

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)
November 10, 2016
10:00-11:30 AM KL 362
Documents available at: [UCM BOX](#)

- I. **Consultation with University Registrar Laurie Herbrand**
- II. **Chair’s Report – Ramesh Balasubramaniam**
 - a. Division Council meeting – October 6, 2016
 - b. CCGA Meeting – November 2, 2016
 - c. Graduate students TAing Graduate courses
- III. **Vice Chair’s Report – Teamrat Ghezzehei**
- IV. **Consent Calendar**
 - a. Approval of the October 20, 2016 minutes pg. 3
 - b. Approval of the November 10, 2016 agenda
 - c. [Grad Group Policies & Procedures](#) approval
 - d. [Graduate Advisor’s Handbook](#) approval
- V. **Professional Development Course offered by Graduate Division (GradDiv)**
 - a. **Background:** VPDGE Zatz was asked to send a memo regarding: 1) who will be reviewing the course before it comes to GC, 2) is this course a one-off or will it be setting the precedent for more offerings in the future, and 3) how will faculty be recompensed for their time.
 - b. **Action:** GC to review memo from VPDGE Zatz and discuss proposal.
- VI. **Committee Review Item**
 - a. **School Executive Committee Input to Graduate Council** pg. 7
 - i. **Background:** Senate Chair Amussen has requested comments regarding what information GC would like to receive from the Executive Committees on resource-related and planning aspects of the duties and responsibilities that GC carries out.
 - ii. **Action:** GC sends comments to senatechair@ucmerced.edu by 5:00 PM on Monday, November 21.
 - b. **Proposed revision to Non-Academic Senate Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses** pg. 8
 - i. **Background:** Faculty have been contacting the Graduate Council and Graduate Division requesting that the current policy regarding graduate students teaching other graduate students be reviewed.
 - ii. **Action:** GC will discuss and vote on the proposed policy revision.
- VII. **Systemwide Review Items**
 - a. **[Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 - UCIE](#)**
 - i. **Background:** Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Chalfant has requested comments on proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 (University Committee on

International Education). COR, UGC, and GC are lead committees on this review item.

- ii. **Action:** GC sends comments to senatechair@ucmerced.edu by 5:00 PM on Thursday, December 8.

b. Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Policy

- i. **Background:** Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Chalfant has requested comments on a proposed revised policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). CAPRA, GC, and D&E are lead committees on this review item.
- ii. **Action:** GC sends comments to senatechair@ucmerced.edu by 5:00 PM on Thursday, December 8.

c. Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015

- i. **Background:** Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Chalfant has requested comments on a proposed revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM 015. FWAf, D&E, and P&T are lead committees on this review item.
- ii. **Action:** GC sends comments to senatechair@ucmerced.edu by 5:00 PM on Thursday, December 8.

VIII. Consultation with VPDGE Zatz

IX. Upcoming Business

X. Other Business

XI. Executive Session (Voting members only)

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**October 20th, 2016****Documents available at: UCM Box "[GC AY 16-17](#)"**

Pursuant to call, the Graduate Council met at 10:04 AM on October 20, 2016 in Room 228 of the Student Services Building, Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam presiding.

I. Consultation with Provost/EVC

A committee member asked about how to accomplish a better alignment of graduate programs within departments? Are these departments aligned with graduate groups? Provost Peterson replied that this is one of the most important questions regarding restructuring. The administration and faculty working group is tasked with developing ideas to be vetted by all senate committees on the structure for the academic side of campus. It is well known that the current structure, in place since the campus opened, cannot continue without additional academic leadership at a level below the deans. Providing discipline-specific orientation and maintaining a clear inter-disciplinary culture is key to this. This is evident when comparing undergraduate groups to graduate groups. The Provost hopes for positive faculty input for this restructuring effort. The next phase of the process is where additional faculty can be involved. Regarding the budgetary structure, and the support needed for junior faculty, the Provost wants the conversations to not occur in isolation, and recognizes that internal support for graduate students needs to improve.

Regarding the make-up of the administration and faculty working group, the deans and two faculty members from each school were invited, and the Provost believes the Executive Committees were consulted. A concern was expressed that the committee does not represent the diversity of ideas and conflicts, and the Provost recommended that the committee membership be informed of ideas and conflicts that arise, copying him and the Senate office for clear documentation that an issue is being asked for consideration.

Responding to the belief that communication is not occurring adequately because the restructuring is being rushed to implementation, the Provost stated that this will be implemented when it is ready, and there is nothing being rushed to meet a deadline. He expressed his concern about the potential rumor of the deadline being rushed. Within the structure that the academic chairs proposed, there was a multi-year plan for how the restructuring could evolve, which may be the genesis of this rumor.

