

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE GRADUATE COLLEGE (GC) April 2024

INTRODUCTION

The University of Iowa (UI) Operations Manual requires that reviews of colleges and programs be conducted regularly, and the internal and external review can emphasize specific areas of focus. In accordance with this operating procedure, UI Executive Vice President and Provost Kevin Kregel formed a committee ("the Review Committee") and charged it to conduct a review of the Graduate College (GC) focused on specific areas and to prepare this report. The Review Committee members are listed in Appendix A.

Materials Consulted and Individuals/Groups Interviewed

Materials used to inform the Review Committee include the Provost's charge for the review and the GC's self-study. Individuals and groups interviewed were selected by the Provost's Office and included UI leadership and individuals from the GC and its affiliated units. Interviews were conducted via Zoom between February 19 and 21, 2024. A full list of those interviewed appears in Appendix B. Specific areas that the Review Committee was charged to focus on are listed in Appendix C and appear as **subheadings with a grey background** in the body of this report.

STRENGTHS

The Review Committee regards the GC's leadership as a strength. Dean Amanda Thein, who also serves as the UI associate provost for graduate and professional education, has done commendable work leading a college focused on academic rigor, student success, wellness, and professional development. The GC's participation in a future UI fund drive has the potential to greatly enhance the work of the GC. Dean Thein is assisted by a talented and well-respected staff. For example, Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs Heidi Arbisi-Kelm, who is seen as an essential, invaluable leader and resource locally by the faculty, has led important discussions across the Big 10 Academic Alliance regarding holistic admissions after the recent Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) decision on admissions of minority applicants. The Graduate Student Success Center, led by Assistant Dean Jennifer Teitle, unique to UI, is often described as a model for other institutions, and is integral to the overall mission of the GC. Associate Dean Shelly Campo has been integral in leading the effort to adjust the GC fellowships programs to help meet UI and the GC needs and priorities in light of the recent SCOTUS decision. The GC is also committed to excellence in diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), UI's focus on belonging, and collaboration in the campus-wide initiatives in this area.

SPECIFIC AREAS OF FOCUS

1. Is the Graduate College successfully promoting the UI research mission by ensuring that the graduate programs offered by the University are of high quality and stimulate the creation of new knowledge and information?

Yes, the GC ensures that the graduate programs offered by the University are of high quality. The graduate-student and postdoctoral endeavors are critical components of the UI's research mission and are essential for attracting top faculty and research funding to the university. Quality in graduate education is assured at multiple levels, including the quality of graduate students admitted to UI, the quality of training provided by the faculty, and the quality of academic programs. The GC is involved in all three aspects, beginning with the standards of graduate school applicants and the value they add. The GC maintains and enforces the critical requirements for admission of quality students into graduate education and assists graduate programs in recruiting qualified and diverse applicants through recruitment activities, financial support, and attractive programing.

The impact on quality at the student level is more distributed to the graduate faculty who are better served to examine the specific qualities that are unique to their field. However, the GC ensures the overall quality of the students (through minimum standards, etc.) and programs through monitoring of enrollments, time-to-degree, student completion, and future placement. The GC also sets standards in terms of the constitution of doctoral dissertations and master's theses (in which the research and scholarship is conveyed), and, overall, maintaining the rigor of those research outcomes across campus at a high level. Subsequently, the efforts of the GC to aid in recruiting and retaining graduate students and postdocs play an important role in retaining high-quality research faculty, and by extension, in accomplishing the research mission of the UI. Thus, it is highly important for the GC to continue in its mission.

The GC excels at providing support for, and partnering with, academic units to develop new programs and revise or update existing programs. The GC is seen as a helpful partner to academic programs in curricular matters and in educating programs on best practices. Many of these activities are happening through Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) meetings. Over the last several years, the GC has focused on helping programs define their learning objectives and publishing those objectives into catalogs, which also occurs at the associate dean level in the colleges.

