including the newsletter of the Council of Graduate Students. The chair of the committee wrote to all department chairs, deans, Directors of Graduate Studies (DGS) and graduate faculty soliciting comments. Members of the committee met individually with deans, the Council of Graduate Students, each Policy and Review Council, the Graduate School Executive Committee, the staff of the Graduate School and faculty and deans on the Duluth Campus. The committee

received 61 letters from individuals. (An abstract of issues raised in these letters is included in Appendix I.) Additional information was collected from graduate schools at other universities. Over summer and the fall quarter the committee held seven full committee meetings to review this material and to formulate its recommendations. Numerous meetings of three subcommittees were held as well.

In conducting its assigned task, the committee identified three principles as foundational to the future success of graduate education at the University of Minnesota. These principles are:

- A close association must exist between the research and scholarly resources of the University and the policies and practices of graduate education. Just as resources for scholarly activities are a critical source of funding for graduate education, graduate students are part of the life blood of the research and educational process.
- All graduate education at the University of Minnesota must be held accountable to high standards of quality. As a major public research and teaching institution, the University of Minnesota must conduct graduate education according to standards of its best peer institutions, private as well as public.
- Graduate programs must be effectively managed; this includes setting clear goals, assessing progress towards the achievement of these goals and providing adequate resources for administering programs and funding students. To be effective, graduate education in a major public institution must also include the establishment of an academic community in which the demand for intellectual rigor is coupled with a commitment to the success of a diverse student body.

In what follows, we begin with a brief synopsis of the strengths and weaknesses of the Graduate School as presently organized. We then draw on Vice President Petersen's questions, the above principles and our analysis of information collected in the review process to make recommendations for the structure of the Graduate School and its role in graduate education at the University of Minnesota. We conclude with a discussion of each recommendation in which we attempt to set down our reasoning. Several appendices containing summaries of material generated during the review process are attached.

## STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The Graduate School has a number of outstanding and committed staff. These individuals have contributed to the Graduate School's effectiveness in administering tuition waivers, handling distribution of block grants, and administering programs such as competitive fellowships, Hill Professorships and the McKnight program. The Graduate School also appears to be efficient at maintaining a wide variety of records concerning graduate programs and graduate students. Significant initiatives in recent years include tuition cost funding for doctoral students and subsidized costs for program promotional materials (e.g., recruitment brochures).

Weaknesses in the current system of graduate education occur on several fronts. It is apparent, for example, that offices in the Graduate School that deal with graduate students and faculty sometimes cause the kind of problems they were designed to correct. For example, interactions with Directors of Graduate Studies and graduate students occasionally lack sensitivity for the personal feelings and needs of the individuals and programs involved. Graduate students are sometimes turned away without answers to questions, or are required to wait too long to get the information they seek. In other cases there appears to be little understanding and too little empathy with the plight of the individual graduate student.

We also note that when students have difficulty or experience frustration with their education there is no system that provides a well defined path to follow in order to alleviate these difficulties. Indeed, in some cases the faculty, Director of Graduate Studies or Graduate School appear to be part of the problem.

Significant among additional problems in the view of the committee is the large number of graduate programs at Minnesota. Of the 173 current graduate programs (158 on the Twin Cities Campus and 15 on the Duluth Campus), 46 have nine or fewer students and 34 have five or fewer students. Graduate programs at the University of Minnesota have proliferated to the point where they appear to have been designed for a very small number of students and faculty. Students in such programs often lack adequate funding. In some cases there may not be enough individuals to form a critical mass for interaction among students or among faculty. In the worst cases there is no substantive intellectual core of knowledge in terms of which high quality graduate education can be conducted.

There is also concern about activities of the six Policy and Review Councils. The major role of these groups appears to be that of reviewing course changes, proposals for new programs, recommended appointments to the graduate faculty, and initiatives from the Graduate School.

The activities of the Councils use a significant amount of faculty and graduate student time. It is important that this valuable resource be spent on significant problems of graduate education.

