Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, February 21, 2013
1:00 – 3:00
238A Morrill Hall

Present: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (chair), Avner Ben-Ner, Brian Buhr, James Cloyd, Chris
                  Cramer, Nancy Ehlke, Michael Hancher, Scott Lanyon, Russell Luepker, Elaine Tyler
                  May, Alon McCormick, Ned Patterson, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman,
                  George Sheets

Absent: Linda Bearinger, Peter Bitterman, Will Durfee, James Pacala, Richard Ziegler

Guests: Vice Provost Henning Schroeder

Other: Ken Savary (Office of the Board of Regents)

[In these minutes: (1) graduate education issues; (2) committee elections; (3) bylaw change concerning
dockets; (4) faculty education about disabilities; (5) proposed data classification policy; (6) proposed
open access policy; (7) constitutional question of Faculty Senate membership]

1.   Graduate Education Issues

Professor Kohlstedt welcomed Vice Provost Schroeder to the meeting to discuss issues in
graduate education. She also thanked him for compiling and presenting the Committee with data on
relatively short notice. [The Committee had provided Dr. Schroeder with a set of questions prior to the
meeting; Dr. Schroeder provided written text in response to the questions prior to the meeting. These
minutes record the question, the written response, and the discussion at the meeting, if any.]

The question from the Committee: 1) Discussions with faculty indicate a perception that the
number of graduate students, especially Ph.D. students in the disciplines, has been declining at
the same time as tuition, fees, and benefit costs have increased. Even in STEM and health fields,
where there are many research grants, it appears that faculty members are increasingly opting to
hire post-docs rather than graduate students who need to take classes, be trained in techniques,
and have not yet published. TAships appear to be declining because the budgets for them have
not increased and so fewer can be hired with the same dollars as costs and stipends have
increased. We would like to have data (over the past 5 years and past 10 years, if possible) on the
number of current graduate students, numbers of applicants, acceptances - by college and by
department or program. While extensive data are reported by program on the Graduate School
site, we would appreciate aggregated data that you use for long and short term assessment and
planning.

The response from Vice Provost Schroeder: There has been evidence that increasing number
of faculty members prefer to hire post-docs rather than taking in graduate students for the reasons

mentioned above. There have also been signs that more research-only faculty and P&A staff have been hired to advance the research mission of the University. These types of appointments do not come with the expectation of advising and supporting graduate students. They may serve on examination committees but they don't have primary focus on graduate education.

Overall graduate enrollment number has declined in the last few years. We are currently at about the same enrollment level as in 2003, see Table 1. Most colleges experienced steady or reduction in enrollment number with the exception of College of Science and Engineering, School of Public Health, College of Pharmacy and School of Nursing, see Table 2.

The number of applications increased significantly in the past nine years. However, the numbers of admission offers and acceptances have stayed relatively stable during this time, see Table 3. Most colleges have seen a notable increase in the number of applications to their graduate programs especially for College of Liberal Arts, College of Science and Engineering, Carlson School of Management, College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences and School of Public Health, see Table 4.

Discussion: In order to make hiring of graduate students more attractive as compared to postdocs, **t**here is need for more flexibility in policy, Dr. Schroeder said, such as how charges for thesis credits are imposed. How that is done affects college funding as well as PIs, but it is one way to lower the costs of graduate students. He also noted that admissions offers (and acceptances) are not something controlled by the central administration—that is decided at the college level, and some colleges have increased enrollment while others have reduced it.

Professor Lanyon commented that graduate programs are changing sizes but those are not strategic changes, they are changes in response to the University's budget model and not in response to what would be best for the program or the students. It is how dollars are distributed and charged that drive decisions. Does Dr. Schroeder agree?

In part, Dr. Schroeder said, but there is also strategic thinking about where students go and the number of jobs in a field. Programs may seek to identify ways to teach new graduate students; these are driven by educational goals and it may be that fewer students study in the traditional program, for example, or a program may go into a new arena. It is not a matter of just shrinking the number of graduate students because there are fewer dollars; there is also thought about where they go. The upcoming Graduate Assembly will be on tracking where students go [April, 3rd, 1:30-3:30 pm, Mississippi Room, Coffman Union http://www.grad.umn.edu/deans-office/projects_initiatives/gpea/2013spring/index.html] A number of colleges are already tracking graduates since placement became one of the metrics used to evaluate graduate programs.

Professor Lanyon cautioned that it is nonetheless important not to lose sight of the fact that among the driving factors is the money.