The review committee noted several examples of innovations—in culture, practice, and policy—developed by the GC that contribute to the UI's high quality of graduate education. Several innovations demonstrate the GC's commitment to a student-centered focus on graduate education—a focus not just on courses, but on the whole graduate student experience, including wellbeing, research and training, professional development, and career development. One specific innovation in this area is the peer-to-peer mentoring program that fosters connection, belonging, and development. This program was recently piloted, and the GC should prioritize an assessment of its impact on student outcomes to help make a data-informed decision on whether to continue and potentially expand the program. The Grad Success Center is another innovation in this area, and an exemplary model of student success structure and programming for other institutions and graduate schools.

Another example praised by the Review Committee is “alternative degree deposits” that recognize and allow for flexibility in disciplinary differences in the format of scholarship—multimedia, portfolios, recorded dance or performance, and two-style articles that serve as theses or dissertations for advanced degrees. The GC is a national leader in innovating ways to fashion such deposits. Other examples are advancing the U2G (Undergraduate to Graduate) pathway to enhance retention of our UI undergraduate students and accelerate the time to degree for students seeking these types of advanced degrees.

In addition to these activities, the GC has the responsibility for supporting tenured faculty who are producing high-quality scholarship. By supporting the interdisciplinary graduate training programs (IDGPs) across campus, the GC maximizes the potential for faculty to engage in research opportunities and explore innovative areas. Innovations occur in these IDGPs because of the connections the GC provides by breaking down the standard academic barriers that might otherwise exist.

2. Is the Graduate College optimally deploying resources to achieve the UI strategic plan objectives of a) supporting graduate student and postdoctoral success through academic support and professional and career development?

Graduate Students

Unequivocally yes. The GC optimally deploys resources to achieve the UI strategic plan objectives of supporting graduate students. It provides academic support through communications with DGSs and promoting success in moving students to degree completion. It has an effective Grad Success Center and provides graduate

student fellowships. The GC self-study notes that the average time to degree has gotten shorter, and the percentage of students completing a degree has increased.

However, as far as professional and career development, the GC has the opportunity to track outcomes better. It is not clear that employment outcomes are being tracked. The GC needs to consider the optimal way to do this [i.e., methodology (outside, e.g. academic analytics, vs. new in-house designed system; should tracking be done by the GC or should the GC assist programs in doing their own tracking?)]. It is unclear to the committee what the costs, benefits, and functionality of using an in-house designed versus using an existing vendor would be for the GC. However, prospective students want to know what kind of jobs they can secure as a result of the degree they will obtain and how well former students in the UI programs have done in their careers. The GC should advocate for such tracking to be done well, and for the application of proven standards to it. Thus, the committee recommends that the GC carefully consider the benefits vs drawbacks related to speed of deployment, costs and functionality in choosing to use an existing external system vs developing a brand new in-house internal system that apparently will need to be created from scratch for tracking. The UI overall needs to be gathering and disseminating outcomes information more effectively. The GC has the opportunity to advocate for rigorous tracking of outcomes data, and it mentions in its self-study the GC Office of Information Technology and its aim to develop technology to better collect career outcomes. This should be a short-term goal and priority.

While the DGS meetings have been a great success, onboarding of DGSs appears to not be uniform. The level of expectation of DGSs also seems to vary significantly across colleges. The GC can advocate for implementation of best practices, e.g., that each DGS should meet with their associate dean on a regular basis. DGSs would benefit from having a document or handbook that describes their responsibilities and connects them to relevant resources that will help them support their students.

Postdoctoral Scholars

The situation for postdoctoral scholars at UI is similar to the climate for postdocs nationally. While the GC is leading efforts to improve the situation, there does not appear to be a clearly defined home for postdocs in the UI. The GC needs a specific, named unit and individual to whom postdocs could reach out. For instance, the self-study lists an office of postdoctoral affairs but this individual or office is not found on the organization chart. At present there seems to be an unorganized set of people who handle different aspects of postdoc issues. The result is that postdocs have a poor understanding of who they should talk with about their concerns and needs. This is an area that needs to be addressed going forward.