Though brief, these remarks are intended to convey major conclusions from the review process. A more detailed description of the issues examined by the committee can be found in Appendix I. We turn next to the recommendations for reorganization of the Graduate School and its programs. This is followed by a discussion of each recommendation.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Graduate School should retain its current record-keeping functions and add additional ones that will assist in an on-going determination of the quality of its graduate programs.
2. The Graduate School should retain its current financial authority in areas of tuition waivers, block grants, fellowships, faculty research grants, and funds for the recruitment and retention of minority students.
3. The Graduate School should maintain an office to assist individual graduate programs in evaluating applicants from those schools or countries where the graduate program in question has little knowledge of standards and practices.
4. Authority for graduate student admissions should rest solely with graduate programs.
5. Authority for approval of student programs should rest solely with graduate programs.
6. Authority for admission to the graduate faculty (as well as limited teaching status) should rest solely with graduate programs.
7. Each graduate program should act promptly to establish program goals that include maintaining appropriately high standards for admissions and the education of its students, as well as a process for regularly assessing progress toward these goals.
8. Each graduate program should provide to each new graduate student, on arrival, a written statement (bulletin) of the requirements for each degree offered by the graduate program.
9. Newly constituted, smaller Policy and Review Councils should be composed of Directors of Graduate Studies, faculty at large, and graduate student members.
10. Policy and Review Councils must play a significant role in maintaining standards for graduate education.

11. The Graduate School, with the assistance of its Policy and Review Councils, should oversee an immediate reduction in the number of graduate programs via the closing of programs of marginal quality and/or consolidation of closely related programs.
12. The Graduate School should establish an Executive Council made up of a small number of individuals who are recognized as outstanding members of the graduate faculty and at least two graduate students.
13. The Graduate School should take major responsibility for determining the overall goals of graduate education at the University of Minnesota.
14. Where the administration of graduate programs has budgetary implications, there must be an appropriate adjustment of budgetary resources.
15. The Graduate School should provide resources for the administration of cross-collegiate (interdisciplinary) programs.
16. Graduate programs should provide resources for the support and evaluation of their DGS function.
17. The Graduate School should aggressively seek funds to support multi-year graduate fellowships.
18. The Graduate School should aggressively seek funds to support better recruitment and retention of minority graduate students.
19. The Graduate School should take immediate steps to seek a better alignment between the cost of graduate education and the activities of its graduate programs.
20. The Graduate School should create a central office that coordinates functions now found in the Graduate Assistants Office with those associated with graduate student employment and fringe benefits.
21. The University should create an ombudsperson system for graduate students to use in dealing with dissatisfaction with any aspect of their graduate education and grievances not already covered by a separate grievance policy.
22. The position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration at the University of Minnesota at Duluth should be combined with the position of Associate Dean of the Graduate School at Duluth.

23. The University should establish a task force on graduate education to identify and examine issues relating to graduate programs not currently within the Graduate School.

## DISCUSSION

**Recommendation 1.** *The Graduate School should retain its current record-keeping functions and add additional ones that will assist in an on-going determination of the quality of its graduate programs.* The records kept by the Graduate School should include all of the data now collected, plus additional data that can serve as benchmarks of program quality. Among these additional kinds of data are time of enrollment for an advanced degree and the history (e.g., placement) of each degree recipient (see also the discussion of Recommendation 7). Such data provide one of the most significant ways of evaluating the success of a given program in training advanced degree candidates. Obviously, separate records need to be kept for masters students and for Ph.D. students.

**Recommendation 2.** *The Graduate School should retain its current financial authority in areas of tuition waivers, block grants, fellowships, faculty research grants, and funds for the recruitment and retention of minority students.* While not unanimous, there seems to be general agreement that the Graduate School is successful in its administration of block grants, tuition waivers, fellowships, faculty research grants, and McKnight and Hill Professorships. These should continue with the stipulation that the process by which individuals are selected to serve on committees and the criteria used to make awards be clearly stated and made readily available to programs. We also believe the Graduate School should retain oversight for such activities as funding minority recruitment and retention at the graduate student level.

The current policy of a guaranteed minimum level of future support gives programs important flexibility for multi-year planning, while it gives the Graduate School the necessary flexibility to adjust commitments in response to changes in the quality of programs. The Graduate School should avoid pressures for across the board entitlements. The allocation of support monies needs to reflect the quality of programs and the opportunities for programs to generate their own forms of support through external grants and fellowships. There may be an appropriate analogy with an optimal program of state aids to local communities. It is more important to look at revenue capacity than revenue raised. A community with a large tax base but low tax revenues due to an unwillingness to tax itself is not a deserving candidate for state aid. Evaluation of the ability of units to generate their own support will require new comparative information on the sources of support from similar programs at other institutions. We urge the Dean of the Graduate School to

work within relevant regional and national associations to develop the necessary comparative data.