Professor Hancher noted, on one of the tables of data, that the number of graduate students in CLA dropped from 2107 (fall 2003) to 1689 (fall 2012); that is a big drop. What percentage of the decrease was due to purposeful thought and what percentage because of the budget model? Professor Cramer noted, on a different data table, that the number of matriculants in CLA, over the same period, had dropped from 454 to 371, a smaller decline. At the same time, Dr. Schroeder observed, the number

of applications to CLA increased from 3405 to 4124, so CLA was able to recruit more from the top portion of the field. The only way to rationalize the difference between the two tables is to conclude that students are graduating faster, Professor Cramer concluded.

The question from the Committee: 2) Do you see ways to address the financial and structural issues that are implicit in the items above?

The response from Vice Provost Schroeder: Enrollment number or the size of the graduate programs should correlate closely with job placement and anticipated job availability for the graduates. Programs and colleges need to be in tune and responsive to the changing job market needs and trends and modify their curriculum accordingly.

Maintaining and improving the quality of our graduate programs is less of a structural issue but rather, a collective goal that we should all strive for. From a financial point of view, it is clear that we all need to work together to either generate more revenue or find ways within our current budget to increase the overall investment in our graduate education enterprise. Continue to increase the size of the graduate education cost pool is not a sustainable solution. Similarly, continue to shift the majority of the financial demand to the individual programs is also self-limiting.

In fall 2011, the Graduate Student Financing Task Force submitted a report to the Provost outlining a number of potential short-term and long-term solutions to help address the issue of financing graduate students. Options such as a constant tuition fringe rate, increase tuition rate for the FTE credits, per credit tuition model, etc. were discussed in the report. The document is available on the Graduate School website (http://www.grad.umn.edu/prod/groups/grad/@pub/@grad/documents/asset/financing_tf_report.pdf).

Discussion: Vice Provost Schroeder cited examples of new revenue streams that could be used to fund graduate education and reported that in a number of colleges there are entrepreneurial activities to find new revenues to support graduate students. Some colleges may have such opportunities, although not all.

Professor Kohlstedt observed that even if the amount of money has remained steady, the number of fellowships has declined because of increases in tuition and benefit costs. Should we be thinking about the level of graduate tuition? Dr. Schroeder agreed this was an issue and said that Vice President Herman is very interested in graduate education as well and has noted that graduate students are very costly to employ in research. His office and Dr. Herman's office can be allies in dealing with the problem. He noted a data table indicating the total amount of money spent on graduate student appointments in FY12; for graduate assistants, the total expenditures were $78.5 million for stipends and $61 million for fringe benefits, for a total of $139 million (amounts rounded); for fellows and trainees the total expenditures were $21 million (no fringe benefits). The grand total was $160 million.

Professor Roper-Huilman pointed out that TAs are not simply a cost but that they do something for the University. Dr. Schroeder agreed that there is a mutual benefit in both the TAships and RAships and that he had simply been asked to identify the amounts spent. Under the current budget model funds

are collected from all colleges and there is a cross subsidization that is intended to maintain high academic quality.

Dr. Schroeder noted that one of the questions the Committee posed [later] asked about the amount of money going into graduate education vis-à-vis the University's peers. He provided information about some of the peers (data appended to these minutes, from 2011). Committee members discussed what should "count" in looking at the mechanisms; Dr. Schroder said that the University does provide a significant amount but that he would not argue against increasing that amount, particularly in light of what its competitors nationally and internationally invest into graduate education. Professor Kohlstedt said it would be useful to have a CIC study with more fine detail for comparison.

Professor Cramer noted that block-grant money went from the Graduate School to the colleges. Dr. Schroeder said that $3.5 million of first-year fellowships based on their five-year average success rate in getting fellowships was removed from the cost pool and transferred permanently to the colleges, while $4.5 million (the former block grants) was given based on quality metrics.