The GC has been charged to serve as the administrative home for oversight of postdoctoral training, but it appears this is an unfunded mandate and it was not clear to the committee that the GC receives any support for postdocs. The GC's reputation has therefore suffered because it was given the responsibility and oversight of postdoctoral scholars without resources or infrastructure to do so effectively. This situation is only going to get worse if the recommendations in the *NIH Advisory Committee to the Director Working Group on Re-envisioning NIH-supported Postdoctoral Training* report are implemented.

The GC has started to address postdoc issues. It has helped determine what appointments are allowed, and to expand guidelines for what can and cannot happen on appointments. It has created onboarding checklists for primary instigators and held forums with the GC dean and other campus leaders. Some of the services of the Grad Success Center are available to postdocs. The GC can work to ensure that postdoctoral scholars are included on mass emails to graduate students, which would greatly enhance the postdoc sense of belonging at UI.

It is notable that one of the GC's stated critical tasks is to "develop a postdoctoral fellowship program to support efforts to recruit, develop and place postdoctoral scholars." The GC can reach out to the Big 10 Academic Alliance for strategies in delivering services to postdoctoral scholars.

3. Is the Graduate College optimally deploying resources to achieve the UI strategic plan objectives of b) cost containment through efficiency and innovation?

Yes, the GC has deployed its limited resources in an optimal way. This includes innovation in the areas of alternative degree deposits and electronic records. Further, the GC has adapted the timing and deployment of their awarded fellowships to maximize the support of graduate students since the last review. One area that remains a concern for the GC are the "academic units" that are housed in the GC by UI and take up GC resources but do not advance the GC mission (see Question 4 below).

4. Does the organizational structure of the Graduate College a) meet the needs of the UC?

The organizational structure of the GC meets its needs. The filling of the open associate dean position, which occurred during this review, should enhance GC efforts and hopefully reduce the burden that other associate and assistant deans have had to take up during the interim. This position had been vacant for over a year.

The GC oversees five academic units—University of Iowa Press, Center for the Book, International Writers' Program, School of Library and Information Sciences, and School of Planning and Public Affairs—whose activities do not fit the GC's mission. This Review Committee, as did the last one, questions whether these units should be removed from the GC and placed elsewhere to realign the GC budget with its mission areas of graduate and postdoctoral education and training. It was reported in the last review period that the GC did an evaluation and decided to keep the units in the GC. It appeared that, while the units don't advance the mission of the GC, at the time no better administrative home could be identified. Regardless, the main point is that the GC is not a natural home for these units; they represent a drain on the GC resources and do not fall under the GC's mission.

The Review Committee emphasizes that the commentary above is not a criticism of these units themselves, but instead it concerns the administrative structure of the GC. The challenge for the UI is to acknowledge the synergies between many of these units and find an appropriate administrative structure and home for them.

4. Does the organizational structure of the Graduate College b) support the departments/programs that report to the dean be part of the Graduate College?

The five programs discussed above are happy with their relationships with the GC and praise the support they have received from Associate Provost and Dean Thein, but they acknowledge that they are not a good fit within the GC. However, they do not have a suggestion for where they would better fit in the UI structure.

The IDGPs (i.e., interdisciplinary graduate programs) likewise are very happy with the support they receive from the GC, but the GC represents only part of their total support. Some of the IDGPs do not feel financially secure and supported by the UI, in that some of their funding/support comes from individual colleges. There is a worry by those programs that the other college may not appreciate the value they and their faculty add to the UI, and there is an institutional need for a clear articulation of the value of the interdisciplinary programs and faculty to all colleges.