**Recommendation 3.** *The Graduate School should maintain an office to assist individual graduate programs in evaluating applicants from those schools or countries where the graduate program in question has little knowledge of standards and practices.* We recognize that for many small graduate programs, the Director of Graduate Studies and any existing admissions committee may have only limited experience in judging the qualifications of applicants who come from certain schools or from countries where the individual graduate program has no prior experience. In those cases, it should be possible to turn to knowledgeable individuals within the Graduate School to obtain information about the relative training of a prospective graduate student.

**Recommendation 4.** *Authority for graduate student admissions should rest solely with graduate programs.* There are several aspects of Graduate School activities that the committee feels are best left to the individual graduate programs. The first of these is admission. Obviously, standards need to be maintained and there is always the fear that individual graduate programs may diminish their requirements in order to increase the size of their graduate student body. Thus, there must be oversight of the practice of decentralized admissions (see recommendation 10). In general, however, we believe that individual programs are best equipped to judge the qualifications (e.g., GPA's, test scores) of individuals who apply for admission. Similarly, Graduate School staff are generally not familiar with the individuals providing letters of recommendation and the quality of various colleges and universities in specific disciplines. We believe there is a strong case for individual graduate programs handling their overall admissions policy and its implementation.

**Recommendation 5.** *Authority for approval of student programs should rest solely with graduate programs.* While recognizing that graduate programs sometimes approve forms that are not consistent with Graduate School guidelines, we believe it is better to provide training and oversight for Directors of Graduate Studies than to attempt to regulate what is fundamentally a matter between individual students and their graduate programs. As with admissions (recommendation 4) and graduate faculty status (recommendation 6), the Policy and Review Councils are the appropriate body to perform the necessary oversight function.

**Recommendation 6.** *Authority for admission to the graduate faculty (as well as limited teaching status) should rest solely with graduate programs.* Departments/graduate programs are best qualified to make judgments of admission to the graduate faculty. While addition of faculty to a graduate program should be at the discretion of faculty in that program, continued membership in

graduate programs should be reviewed by the individual Policy and Review Councils (see recommendation 9). We recommend that Policy and Review Councils conduct a periodic review of all members of the graduate programs under their respective jurisdictions. Dismissal from a graduate program is warranted for those members of the graduate faculty who have failed to meet at least one of the following criteria during a specified period of time (e.g., three years): (a) teaching graduate level courses, (b) supervising graduate student thesis research, (c) acting as an advisor to graduate students, and (d) serving on graduate examination committees. Clearly, an individual who has no involvement in the teaching, research, or examination process within a given graduate program over a reasonable period of time is not an active member of that graduate faculty and should not be viewed as such. In appropriate cases, the Policy and Review Councils should recommend dismissal to the Dean of the Graduate School and indicate why such action is being recommended. The ultimate decision should be made by the Dean of the Graduate School. Individual graduate programs are encouraged to give careful consideration to those individuals who they choose to appoint to graduate faculty status within their programs in view of this policy.

**Recommendation 7.** *Each graduate program should act promptly to establish program goals that include maintaining appropriately high standards for admissions and the education of its students, as well as a process for regularly assessing progress toward these goals.* Current policies and practices of the Graduate School lack two critical tools for the effective management of graduate programs:

- **Periodic setting of program targets and goals.** In addition to long-term goal setting (e.g., every ten years), relatively frequent (e.g., every two or three years) goal setting procedures should also exist; such long-term and short-term sets of goals give a much needed reference point for assessing the success and the quality of graduate programs.
- **Means to assess the achievement of program goals.** Programs should regularly provide data relevant to the assessment of program performance and determination of program viability (see recommendation 10).

Each graduate program should establish goals and transmit these to the appropriate Policy and Review Council as well as to the Dean of the Graduate School. These goals form the basis for evaluation of programs by the Policy and Review Councils and external reviewers (see recommendation 10). On a short-term basis the central issue is how well a given graduate program is equipped to provide its students with the intellectual and academic resources needed for successful professional development. On a long-term basis the issue is the success of a

program in terms of placement and activities of its graduates. To help programs establish appropriate goals and to assist the Policy and Review Councils in monitoring the effectiveness of programs will require cooperative efforts to develop and maintain information relevant to the following critical issues.