> **The question from the Committee:** 3) Also discussed was the perception that there has been a redistribution of graduate fellowships and, perhaps more importantly, an overall decline in numbers who receive them. Would you please provide us with data that show the numbers of Graduate Fellowships and DDFs over the past 10 years, again, by college?
>
> **The response from Vice Provost Schroder:** With the decentralization of the First-Year Graduate Student Fellowship funds, we have been receiving feedbacks from colleges and programs that they welcome the flexibility in packaging fellowship offers as well as establish review and selection criteria that are specific to their field and discipline. However, we also recognize that it is more challenging for individual colleges to take on the risk of over-committing available funds by providing more fellowship offers than the budgeted amount.
>
> To help address this issue, the Provost Office and the Graduate School have identified one-time funds to provide matching fellowship support for seven colleges for the current recruitment season (for the 2013-14 cohort). This is only a short-term arrangement. We will be working closely with colleges and governance groups such as the FCC in the coming months to establish a long-term plan to help programs recruit high quality students.
>
> With regard to the Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship (DDF), this remains a high priority program for the Graduate School and the University in recognizing the achievements of our Ph.D. students and in promoting timely degree completion. President Kaler invested an extra $2 million per year for three years in this fellowship program. Therefore, the total number of DDF awards increased for the 2012-13 fellowship year (from 101 for 2011-12 to 132 awards), the first year with the extra investment, see Table 5.
>
> (Discussed in the course of considering other questions.)
>
> **The question from the Committee:** 4) Department chairs worry that their ability to attract graduate students (and indeed outstanding faculty) has been compromised because of declining resources and that they are losing competitive advantage in recruitment with even other public R1 institutions. Do you have comparative data on the size of graduate fellowships elsewhere? Do

you have data on the range of TA and RA salaries by discipline and field? It would be particularly useful to know the comparable CIC data.

The response from Vice Provost Schroder: In spring 2011, phone conversations with the graduate dean of our peer institutions were conducted to gather information on the level and mechanisms of graduate education funding that were administered by the graduate schools. Attached is a summary of the collected information.

Table 6 shows a comparison of average salaries for research and teaching assistants between the University and among the CIC institutions. In general, our salary levels for research assistants are somewhat lower than the CIC averages across most disciplines especially the engineering and biomedical fields. Salary levels are more comparable for teaching assistants.

Discussion: Department chairs say they are losing ground because of both the amount they can offer and the number of fellowships they have, Professor Kohlstedt said. Dr. Schroeder reiterated his reference to the data table indicating average salaries for TAs and RAs by discipline, compared to CIC averages. Some programs may not have trouble recruiting graduate students, even if their salaries are lower, because the programs are so sought after.

Professors Cramer and Ehlke both commented that the data for their fields are numbers significantly lower than what they actually pay, with subsequent discussion suggesting that the listed values were for only the academic year rather than annual. Professor Ropers-Huilman asked about the cost of benefits; she and Professor Ehlke suggested that one needs to see the total package, not just the salaries, and that one needs to be careful about how these perhaps-incomplete data are used. Dr. Schroeder said that benefits are important but that for most graduate students the amount of money in the pocket is more important.

Professor Lanyon reported that his department talks with graduate students who they lose in recruiting; the issue is not salary, it is the one-year versus three-year fellowships. That issue has come up multiple times, Dr. Schroeder said. Graduate School fellowships were moved to the colleges and the funding is recurring, but there is a reluctance on the part of colleges to make multi-year offers. The Graduate School had a 35% yield on multi-year offers. The money is still there but it is handled differently; if a department has two fellowships available, it will not make six offers (expecting on average to have two of them accepted) because they do not have funding in place to deal with unanticipated variation in local acceptance rates on a year-to-year basis.

Before the change in the funding, Professor Lanyon said, his department made 16.6 offers per year; now they make 3. Before, the Graduate School accepted the risk because it was spread more broadly, but individual departments cannot accept that level of risk so make far fewer offers. Dr. Schroeder said the provost has encouraged the deans to take the risk, but much of the money is from the colleges. The message he hears consistently from the deans and associate deans is that they appreciate the flexibility to package funding in a way that meets disciplinary needs, and the process does not take as long; all think it is good in that it allows immediate offers of the best packages to attract the leading students. But risk aversion is a problem at this point, and that is why the provost and he have provided additional funds to create multi-year fellowships for recruiting the 2013-14 cohort of graduate students. It is controversial because they said that colleges with one-year fellowships were eligible for a second year while those that had none were still not included. One can say that they are giving the money to winners,

which they recognize, and which is why they have put together a group to address the long-term issues that will include all colleges.

Professor Kohlstedt skipped to question 7 at this point.

The question from the Committee: 5) What data does the University have on the total dollars the UMN directs toward stipends and tuition support for graduate students? Does this number include direct support to graduate students from externally-funded training grants? Please provide us with an overview of the data that you use to assess this issue of graduate student funding support.