While the IGDPs receive some support from other colleges, they don't report to those colleges, so the obligation from those colleges to continue funding and supporting the IDGPs is less clear. The faculty in the IDGPs are at the mercy of the support of the colleges where their primary appointments are housed. The issue that arises is, if

a leader of one of those other colleges leaves the UI and/or chooses to not allow their faculty to support the IDGP, then it is less clear what the support would be for that particular program. Also, feedback to the Review Committee indicated a need to understand how a particular college receives “credit” for the housing of faculty and students associated with these IDGPs. It was expressed by some colleges that their college’s faculty advise students of these IDGPs, which takes significant amount of time, and those students are not even accepted in a program housed in that particular college and are, therefore, not counted as collegiate students under the current business model.

A threat to the GC is that if any college changes anything related to an IDGP, then those changes may have a negative impact on the GC and UI mission as a whole.

4. Does the organizational structure of the Graduate College c) enhance its ability to contribute to the university’s strategic plan?

Yes, the organizational structure of the GC enhances its ability to contribute to the University’s strategic plan. It promotes innovation, collaboration, and the interaction between the two. The GC bridges colleges through the IDGPs. The GC takes a holistic approach to well-being and success, and it provides best practices for student success. The GC promotes a welcoming and inclusive environment; the GC has spent a significant amount of time working in this area across UI colleges.

As mentioned in the STRENGTHS section at the start of the report, the GC has taken the lead across Big 10 Academic Alliance in responding to the recent SCOTUS decision with respect to admissions policies.

OTHER ISSUES

GC Mission and Goals

The overall mission and goals of the GC are in line with the UI mission. The GC could benefit from creating and disseminating a graphical map of what the GC does and how it integrates major UI stakeholders.

Students

The efforts the GC has put toward retaining students have been commendable. The GC’s approach to transitioning students from undergraduate to graduate programs is appreciated. While the Review Committee was only afforded the opportunity to talk with five graduate students in total, no major concerns were raised. Similarly, no specific issues arose from meetings with graduate program coordinators. The GC recently held a discussion of “toxic mentors” and how to address related issues; this awareness is also appreciated.

One area in which the GC is lagging behind relative to Association of American Universities peers is in conducting regular surveys of graduate students about their experiences and making those results available at the level of individual graduate programs. Without anonymous, program-level results it is very difficult for programs and colleges to identify and address problems.

It was reported that communication from the GC can be inconsistent depending on what department or program a student is part of. Overall, conveying the GC’s resources is an area for enhancement.

Warnings of an “enrollment cliff” have been heard, and it appears that universities nationwide are shifting their efforts toward undergraduate admissions. After a steady increase in graduate students since 2014, enrollment has leveled off. Flat graduate enrollments and a looming decline in undergraduate enrollments speak to issues of recruiting future graduate students. In general, there is a sense of an absence of strong leadership and advocacy for strategic enrollment management at the graduate level. While not under the domain of the GC, faculty look to the GC as a natural leader to develop plans to secure future graduate enrollments. For UI to avoid a

postbaccalaureate enrollment cliff, the GC will need to play an important oversight role but with new UI investments. To repeat the theme introduced at the start of this report, graduate students and postdoctoral scholars are central to a university's research mission at large, and all missions are at risk without attention to them. In the past this has always been an important area that central UI leadership has not had to worry about, but now is the time to pay attention to it.

Educational Programs

The GC is leading the effort for the various UI colleges' programs to develop their learning objectives and outcomes. Currently, the GC and colleges are working on the assessment part of this effort.

Scholarly and Creative Activities

The GC has a presence on the national stage as a graduate college on the forefront of graduate education. It is not being insular. Examples of efforts that distinguish the GC nationally include its emphasis on holistic admissions, its investigations into and support of alternative deposits for dissertations and theses, and its emphasis on digital projects, recordings, exhibits, capstone projects—all these areas have been expanded. The GC was part of a national pilot program on student-centered doctoral education with the Association of American Universities.