- Quality of the pool of students the program attracts.
- Quality of the faculty members in the program, with particular attention to how the program interfaces with other graduate programs and utilizes other research resources available at the University of Minnesota.
- Quality and quantity of the intellectual and academic interaction occurring among faculties, and between faculty members and graduate students (mentoring function), to ensure the existence of an open intellectual environment where students and faculty can develop broad, wide-ranging intellectual interests in their chosen field(s).
- Availability of resources.

Individual graduate programs have first line responsibility for maintaining high quality standards. This refers not only to the course requirements and the academic portion of the specific graduate program, but applies also to the admission of graduate students, the selection of graduate faculty within a program and student-faculty interactions. Failure to meet specific standards should result in graduate programs being placed on probation and, if improvement does not occur over a stipulated period of time, programs should be eliminated. The Graduate School should exercise its authority to withhold funds (fellowship, block grants, research grants, etc.) from programs that fail to meet standards of quality.

**Recommendation 8.** *Each graduate program should provide to each new graduate student, on arrival, a written statement (bulletin) of the requirements for each degree offered by the graduate program. Graduate students often find that degree requirements for graduate programs are described verbally but not provided in written detail. Graduate students should be provided with explicit written details of degree requirements (including appropriate milestones) in order that misunderstandings are avoided and a written document is available for referral and review. When program requirements change, currently enrolled students should be permitted to finish under existing rules.*

**Recommendation 9.** *Newly constituted, smaller Policy and Review Councils should be composed of Directors of Graduate Studies, faculty at large, and graduate student members. Policy and Review*

Councils play an important steering function in graduate education. Many current Policy and Review Councils are too large to be effective working groups, however. We believe that each Council should consist of a relatively small number of individuals (e.g., three DGSs, three faculty at large and two graduate students). The committee endorses the current three to one ratio of faculty to graduate students. Faculty and DGSs as well as graduate student members should be appointed to Policy and Review Councils by the Dean of the Graduate School. Nominations from the Council on Graduate Students (COGS) should be considered in the appointment of student members. While we are proposing smaller Policy and Review Councils with new responsibilities, it is important that the Graduate School continue to meet with the Directors of Graduate Studies of all graduate programs on a regular basis for an open exchange of views and information. These meetings should be held quarterly.

**Recommendation 10.** *Policy and Review Councils must play a significant role in maintaining standards for graduate education.* Giving increased decision making authority to programs (recommendations 4-6) needs to be coupled with clear procedures for accountability. A credible program of review and oversight requires that significant effort be invested in the establishment of relevant data on program quality. Policy and Review Councils should have the responsibility for overseeing the quality of graduate programs. While the committee believes that the Graduate School should avoid a regulatory stance with respect to its programs, there is a genuine need for regular examination of a relatively small amount of data that can serve as benchmarks of program quality. We envision a three-part system of review and oversight in which the Policy and Review Councils evaluate graduate programs based on their goals and objectives (recommendation 7) and data that reflect program quality.

- Annual audits should be conducted to review the trend in data such as GPA and GRE scores of incoming students, time to completion of degree recipients, and the progress of cohorts through a program. These indicator variables are not comparable across programs. We are more concerned that adverse trends within programs be identified and corrected on a timely basis. Information for these reviews should be compiled by Graduate School staff under the direction of the Policy and Review Councils.
- Periodic internal reviews should be conducted to address questions concerning program goals and achievements. Internal reviews should take place on a four- to five-year cycle. Programs would be expected to prepare a brief document that addresses recent accomplishments, is candid about current difficulties and lays out directions for the future. Policy and Review Councils should recommend to the Dean of the Graduate School probation for those programs that are in trouble as well as the closing or

consolidation of programs that lack viability and/or have been a problem for a significant period of time. There is need for immediate action in this latter area; there are currently too many graduate programs, a number of which are too small to be effective. Undoubtedly, there are also larger graduate programs that are similarly ineffective and would benefit from restructuring (see recommendation 11).