The response from Vice Provost Schroder: The University invested over $160 million to support graduate student stipends and fringe in FY12, see Table 7. The majority of the graduate student support comes from the colleges and programs, only a relatively small portion is funded through central units such as the Graduate School.

The question from the Committee: 6) With the transition well underway, are there elements of the decentralization that are working particularly effectively? Are there elements that are not functioning well and may require taking back into your portfolio, changing the structure, or changing the function and roles of the key responsible administrators for graduate education?

The response from Vice Provost Schroeder: The streamlined governance framework for graduate education in the form of a single Graduate Education Council has been effective and efficient in providing input for important issues relating to graduate education. Feedbacks from colleges indicate that the increased local authority and accountability of their graduate programs is appreciated even though it comes with a higher work load.

There is general consensus among the colleges that a central unit, such as the Graduate School, is important in fostering intercollegiate, interdisciplinary programs and initiatives. For example, the Graduate School has committed unbudgeted funds this year to support new Interdisciplinary Graduate Groups. Additional funds have also been directed toward the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Fellowship program.

The question from the Committee: 7) Several committees that report to the Senate are responsible for matters that engage graduate education to a greater or lesser extent; for example, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, and the Senate Research Committee. How well does this arrangement work? How could it be improved?

The response from Vice Provost Schroeder: The current arrangement with the Senate committees is working very well. As an example, last fall, when a policy-related issue on the role of the advisor at the preliminary oral exam came up, we engaged the involvement of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) and the matter was brought up at a meeting with a very productive discussion. The issue was resolved satisfactorily in a timely manner. Members of

SCEP are actively involved in an ongoing key graduate education initiative, Graduate Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment, that was first introduced at a SCEP meeting.

How is the transition working, Professor Kohlstedt asked? What should be addressed in the future?

Vice Provost Schroeder said that of all the changes made, he has not heard complaints about the new governance model and he believes it to be reasonably effective. With respect to connections between it and this Committee and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), they are very good, and a group has been established to develop student-learning outcomes for Ph.D. programs that has three SCEP members.

The former Policy and Review Councils did two things, Professor Kohlstedt recalled: They had governance/review responsibilities for standards and they served as a conduit for Directors of Graduate Study to be kept up to speed. Are the DGSs still as well informed in their college? Her sense is that that varies across colleges; has the Graduate School investigated that issue? Dr. Schroeder said the Graduate School remains in touch with DGSs, although not on as many matters as in the past, and they convene groups around various issues, for example interdisciplinarity. He said he has not heard any complaints about orientation, etc. The groups doing the restructuring recognized the role that the P&R Councils played, which is why they created the Graduate Education Assembly as a place to talk about issues in graduate education and noted that there would be another one this spring that is open to the entire University.

Professor Cloyd said it is not clear, from the tables, what the level of funding for graduate education comes from federal dollars through traineeships. They have those data, Dr. Schroeder said, but they are not included in the information he brought to this meeting. That is a question, Professor Cloyd said, because a fair amount of graduate education is supported by training grants, although these numbers suggest the number cannot be large. Training grant funding has been increasing, Dr. Schroeder responded, and they expect to see more applications for such funds—which he hopes are successful. The Graduate School now has a recurring line item in its budget, "training grant matching funds," that is part of a strategy to increase the number of training grants on the campus. It is true they only provide 8% in indirect cost funds, but they also provide student stipends, tuition, and fees. Professor Kohlstedt commented that postdocs replacing graduate student is a serious and important problem and that in the health sciences particularly the traineeships may help offset that tendency.

Professor Kohlstedt skipped to question 9.

The question from the Committee: 8) In the Graduate Education Committee working well? What are the major concerns and items under discussion?

The response from Vice Provost Schroder: The Graduate Education Council (GEC) serves as an advisory body to the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education on matters relating to graduate education. The current version of the bylaws can be found at: http://www.grad.umn.edu/prod/groups/grad/@pub/@grad/documents/asset/gec-bylaws-fall-2012.pdf
Meeting agendas and minutes are available on our website:
http://www.grad.umn.edu/deans-office/policies_goverance/council/gec_mtgs/index.html

The Council is in the process of identifying a slate of nominees to replace five outgoing members for the next academic year. Campus-wide election is anticipated to occur around mid-April.

The question from the Committee: 9) Have there been significant advances in cross-disciplinary projects and programs, especially with regard to team teaching across departments and colleges, seed funds for new initiatives, or other efforts to offset barriers that administrative structures perhaps inadvertently impose?