Service

The GC is a thoroughly student-oriented service organization—e.g., its Grad Success Center. The Review Committee applauds the plan for the GC to move to the old Art Building, which will allow it to create space for student workspaces and gathering places. The Review Committee encourages accelerated progress toward this ultimate move. The Review Committee also was pleased to learn about the \$12 M capital campaign underway for the GC.

As discussed above, there is a need for more and enhanced support for postdoctoral scholars across the UI. There exists an awareness on campus that there is less scholarship support from the GC, but this is outside the GC's control.

OVERALL FINDINGS

1. The GC is mission-focused and its staff are dedicated and highly respected. It was obvious to the Review Committee that staff are student-focused and committed to providing excellent service to their students, postdocs, faculty, and staff.
2. The GC staff are universally seen as overworked and there is serious, and justified, concern that GC staff are overextended. Such overextension creates a stress point. The fact that the associate dean position was recently filled will be a significant help. Nevertheless, the GC faces risk of burnout and loss of individuals from the UI. The Review Committee recommends that there be some kind of cross-training of staff, recognizing the importance of "institutional knowledge." In addition, mapping staff activities against the GC mission might reveal opportunities for re-allocation. For example, advising non-degree-seeking graduate students takes up a significant amount of time. Advising non-degree-seeking students would seem to be more appropriately an academic college or Academic Advising Center responsibility.
3. There does not appear to be a good process for the GC to look internally to collectively prioritize activities to avoid staff taking on too much work. The GC needs to look to its strategic plan to decide what activities *must* be done, versus those that are tangential; this could be a good construct to help the GC prioritize its work. GC staff report doing this on their own, but that limits the opportunity for synergy between offices. The only way the GC will be able to devote resources to new strategic initiatives is if some existing activities are stopped. This process is more achievable if it is a collective decision of the GC.

4. Faculty connections to the GC appear to be largely to individual staff members, not GC offices or GC programs. This raises concerns about sustainability, access to services, and longevity. There is a need for enhanced marketing and communication of GC services. The GC should consider designing an organizational chart with descriptions of what each office does, one that points to what offices do and not just individuals. Further, the GC should consider utilizing a generic email address that multiple GC individuals can access. The intent is to get the graduate education community to understand that the GC has services that it can provide (instead of the name of just one individual).
5. There seems to be consensus that graduate education is appropriately decentralized/centralized at the UI. At some institutions, there is significant dissatisfaction and disfunction as a consequence of where they fall along the axis from centralized to decentralized. However, the GC, colleges, and programs seem to feel that graduate education at UI has found an effective place between these two extremes. Formal communication of the centralized/decentralized functions and services of the GC and local academic units would help address subtle issues of communication and coordination with the colleges, to clarify what services the GC could provide relative to what the academic units will provide. The GC is highly communicative to central deans and colleges. After that, though, it seems that information does not filter down or up to where it needs to get to. This is not unique to UI, but it warrants attention. Are there other ways that the GC can disseminate its information, in a multi-modal and repeated and reinforced manner?
6. There is need for improved communication from the GC to constituents, including students and postdoctoral scholars. There is a critical need for postdocs to be included on email blasts to all graduate students. Students appreciate the great services that the GC provides, and which were talked about at Orientation, but that information doesn't get a chance to settle into their thinking at a time when they are given a massive amount of new information. The GC can a) make sure that people can attend orientation (or have a virtual and/or recorded orientation), and b) offer a follow-up orientation at a later date to reinforce the services available. The GC relies on talking to associate deans and expecting them to convey information to students and postdocs, but this process isn't always working. This issue is not unique, and the GC is aware of it—but it needs to be addressed. The GC can provide specific instructions and strategies to associate deans, DGSs, and program coordinators on how to disseminate information. In many instances it may be sufficient to simply say to associate deans, “we need you to communicate the information we just provided to your DGSs and here is a PowerPoint slide you can use and a pdf you can distribute.”
7. In its routine meetings, the GC should leave more time for bi-directional flow of information. Time should be left on agendas for a more free-flow of information allowing more ability for attendees to have input. For example, prior to the meeting, the GC could ask participants to contribute agenda topics. Importantly, these meetings should be an opportunity for information flow not just between the GC and programs, but also between programs. Another suggestion heard by the Review Committee was that the GC should not cancel Graduate Council meetings. While individuals appreciated the “found” time, it did remove opportunities to discuss information that is important to them.
8. The GC has tremendous legitimate demands on its resources, and these demands are growing. It has limited opportunities to generate additional revenue with which to satisfy those demands. Given that the GC's mission is highly integral to the missions of the colleges and the UI as a whole, what can the UI do to provide the GC with additional flexibility? Staff in the GC will truly benefit from the recent, successful filling of the associate dean position, which will allow them to clear some items off their desks. The Review Committee acknowledges the leadership of the GC in taking on activities that other UI colleges would have to do on their own (e.g., electronic records and forms, holistic recruitment, holistic admissions, best practices, student peer-to-peer mentoring in the Grad Success Center within GC), development of individual mentoring campaigns, and the “Gold Rush” campaign to bring wifi Internet access to students in 2020 during the COVID pandemic (the GC facilitated wifi hotspots in parking lots when students didn't have access to offices and labs, to facilitate students continuing their work and interacting with others).