- External reviews should be conducted to evaluate overall program quality using nationally recognized experts from the disciplines being reviewed. While the committee supports the continuation of external reviews, we are concerned that current reviews may not be cost effective. In numerous cases it was felt by faculty and/or college administrations that the result was not worth the effort. In some instances there was duplication of effort when a mandated review of collegiate programs (e.g., for accreditation purposes) was not coordinated with the Graduate School review process. The best external reviews seem to have focused on both graduate and related undergraduate programs. Such reviews can provide important information that complements the annual audits and internal reviews discussed above. We believe the usefulness of external reviews would be significantly improved if they focused on a limited number of clearly identified critical issues. Such issues should be discussed and communicated in writing to programs and departments in advance of the preparation of the self-study document. The identification of key issues could arise from programs, from the Dean of the Graduate School, from collegiate deans or from Policy and Review Councils. Given the basic stance of the committee to move towards a less regulatory, more decentralized model of graduate education, we believe that an in-depth external review of a program by the Graduate School using faculty outside the University should be conducted not more often than every ten years, except when the internal review points to a significant deterioration of quality or failure of a weak program to improve, or at the request of a collegiate dean, program faculty or Policy and Review Council.

**Recommendation 11.** *The Graduate School, with the assistance of its Policy and Review Councils, should oversee an immediate reduction in the number of graduate programs via the closing of programs of marginal quality and/or consolidation of closely related programs.* In the interests of better graduate education and for the benefit of applicants who are not sure of which subdivisions of a certain subject best match their interests, we believe that it is necessary to consolidate a number of existing programs. As other major universities have done, we suggest that closely related programs be grouped together under a single umbrella for administrative purposes. (In certain instances, it may be that marginal programs should not be incorporated under an umbrella group but rather should be incorporated into midsize or large graduate programs where there is a close

logical relationship.) It may also be desirable to retain individual tracks within the overall umbrella program. Using this model, a single graduate committee and single Director of Graduate Studies would handle admissions for the umbrella program and oversee standards within that program. Faculty within the individual tracks could determine specific requirements (e.g., course work) for graduate students in that track with the agreement of the graduate committee of the umbrella program. We note that the process of closing and consolidating programs must be undertaken with a clear view of the consequences to graduate students who are currently part of the affected programs. It is particularly important that any such actions provide students with the option of completing their degrees within a reasonable period of time.

**Recommendation 12.** *The Graduate School should establish an Executive Council made up of a small number of individuals who are recognized as outstanding members of the graduate faculty and at least two graduate students.* An Executive Council consisting of a small number of outstanding individuals from each of the newly constituted Policy and Review Councils (e.g., six faculty and two graduate students) should be appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. The Executive Council should regularly review the activities and standards of each Policy and Review Council with respect to that Council's evaluation of the individual graduate programs within its jurisdiction. If an individual Policy and Review Council fails to maintain appropriate oversight and standards, that Policy and Review Council should be reconstituted.

**Recommendation 13.** *The Graduate School should take major responsibility for determining the overall goals of graduate education at the University of Minnesota.* We believe that the Graduate School must take major leadership responsibility for determining where graduate education at the University of Minnesota should be headed, and provide the necessary direction to reach those goals. Included in this leadership function is the need to recognize areas of scholarly activity that will become increasingly important. Such activity should result in the identification of potentially exciting interdisciplinary programs and the active involvement of faculty committed to these new directions. While the consolidation and elimination of some programs is essential to the quality of graduate education, it is necessary to recognize that new initiatives are important to the quality and diversity of graduate education at the University of Minnesota. As part of this effort, the Graduate School and the Executive Council will need to carefully consider both innovations and directions in graduate education for the Twin Cities campus and for the Duluth campus, where the University has made a commitment to increase graduate level education. Of special concern for graduate education is the fact that as traditional resources decline, research groups that have excelled in the graduate training of successful professionals may be irreversibly damaged. At this juncture, investment of Graduate School and collegiate resources in the protection of existing

high quality research and scholarly activities must be balanced against expansion into new programs.

**Recommendation 14.** *Where the administration of graduate programs has budgetary implications, there must be an appropriate adjustment of budgetary resources.* We have recommended that programs have increased authority in matters such as admissions, approval of student programs and membership on the graduate faculty. This increase in authority does not imply increased administrative responsibilities. The only difference from current practice in most cases is that action by the faculty (and DGS) would be the final action. We believe the Graduate School should continue to process student applications for admission, work with applicants to see that files are complete and send notification letters to students (since admission is still to the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota as well as to an individual graduate program). Moving these activities to programs would significantly increase program costs without obvious benefit. At the same time, where the administration of a given program has cost implications, there must be an appropriate adjustment of budgetary resources. It is essential that individual colleges be cognizant of the fact that they have major budgetary responsibility for graduate as well as undergraduate education. Collegiate deans should expect to support the administrative costs of graduate programs.