The response from Vice Provost Schroder: There are currently discussions on the various options and tuition models that have the potential for reducing the barriers for interdisciplinary teaching. The Provost ID Team shared these options with the Provost recently and she agreed that something needs to be done to address this issue.

The Graduate School is once again funding Interdisciplinary Graduate Groups proposals as a mean to seed early ideas of cross-disciplinary collaborations.

The Quality Metrics Committee recently produced a report to the Provost that proposed the creation of an innovation pool to promote and provide seed funding for new ideas. The Provost is very supportive of this idea and we will work together to develop a framework on what the innovation pool may look like.

Discussion: Professor Kohlstedt said that cross-disciplinary projects and programs were within the purview of the Graduate School and it can still do a great deal in this area, noting a recent announcement of funds available [see above].

Dr. Schroeder noted the existence of the provost's interdisciplinary team, which acts on a number of issues to remove barriers to interdisciplinary teaching and research, and funds new initiatives. He has resurrected the interdisciplinary graduate group, which at this point still has a small budget, but faculty can gather around an idea and it need not necessarily lead to a degree program.

The question from the Committee: 10) In the health sciences, faculty have expressed concern that administrators are not encouraging or not willing to permit faculty to submit training grant proposals because of the low (8%) indirect rate and perception that the costs/benefits of training grants versus research grants are not comparable. Do you have any plan to address this situation?

The response from the Vice Provost Schroeder: The Graduate School has secured a recurring budget line item to provide matching support for pre-doctoral training grant proposals. Details of this matching program are available on our website: http://www.grad.umn.edu/deans-office/TrainingGrants/index.html

The primary goal of the matching fund program is to improve the competitiveness of the training grant applications. It also serves as a mean to leverage additional support from the departments, colleges, and other units. We continue to get the words out that externally-funded training programs are becoming increasingly valuable to our graduate education enterprise as federal research grants are dwindling and extremely competitive. Training programs with a successful track record of renewal elevate the overall quality of the graduate programs.

Professor Kohlstedt said to Vice Provost Schroeder that one big question is the agenda he will push forward. She said she is glad to learn he will focus on stipends in order to improve capacity and competitiveness in individual programs and for the reputation of the university overall, including dealing with tuition. Dr. Schroeder said the discussion touches on many topics, including valuing a Ph.D. in credits or as a whole, whether there should be a flat-fee model or if it should be credit-based. The budget model creates pressure to offer more seminars in order to generate more revenue (which is why there is the new policy limiting the number of credits that can be required for graduate degrees). Professor Kohlstedt pointed out the significant ramifications of such a policy in a tuition driven budget model where colleges and thus departments depend on the revenue that their ongoing teaching and advising require.

Professor Kohlstedt thanked Vice Provost Schroeder for joining the meeting, commented that he is in charge of a part of the University that most faculty see as one of the institutional drivers, and offered our help as he keeps graduate education moving forward.

2.   Committee Elections

Professor Kohlstedt next called for the election of a replacement for Professor May, who will be gone next year on sabbatical. She noted that Senate bylaws provide that the Committee selects individuals to fill vacancies. Professor Kohlstedt nominated Professor Will Durfee, who was elected by acclamation.

Ballots were then distributed for election of the chair for 2013-14; by Committee rules, everyone whose term continues into 2013-14 is automatically a candidate. The Committee elected Professor Durfee as chair for 2013-14.

3.   Bylaw Change about Dockets

The Committee voted unanimously to approve a bylaw change clarifying that this Committee, as the executive committee of the Faculty Senate, has the final approval authority for dockets of Faculty Senate meetings. The same bylaw was adopted for the Senate Consultative Committee as the executive committee of the University Senate; the parallel bylaw for the Faculty Senate was inadvertently omitted from the docket at the time.

Professor Luepker pointed out that this change does not preclude people from bringing up items on the floor of the meeting for later consideration.

4.   Faculty Education about Disabilities

Professor Kohlstedt drew to the attention of Committee members the proposed resolution for the Faculty Senate that had been provided to them from the Disabilities Issues Committee:

MOTION

The University Senate supports uniform education for all faculty members at the University of Minnesota in the fundamental aspects of disabilities issues and in the nature of reasonable accommodation for students.

COMMENT

The University of Minnesota is committed, in all learning environments, to a positive, inclusive atmosphere that allows and encourages all members of a diverse student body to access, participate and learn.