9. Recruitment of graduate students is an area in which the UI should rely on the leadership of the GC at the same time that it provides clarity concerning the GC role relative to other colleges and programs. While the UI does significant undergraduate recruiting, not as much occurs at the graduate level. To avoid a graduate enrollment cliff and to ensure that the UI can accomplish its research and undergraduate teaching mission, graduate programs will need the kind of support that has historically been provided only to the undergraduate programs. While graduate admissions is not housed within the GC, the GC should be consulted, involved, and have some help in guiding a central unit for recruiting graduate students. Associate deans and other UI leadership are asking for help in recruitment, and they would naturally look to the GC, but recruitment is not in the GC's portfolio. The UI needs to acknowledge the GC's ability to guide such efforts. The GC has done a good job of recognizing best practices in recruiting; some examples were given, and they were reported to have been widely appreciated. The GC could identify programs that have done well with recruiting and have them share their techniques; the GC could be a forum for sharing best practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations that don't require much additional money or time

1. Have a regular schedule for recognizing and celebrating successes in order to increase staff job satisfaction and happiness.
2. Maximize the time spent with stakeholders in meetings. Modify Graduate Council meetings to have a consent agenda in order to use their time more efficiently. Don't cancel meetings if there are not items; use them as opportunities for discussion.
3. Communicate and educate the role and needs of postdoctoral scholars. Let the community know that postdoc responsibility is in the GC, but it is an unfunded mandate and to be patient until the GC can figure out next steps in order to address the significant uncertainty that exists across the UI about where responsibility for postdocs lies.
4. Limit GC requests of faculty and staff to those things that are necessary in order to reduce the burden on faculty and staff. For example, a point was made that letters of recommendation for fellowships are not used in a substantive way and are therefore unnecessarily time-consuming for both the writer and the GC.
5. Consider developing a series of GC email addresses (gcfellowships@; gcdiversity@....) and encouraging people to email those addresses rather than the individual email addresses of GC staff in order to 1) ensure no interruption of service when a staff member is out, and 2) build relationships to various GC offices in addition to GC staff.

Recommendations that don't require much additional money but may require significant time

1. Develop a graphic or "map" that identifies the role of the GC in providing centralized services directly to students and postdocs vs. indirectly through the decentralized functions of local academic unit. A rubric should also be developed to assist the GC in making decisions on programming and resources to continue or begin. Use these tools as guides to prioritize the work and resource allocations of the GC and to avoid overloading staff and spreading their efforts too thinly.
2. Work to move the 5 academic units out of the GC in order to focus the mission of the GC and reduce these demands on GC finances and staff. Maybe these units should report to Dr. Thein in her role as associate provost, not as the dean of the GC.
3. The Review Committee agrees with the GC's assessment that an individual development plan (IDP) for all students is critical. The GC has created the IDP; the next step is to implement it. Consider requiring the use of the IDP by all disciplines in order to facilitate graduate students identifying mentors and their

professional development goals, and to stay on track for graduation. Consider developing a mentor compact and mentor training. Consider a system for flagging problematic mentors.