**Recommendation 15.** *The Graduate School should provide resources for the administration of cross-collegiate (interdisciplinary) programs.* Some graduate programs are composed of faculty from several departments and colleges. In a number of such cases there is no source of support for administrative costs or the DGS function (see recommendation 16). The Graduate School should foster the cooperative efforts required to establish such programs and, where appropriate, provide the administrative cost for programs in which the number of colleges involved makes administration by the participating colleges (and faculty) difficult.

**Recommendation 16.** *Graduate programs should provide resources for the support and evaluation of their DGS function.* The DGS has an essential leadership role in graduate education. This individual guides students (and faculty) during the crucial period when long-term advising decisions are made. As such, the DGS for each graduate program should be an individual who represents the strengths of the program. However, faculty members with vigorous and successful programs of research or scholarship have often been discouraged from assuming this role, as many DGS's are presently not rewarded for their efforts. To encourage the best members of a program to serve as DGS, appropriate incentives must be developed in programs where the work load is significant and such incentives do not now exist. These may include reduction of the teaching load, money to support graduate assistants, additional salary compensation for

summer research, etc. At the same time, programs need to assume responsibility for the training, evaluation and, where appropriate, the replacement of an individual DGS when it is in the best interests of a program.

**Recommendation 17.** *The Graduate School should aggressively seek funds to support multi-year graduate fellowships.* Comparison with a number of other major research universities leads us to believe that Minnesota is in danger of becoming less competitive in attracting more of the very best students. Part of this is the lack of sufficient fellowship funds to be competitive with schools that are routinely offering three- or four-year fellowships. If we are to compete with the best universities for the most talented students, we must be able to offer comparable financial aid. The Graduate School needs to establish a significant number of three- or four-year fellowships.

While the need for financial support is obvious, it is also important to note that excellence in graduate education requires support that is more than financial. It includes an atmosphere and program culture that is supportive of individual students while demanding of intellectual rigor. Mentoring and advocacy are important forms of support that are difficult to measure in terms of dollars but can be critical elements of a high quality program. It is essential that the University of Minnesota remain competitive over the coming decade, both financially and in the non-monetary dimensions of program quality, as the competition for quality graduate students is likely to intensify.

**Recommendation 18.** *The Graduate School should aggressively seek funds to support better recruitment and retention of minority graduate students.* It is well recognized that the University of Minnesota has not been overwhelmingly successful in attracting and retaining minority students into its graduate programs. We believe that greater effort must be made in this area. Once minority students are attracted to the University of Minnesota, programs that will help them to be successful here must also exist and be brought to their attention. The Graduate School, in cooperation with graduate programs, should move vigorously to improve programs designed to increase the diversity of our graduate student population and the success of these individuals in completing their graduate education.

**Recommendation 19.** *The Graduate School should take immediate steps to seek a better alignment between the cost of graduate education and the activities of its graduate programs.* While the committee is sensitive to recommending yet another change in the structure of graduate tuition, two recent changes have produced sufficient comments to justify that these issues be revisited: 1) The recent change that restricts thesis credit registration until after a student has passed his/her preliminary oral examination seems unnecessarily rigid, as many students are engaged in thesis-

related work prior to their preliminary oral examination. We suggest that serious consideration be given to a policy under which students can register for thesis credits prior to their oral preliminary examination, but under which thesis credits are not eligible for the zero tuition band. 2) The recent change that eliminated low cost thesis credits after a student has completed 36 thesis credits should be reconsidered. Students caught in the transition appear to be especially hurt, and the policy appears to have been adopted largely to meet the demands of antiquated computer programs.