The University is committed to the provision of reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities, as required by the letter of the law and implemented using best practices.

In the absence of required education it is unlikely that faculty have the knowledge and understanding of students' disabilities, which results in faculty uncertainty about the scope and limits of their responsibility to accommodate.

Appropriate education would reduce the inconsistency in how University of Minnesota faculty make and implement accommodations for students with disabilities.

The question, Professor Kohlstedt said, is whether this should be a resolution or a policy proposal to the Faculty Senate. The Disabilities Issues Committee brought a resolution.

Professor Cramer said he liked the statement as it is and that there would be resistance to adding more training requirements. There is nothing to object to in the resolution and it goes in the right direction. Professor Ropers-Huilman agreed but asked what would happen if it is adopted by the Faculty Senate. She said she wants faculty members to be up to speed on disabilities but does not want the statement to have too many teeth—but it should have some effect. Will this statement? Professor Kohlstedt said that Professor Kennedy, the chair of the Disabilities Issues Committee, learned from the discussion that there is a need to put materials in place; this Committee could help support the promotion of the materials to the community.

Professor Cloyd asked if "uniform" is too vague. That could be nothing, but common sense suggests that it means "mandatory" but isn't saying so. It is not mandatory, Professor Kohlstedt said, but the goal is to have materials that one can point to at orientation for new faculty members, for example, and the materials will help ensure that when questions arise, the responses will be consistent.

The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the resolution and to place it on the docket of the April 4 Faculty Senate meeting.

5.   Proposed Data Classification Policy

Professor Kohlstedt asked Committee members their view of the proposed new policy on data classification.

POLICY STATEMENT

In order to protect the security and integrity of University of Minnesota data in compliance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations, all University of Minnesota data must be classified appropriately for security purposes. The data classifications are used to determine the

appropriate security controls for the data and for the University systems on which the data is stored, accessed or transmitted.

University Data Custodians are responsible for classifying the data/information for which they are responsible, taking into account the legal protections, contractual agreements, ethical considerations, and strategic or proprietary value of the information. The data classifications are:

Private-Highly Restricted – Private-Highly Restricted data is University data that is not public, is available within the institution only to those with a legitimate need to know, and is so highly sensitive that the loss of confidentiality, integrity, or availability of the data could cause significant personal, institutional, or other harm.

Private-Restricted – Private-Restricted data is University data that is not public and is available within the institution only to those with a legitimate need to know, but is not so highly sensitive that the loss of confidentiality, integrity, or availability would cause significant personal, institutional, or other harm.

Public – Public data is data that by law is available to the public upon request.

Data Custodians must communicate the data classifications to affected groups and individuals. Data Users must follow security controls that are appropriate for the data classifications as documented in the Securing Private Data, Computers, and Other Electronic Devices policy.

In addition, the existing policy on Securing Private Data, Computers, and Other Electronic Devices would be amended to align with the language of this new policy.

Professor Lanyon commented on the language, in the existing policy, which provides: "Employees must not store University private data on personally owned computers or other personally owned electronic devices." The University has many graduate students who teach but who are not provided computers but who are also expected to maintain data. Some do not use Moodle, so there is an issue about graduate students having private data on their computers. The policy, he added, is a good idea, but there is a problem.

Professor Cramer noted that they can use Google docs, which is hosted by Google and certified by them as meeting the level of protection required by University policy. Professor Ben-Ner said that should be made clear in the policy, and it should also address Dropbox versus Google docs. There should be an FAQ, Professor Kohlstedt suggested.

Professor McCormick said that students in a class turn in papers; he downloads them to his own computer to read them. Is that a violation? Professor Cramer said that one can avoid the problem by not downloading the attachments from the email. If that's what the policy means, it should say so, Professor McCormick responded, and that is not what most people are doing—some are downloading it.

Professor Lanyon said it is his understanding that if one has an encrypted machine, one could have private data. This needs clarification, he said; is there a mechanism to do so? This policy says that personal computers may have no private data. Professor Kohlstedt said that one could download a

student's paper, work on it, and send it back; more than one Committee member observed that it would still be on the personal computer.

Professor Ropers-Huilman agreed that the policy needs to be communicated; she asked if people really do #4 in the FAQs in the existing policy: "Are University-owned printers, copiers and multi-function devices (printer/copier/ fax/scanner) covered by this policy? Yes. For example, if the printer, copier or multi-function device has a hard drive, it may contain old copies of University data previously printed/copied/faxed/scanned that are long forgotten. These files should be securely deleted. If the device has a password and configuration options, it will require additional technical attention to prevent misuse from the Internet." How do they know about it? Professor Kohlstedt said that many people could be in violation of this requirement.