4. There is a \$12M capital campaign goal for the GC. The GC could consider working with the UI Provost's Office and Center for Advancement to establish a graduate education capital campaign goal (summing this \$12M goal with all the graduate education goals of the academic colleges) in order to focus more fund-raising attention on graduate education. Even if it is too late to change the current campaign goals, the GC could consider documenting this campaign's goal and success in order to set the stage for increased focus on graduate education in the next campaign.
5. The GC could develop/update/reconstitute formal memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with colleges housing and supporting interdisciplinary graduate programs in order to ensure the sustainability of these programs despite leadership changes in the participating units. Use of MOUs is a way to stabilize programs.
6. The GC could ensure that a template/checklist exists for program closure in order to ensure that important items are addressed (e.g., that required courses will continue to be available for students already in the program)

Recommendations that require investment of non-recurring money and time

1. The GC could ensure that methods exist for students to provide anonymous feedback, at the graduate program level, about their experiences in order that graduate programs can have a process of continual improvement.
2. The GC could consider developing an online orientation to provide new graduate students with information over an extended period of time and on demand. Much of what is developed for graduate students could also be repackaged for postdoctoral scholars. An online orientation could serve to:
 - a. train students and postdoctoral scholars to visit a website and online toolkit;
 - b. educate them about resources available to them; and
 - c. educate international students when they should turn to the GC rather than the International Student and Scholars Services.

Recommendation that requires investment of recurring money and time

1. Allocate reoccurring funds to support a postdoctoral unit.
2. As mentioned earlier in this report, graduate recruitment and admissions are not housed in the GC. However, we believe stronger UI support is necessary to address the challenges in graduate student recruitment. For instance, many peer institutions utilize advanced tools to automate and facilitate recruitment best practices. We encourage the university to consider investing some of its strategic enrollment resources on graduate recruitment.

Appendix A. Members of the Review Committee

- Kevin Legge, Professor of Pathology, Carver College of Medicine, University of Iowa—Committee Chair
- Scott Lanyon, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education, Graduate School, University of Minnesota—External Reviewer
- Mary Stromberger, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School, Graduate School, The Ohio State University—External Reviewer
- Martin Kivlighan, Professor of Counseling Psychology, College of Education, University of Iowa
- Joshua Lobb, Assistant Director of Graduate Programs, College of Engineering, University of Iowa

- Patrick O'Shaughnessy, Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Occupational & Environmental Health; College of Public Health, University of Iowa

Appendix B. Individuals Interviewed by the Review Committee

Amanda Haertling Thein, Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education and Dean of the Graduate College

Partner Deans

- Denise Jamieson, Vice President for Medical Affairs and the Tyrone D. Artz Dean, Carver College of Medicine
- Edith Parker, Dean, College of Public Health
- Sara Sanders, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

UI Center for Advancement

- Jeff Liebermann, Assistant Vice President, UI Center for Advancement

Associate Deans for Graduate Education

- Maggie Chorazy, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Public Health
- Christine Getz, Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Outreach and Engagement, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Barbara Rakel, Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, College of Nursing
- David Roman, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, College of Pharmacy
- Nick Street, Associate Dean for Research and PhD Programs, Tippie College of Business
- H.S. Udaykumar, Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, Research, and Faculty; College of Engineering
- Pam Wesely, Associate Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs, College of Education
- Xian Jin Xie, Associate Dean for Research, College of Dentistry