**Recommendation 20.** *The Graduate School should create a central office that coordinates functions now found in the Graduate Assistants Office with those associated with graduate student employment and fringe benefits.* As a means of solving one of the major problems experienced by graduate students at the University of Minnesota, the Graduate School should take immediate steps to coordinate those University-wide problems related to employment, health and fringe benefits. We were surprised to discover the amount of criticism directed at the Graduate Assistants Office. Though not directly within the Graduate School, this office has served, among other things, as ombudsperson for employment-related problems of graduate students. It is our sense that in the current University retrenchment this function has been lost. Funding and fringe benefit problems encountered by graduate students cannot be handled by the individual graduate programs, nor by offices reporting to different administrative offices within the University. They should be dealt with by a central office that is part of the Graduate School.

**Recommendation 21.** *The University should create an ombudsperson system for graduate students to use in dealing with dissatisfaction with any aspect of their graduate education and grievances not already covered by a separate grievance policy.* There is no carefully drawn statement that provides the individual graduate student with a plan of action when interaction with an advisor, Director of Graduate Studies or the Graduate School breaks down. We believe the University should immediately begin constructing a system that will permit graduate students to know what path to follow when problems occur between either the graduate student and his or her advisor, Director of Graduate Studies, or the Graduate School. It is especially important that such a system be set up to deal with situations before they reach the grievance stage.

**Recommendation 22.** *The position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration at the University of Minnesota at Duluth should be combined with the position of Associate Dean of the Graduate School at Duluth.* Unlike the Twin Cities Campus, graduate programs on the Duluth Campus lack an advocate at a campus-wide level of governance. Currently the Associate Dean of the Graduate School at Duluth is a part-time position. So also is the position of Associate Vice Chancellor. By combining these two positions the faculty on the Duluth Campus will be assured that issues such

as administrative costs of graduate programs and graduate student funding are dealt with as part of a campus-wide budgetary planning process.

**Recommendation 23.** *The University should establish a task force on graduate education to identify and examine issues relating to graduate programs not currently within the Graduate School. Several graduate programs at the University of Minnesota are not currently part of the Graduate School (e.g., M.Ed. programs in the College of Education; M.P.H. programs in the School of Public Health). Moreover, with increasing pressures for mid-career professional programs there is substantial interest in developing additional programs. These programs share with those in the Graduate School an interest in the recruitment and retention of high quality students, delivery of high quality graduate education and allocation of resources, among others. There are also significant differences between many of these programs and those currently found in the Graduate School with respect to the philosophy and practices of graduate education. This is an area that the committee was unable to review in sufficient depth. We are also concerned that we may not be the most appropriate group to consider these issues. The charge to the task force should include recommending mechanisms for dialogue, collaboration and coordination between programs in the Graduate School and those based solely in individual colleges.*

# APPENDIX I

## 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

- 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

## APPENDIX II

### 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)

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Research and  
Dean of the Graduate School

322 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0421  
612-625-3394  
Fax: 612-626-7431

## 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

Deans, Department Chairs, DGSS  
July 31, 1992  
Page 2

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

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

---

Office of the Vice President for Research and  
Dean of the Graduate School

322 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0421  
612-625-3394  
Fax: 612-626-7431

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

Dr. John H. D'Arms  
August 11, 1992  
Page 2

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

Members of the Graduate Faculty  
September 15, 1992  
Page 2

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

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

---

Office of the Vice President for Research and  
Dean of the Graduate School

322 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0421  
612-625-3394  
Fax: 612-626-7431

October 8, 1992

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Policy and Review Council Representatives

**FROM:** *ACP* 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 Councils' productive discussion of the Graduate School review in November.

ACP/vf

cc: Professor Paul E. Johnson

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Research and  
Dean of the Graduate School

322 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0421  
612-625-3394  
Fax: 612-626-7431

October 13, 1992

## 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

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

Dean Paul Magee  
October 13, 1992  
Page 3

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

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Office of the Vice President for Research and  
Dean of the Graduate School

322 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0421  
612-625-3394  
Fax: 612-626-7431

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

October 29, 1992  
Page 2

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?

## **Appendix III**

### **Correspondence Received from the Twin Cities and Duluth Campuses**

## APPENDIX III

### 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)

## APPENDIX IV

### 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

- 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

## **Appendix V**

### **Documents Provided to the Committee by its Student Members**

## APPENDIX V

### 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.”

## **Appendix VI**

### **Universities Surveyed for Information About Their Graduate Schools**

## APPENDIX VI

### 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.

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

TWIN CITIES

**Council of Graduate Students**

409 Johnston Hall  
101 Pleasant Street S. E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(612) 626-1612

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