Professor Ben-Ner said that if the language in FAQ #4 is already policy, is there University support for disposing of hard drives? Is the policy widely known? Professor Lanyon said that all IT offices know about it, which is not the same as everyone else knowing about it.

The Committee endorsed the new policy and the amendments to the existing policy; Professor Kohlstedt said the caveats from the discussion would be noted.

6.   Proposed Open Access Policy

Professor Kohlstedt referred next to a draft policy on Open Access (OA), language the Committee had seen before. She reported that she had met with Karen Williams, from University Libraries, about what work the libraries could do to assist faculty members in making their publications available through open access. Harvard and MIT were in the vanguard on OA, but unlike the language in the draft policy here, MIT puts the burden on the libraries, which negotiate with publishers. The libraries will only go to the faculty member when nothing else can be arranged, at which point the faculty member can say "yes" or "no." Professor Kohlstedt said she asked Ms. Williams if the University Libraries were willing to do what the MIT libraries do; they will if that is what people want. Her suggestion is that the University's policy embrace the practice at MIT—IF this Committee believes OA is a good idea. When the topic came up before, the reactions were mixed, and some worried about the impact of OA on small journals.

Professor Ehlke recalled that there had been a CIC discussion on this topic; she said she believes the Michigan has a practice similar to that at MIT. There are about 8 schools that have signed on to have some version of Open Access, Professor Kohlstedt said, and they were all prestigious institutions. The only restriction is that the faculty member cannot put in OA the final version used for publication without publisher permission. Professor Ehlke agreed that the process would be much easier for the faculty if the libraries would do it. And the faculty simply will not do it, Professor Lanyon predicted; other agreed.

Professor Kohlstedt agreed as well and recalled the message that has been sent to faculty members about negotiating with publishers. Most don't do so. It is time-consuming and sometimes difficult because the publishers who resist see an economic loss in the sale of those articles. This idea is that the libraries would handle things and come to the faculty member only if they are unable to get a copy from the publishers.

Professor Cramer mentioned ResearchGate, which writes frequently to him about his publications that its robots have found in one way or another; it seems to know each journal's policy for posting, and asks if he would like ResearchGate to post those documents that it can, which it does entirely on its own if the author replies "yes." The idea brought up today moves in that same direction. Professor Lanyon said that if third parties are willing to do this, why place the burden on the libraries? It may be unnecessary. Professor Cramer said the libraries want to do it because saving/providing data is in their DNA and they are aware of the third parties. Professor Lanyon asked if the idea is to post something slightly different from what is published; Professor Cramer said that some journals allow a non-type-set version to be posted—that is becoming fairly standard. The complication is how one refers to it, Professor Lanyon observed. This is a transitional phrase, Professor Kohlstedt surmised.

The Committee voted that it agreed in principle with the idea brought forward by the Library Committee she promised that a revised policy would be brought back for review.

7.   Constitutional Question of Faculty Senate Membership

Professor Kohlstedt noted a question that has been lurking for some time: May a college impose restrictions on who may be elected to the Faculty Senate? And who decides? [One college has adopted a rule that 2/3of the individuals elected to the Faculty Senate must be tenured or tenure-track faculty, even though tenured and tenure-track faculty make up less than 2/3 of those eligible to vote for and run for the Faculty Senate.] The advice she has received from several quarters is that it is the Faculty Senate itself that decides whether such a policy is acceptable.

Professor Kohlstedt asked Committee members to think about the question and said it would be brought back at a future meeting because it must be addressed. She adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

Peer Graduate Schools Funding Allocation Mechanisms

Florida-Gainesville: One main funding mechanism:
- Multi-year (4 to 5 years) fellowship packages to incoming students, $4 to 4.5 million/year over four years ($16 million total). Fellowships are valued at $100,000 each. Increasing the fellowship budget is a priority for the graduate school. Fellowship funding is awarded to colleges based on the number of PhDs produced over a five-year period with the rationale that programs receiving money to support PhD students need to demonstrate that they are efficiently producing PhD students and not simply enrolling lots of students. The colleges then redistribute the funds to departments according to college criteria and priorities.
- The graduate school dean tried to allocate money directly to the programs but faced opposition. The graduate school does not have funding similar to Block Grants.
- The graduate school also has $750,000/year of "top off" funding, which provides additional stipend funding ($3,000 to $3,500 each) for incoming fellowship students for up to 3 years. In addition, a "Santa Fe program" supports students who teach at a local community college.