Graduate College Leadership Team

- Heidi Arbisi-Kelm, Assistant Dean, Academic Affairs, Graduate College
- Shelly Campo, Associate Dean for Administrative Affairs
- Wendy Danger, Assistant to the Dean
- Tanesha Herman, Director, Human Resources
- Andy Jenkins, Director, Information Technology
- Katie McKibben, Director, External Relations
- Jennifer Teitle, Assistant Dean, Graduate Development and Postdoctoral Affairs
- Amy Welter, Director, Budget and Finance

Graduate College Unit Directors

- Julia Leonard, Director, UI Center for the Book
- Jim McCoy, Director, University of Iowa Press
- Chris Merrill, Director, International Writing Program
- Haifeng Qian, Director, School of Planning and Public Affairs
- Lucy Santos Green, Director, School of Library and Information Science

Graduate Council

- Eloy Barragan, Associate Professor and MFA Thesis Production Coordinator, Department of Dance, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Margaret Beck, Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Anthropology, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Harleah Buck, Sally Mathis Hartwig Professor in Gerontological Nursing; Director, Csomay Center for Gerontological Excellence, College of Nursing
- Denise Filios, Associate Professor, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- C. Andrew Frank, Associate Professor, Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, Carver College of Medicine
- Lesa Hoffman, Professor of Educational Measurement and Statistics, College of Education
- Jordan Ismail, student representative for Fine Arts & Humanities
- Hans Johnson, Associate Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, College of Engineering
- Karley Monaghan, President of Graduate Student Senate, and student representative for Biological & Medical Sciences
- Hannah Nennig, student representative for Physical, Mathematical, & Engineering
- Nikki Tennessen, student representative for Social Sciences & Education
- Eric Van Otterloo, Assistant Professor of Periodontics, Iowa Institute for Oral Health, and Anatomy and Cell Biology, Carver College of Medicine and College of Dentistry

Directors of Graduate Studies, Representative Group

- Jennifer Buckley, Department of English, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Ryan Carnahan, Department of Epidemiology, Carver College of Medicine
- Ryan Lalumiere, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Alec Scranton, Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, College of Engineering
- Scott Shaw, Department of Chemistry, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Christine Shea, Departments of Linguistics and Spanish and Portuguese, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Graduate Coordinators, Representative Group

- Lindsay Elliott, Graduate Program Coordinator, Department of Chemistry, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Kathleen O'Neill, Graduate Program Coordinator, Department History, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Anne Sparks, Coordinator of Graduate Student Admissions and Graduate Student Support, College of Education
- Kathleen Tandy, Program Administrator, Center for the Book, Graduate College

Interdisciplinary Graduate Program (IDGP) Directors

- David Cwierny, Director of Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Sustainable Development Program
- Juan Pablo Hourcade, Director of Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Informatics
- Laurent Jay, Director of the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Applied Mathematical and Computational Sciences
- Matt Potthoff, Director of Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Molecular Medicine

- Peter Thorne, Director of Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Human Toxicology
- Lori Wallrath, Director of Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Genetics

Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Leadership

- Laura Dean, UI Postdoctoral Association Vice President
- Khyathi Gadag, International Student Advisory Board President

Graduate Student Representative Group

- (Maria) Luz Alcala, Higher Education and Student Affairs MA student
- Adam Galloy, Biomedical Engineering PhD student

Appendix C. Charge to the Committee

The University of Iowa (UI) *Policy Manual* requires that we conduct reviews of our colleges regularly. In addition to the regular review, the GC was asked to address the following specific areas:

Is the GC successfully promoting the UI research mission by ensuring that the graduate programs offered by the University are of high quality and stimulate the creation of new knowledge and information?

Is the Graduate College optimally deploying resources to achieve the UI strategic plan objectives of:

- a. supporting graduate student and postdoctoral success through academic support and professional and career development?
- b. cost containment through efficiency and innovation?

Does the organizational structure of the GC:

- a. meet the needs of the GC?
- b. support the departments/programs that report to the dean be part of the GC?
- c. enhance its ability to contribute to the university's strategic plan?

END OF REPORT