<u>Illinois-Urbana Champaign:</u> Two main funding mechanisms:
- $1.6 million of Block Grants that the recipients (programs) have full discretion on how to use the funds with no string attached. Of the 97 doctoral programs and 110 masters programs, 60 to 65 applications were received for the fall 2010 competition. A faculty committee reviewed the applications and selected the recipients (programs). However, the dean of the Graduate College decided to give the arts and humanities programs the largest share of the Block Grant funds, followed by the social sciences programs, and the smallest share to the science & engineering and life sciences fields. Funding goes directly to selected programs.
- $5 to 6 million of fellowships awarded directly to students with programs nominating the best students and a faculty review committee selecting the awardees.

<u>Michigan-Ann Arbor:</u> Two main funding mechanisms:
- $9.5 million is allocated directly to individual programs, not to the collegiate deans, for a wide variety of uses including research support, equipment purchase, travel grants, fellowships, etc. A combination of program size (enrollment), financial need, and some metrics for program performance/success are used to determine the actual allocation.
- $18 to $19 million in fellowship funds are awarded directly to students through a campuswide faculty review process. Student applicants are nominated by programs and colleges.
- The graduate school, central administration, and the individual schools partner to provide additional resources, which help fill the funding-support gap for NIH grants.

<u>Ohio State:</u> One main funding mechanism:
- Fellowships awarded directly to students. About 3 to 4 years ago, a decision was made to split the overall fellowship funding 50-50 with the colleges based on previous success rate. This was based on the belief that the colleges are equal partners with the graduate school.
- The funding retained centrally at the graduate school is intended to preserve a University-wide competition recognizing outstanding merit. Selections are made by faculty review committees.

<u>Penn State:</u> One main funding mechanism:
- Fellowships are awarded to the colleges, which then allocate them to departments. Approximately 20 fellowships each year at $18,000 per award for stipend only. Most students are supported on research grants.

<u>Texas-Austin:</u> One main funding mechanism:
- Approximately $10.5 million in fellowships are awarded directly to students, nominated by the program DGS. The graduate school fellowships tend to be larger awards, and are campuswide, competitive fellowships that are considered prestigious. There are several "Blue Ribbon" fellowships that are valued at approximately $55,000 per year such as the Harrington with a stipend of $35,000/year plus tuition and health benefits. Decisions are made by a faculty committee drawn from broad disciplinary fields.

<u>UC-Berkeley:</u> Two main funding mechanisms:
- $20 million in Block Grants are awarded directly to programs and can only be used for student support. A 3-year rolling average enrollment is used to determine funding level.
- $28 million of university fellowship competition and about $18 million in federal and private foundation fellowships. These are campuswide competitions.

- The graduate division makes up the difference between the NSF educational allowance and actual costs for about 360 fellows annually. This is a recruitment strategy, because if the department or PI were responsible for making up the shortfall, they might decide not to recruit the student.

UCLA: Two main funding mechanisms:
- Approximately $12.5 million in fellowships are awarded directly to students with a strong emphasis on underrepresented students. Selections are made through a competitive, faculty-review process, with nominations forwarded by the departments.
- About $23 million in Block Grants are allocated directly to programs, and they decide which students will receive funding support. Block Grant allocations are determined by a complex formula, which includes weighting the enrollment of each student, giving a '1' weight to professional master's students, a '3' weight to academic master's students, and a '6' weight to academic doctoral students.

U Washington: Two main funding mechanisms:
- A total of $2.5 million per year for fellowships and small Block Grants.
- Fellowships awarded directly to students and selected by faculty committee.
- Small Block Grants allocated to departments and programs to support recruitment and travel purposes (totaling about $100,000 per year).
- Tuition waivers are allocated to cover the shortfall in NSF educational allowance for about 140 fellows annually.
- Administer about 40 to 45 ARCS fellowships per year.

Wisconsin-Madison: Two main funding mechanisms:
- Fellowships and research assistantships through competitions. Programs submit nomination packets for specific students in the humanities and social sciences. Graduate education and research administration are housed centrally in the same unit.
- The biological and physical sciences request Block Grants to be used to top off NSF, NIH, etc. They do not request funding for specific students. Block Grants can be used for recruiting students, but not for administrative purposes.