Chair Balasubramaniam raised the question about what the instructional budget is and what TA availability is. Up to now, groups have been providing multi-year offers on faith that the funds will be available. Programs that are very well aligned with their undergraduate counterparts will have much more transparency, however interdisciplinary programs may not see the same transparency. The Provost stated that the campus has enough history and predictability that there should be a baseline usable to anticipate the level of resources assured to a program. Fundamental to that is knowing what the budget is going to be from one year to the next, which has been a challenge. GC felt that this was a reasonable approach to take. VPDGE Zatz expressed that the deans have been supportive, with some progress being made last year. The issue of having the instructional budget increase when the undergraduate budget increases was raised, but with no clear answer, tying back to having no overall budget in place. VPDGE Zatz

noted that across the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, students could be receiving a greater level of support.

A member expressed the interest in expanding a master's program, and their group is wondering about a revenue mechanism, or if their students would be on their own. The Provost stated that there will be a retreat with the Dean's Council and Senate Chair and Vice Chair, with the entire focus being on budget. This is one topic to be discussed at that retreat. The Provost mentioned that there seems to be a sentiment that there are "secret pots of money" and how those sources can get into academic units. Mature universities have Indirect Cost Return sharing models, our campus does not, and this will also be a topic at the retreat, as well as how the expansion of a master's program as a revenue source would work out. The question of a timeline is not yet agreed upon, but the retreat is expected to identify things to consider early on.

A member asked about sharing what information is currently available, so that people would know what is possible in terms of budgetary constraints. The Provost referred this to the deans, as there is no prohibition in sharing, though it is most likely that nothing is being shared because no formal budget exists. The Provost will communicate to the Deans explicitly that they are free to share any information they do have. He also noted that he spends time dispelling rumors and reinforcing that administration is doing what is in the best interest for faculty. Chair Balasubramaniam noted the atmosphere on campus that there is a split between the administration and faculty. Transparency would help, though he understands this may not be possible without a budget. Faculty hear a common response to their questions being "we don't know", but perhaps communication could be shared out regarding what the budget is, what is being done, and a reminder that we are here together. The Provost mentioned that he has been criticized for not communicating enough, as he prefers to only communicate when he has facts. He does recognize that even sharing the status when there are no new facts would be of use to faculty.

A member asked if it was possible to homogenize the offer announcements, perhaps during the visitation weekend, to avoid offers being made at different times. The Provost noted that the timing of those decisions is made by the graduate groups themselves. Recommendations to graduate groups could best come from the Graduate Division and the graduate groups.

A member asked about how faculty lines are calculated. The Provost stated that he did not have a formula, certainly allocation directly to disciplinary units is a significant path. In a 140-150 position allocation, fewer than 30 total have been allocated to a cluster-hiring approach to date. Undergraduate student demand is an important factor. The Provost also made a point highlighting that faculty cannot make the argument for increasing ladder-rank faculty, and then argue that ladder-rank faculty have no responsibility to teach the undergraduates. There are many programs where the role of the ladder-rank faculty is near zero.

The question was raised about the closure of a program review, especially when a program review recommends faculty lines. The Provost pointed out that, by definition, program review will always say the Provost needs to allocate money to a particular place. This information is important and should be shared with CAPRA. We want to avoid taking the recommendations from external committees solely for how faculty lines get allocated.

The Provost wanted to end his conversation with GC regarding morale on campus. He is very concerned about the sentiment of an adversarial relationship between academic leadership and the academy. He hopes that it will be understood everyone is working towards the same goal. He asked the committee members to discourage conversations of an “us against them” nature. If it is true that the leadership cannot deliver, he expressed that it then is time for a change in academic leadership. It is hard for him to define a good working relationship when sometimes the only voices heard are those of dissent, not based on fact. The 2020 project is an example, viewed as a “glowing signature element” that is not functional for faculty and students, ignoring academic needs. Chair Balasubramaniam noted that while there is always a vocal minority, people in general do not respond well to uncertainty. Having even some information would be helpful. The Provost gave credit to VC Feitelberg, who has developed a long-term projection over multiple decades, that includes the 2020 project and faculty hiring, showing that the campus will remain solvent.

A member expressed that having the Provost attend the GC meeting gave him added confidence. If more information can be shared, more faculty may also feel better. The Provost does not view questions directed to him as confrontational, and wants to dispel rumors as much as possible. He hopes that everyone understand that even all the Senate Committees do not represent all faculty, so members should share the information they have as well. The Provost is happy to come back if the committee is interested or has more questions.

II. **Chair’s Report – Ramesh Balasubramaniam**

Chair Balasubramaniam welcomed Fred Wolf to the Graduate Council, and updated GC members on the following topics:

- a. October 6 Division Council meeting
 - i. A lot of conspiracies were discussed.
- b. October 5 CCGA Meeting
 - i. Systemwide, very interesting discussions were had regarding self-sustaining programs. The Public Health proposal has been assigned a Lead Reviewer by CCGA and will go for peer review.
- c. Review items for GC this year:
 - i. There will be three CCGA proposals this year: MIST, EECS, and BEST, which has been revised and now under a different title, “Materials and Biological Engineering” (MBE), ready to be submitted to GC in October.
 - ii. Grad Group Policies & Procedures and Graduate Advisor’s Handbook will be moved to email discussion and approval. VPDGE Zatz requested articulation on how students that have difficulty making progress can be assisted.
- d. Graduate students TAing Graduate courses:
 - i. There are five Grad Groups that have expressed their concerns regarding the [policy as written](#). A member conveyed his observations about this issue and how it would impact the future of teaching one of his courses. VPDGE Zatz expressed the need for being conscious of power differentials, having a clear split between the student that would be TAing and the students taking the course (doctoral student TAing a Masters course). Chair Balasubramaniam noted that a Grad Group expected to not be able to offer a particular course if they could not get TA support. The Grad Group would be modifying the respective CRF so the course would only take students from their specific Grad Group, hurting students from other programs. A member asked about

conjoining courses, and the response was that the University is trying to limit conjoined courses as much as possible. Further discussion among the committee showed that there is enough interest to revise this policy, and Chair Balasubramaniam will draft a modified version for Policy subcommittee review.

III. Vice Chair's Report – Teamrat Ghezzehei

- a. October 10 PROC Meeting:
 - i. Closing the loop on program reviews.
This topic is very important, but was not able to be discussed at the PROC meeting.
 - ii. How do we include a process for students who are not progressing successfully towards graduation?
VPDGE Zatz noted that this information should be shared throughout the course of the student's time on campus, as well as having this information in the Policies and Procedures is very important. Chairs are also supposed to verify that all steps have been completed by the student.
 - iii. Discussion on streamlining paperwork and checking requirements across grad programs.

IV. Consent Calendar

- a. The September 29th, 2016 meeting minutes were approved as presented.
- b. The October 20, 2016 meeting agenda was approved as presented.
- c. QSB 214 – Tissue Engineering Design was approved and will be forwarded to the Registrar.

V. Professional Development Course offered by Graduate Division (GradDiv)

- a. This topic was tabled for the next GC meeting.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

- a. [Presidential Policy on International Activities](#)
 - i. A memo will be sent to the Senate Chair that GC has no comments.
- b. [Proposed revisions to APM 015, APM 016, and Senate Bylaw 336](#)
 - i. A memo will be sent to the Senate Chair that GC has no comments.

VII. Consultation with VPDGE Zatz

VPDGE Zatz shared the file titled, "[UC Long Range Enrollment Plan 2013-2014 to 2020-2021](#)".

VIII. Upcoming Business

IX. Other Business

X. Executive Session (Voting members only)

GC entered Executive Session at 11:18 AM. No minutes were recorded.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:34 AM.

Attest:

Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Chair

Subject: By 11/21 (if possible!): Request for UGC, GC, and CAPRA Thoughts

On behalf of Chair Amussen

Dear Anne, Mukesh, and Ramesh:

In my Chair's report at last week's DivCo meeting (10/6), I mentioned the meeting I had with School Executive Committee chairs. As you know, School Executive Committees are charged in school bylaws with advising the dean on academic planning, budget, and resource allocation in support of education and research. Yet, the extent of consultation varies across schools from over-involvement to none at all.

To support School Executive Committee functions, and to better inform campus Senate decisions, I thought it would be useful for our committees to think about what information they would like not just from the deans, but from the Executive Committees. Your committee is one that receives recommendations from deans; I'd like you to consider whether it would be helpful also to have faculty Executive Committee input. This might, for instance, include memos from School Executive Committees regarding resources or other aspects of proposals.* Based on your feedback, we'll be in touch with deans and school chairs.

If possible, by 11/21, please provide your committee's thoughts regarding the need for and/or benefits of input by School Executive Committees on resource-related and planning aspects of the duties and responsibilities your committee carries out. Your committee's comments should, as relevant, address the specific proposals/activities on which the School Executive Committee's input on resources would be desirable.

Thank you for helping with this important matter and please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Susan

*Relatedly, as per the administrative [Policy for Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs](#), School Executive Committees are asked to approve or reject proposals for new undergraduate programs (Section IVD, 2), and the dean is asked to provide an independent recommendation regarding resource support for the proposed program (Section IVD, 3).

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**Non-Academic Senate Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses**

Approved on March 18, 2015

Teaching graduate courses is a privilege reserved for Academic Senate faculty (i.e., ladder rank faculty, Lecturers with Security of Employment, Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment) and granted only to others by exception. Exceptions are granted by the Chair of Graduate Council based on the merits of each case presented by the graduate group involved.

The review process described here applies to any non-Academic Senate faculty nominated to teach a course numbered 200 or higher, regardless of the content of the course and without regard to whether the graduate course is to be taught concurrently as an undergraduate course. This policy applies to all graduate courses at UC Merced.

Graduate Council reviews the following academic appointment titles when a request is made for approval to teach graduate courses:

- Unit 18 Lecturers
- Adjunct faculty of any rank
- Visiting faculty (other than UC faculty) of any rank
- Postdoctoral Scholars

Requests for exceptions involving non-Academic Senate faculty require:

1. Completion of the form titled Request for the Approval of Graduate Instruction.
2. Current curriculum vitae for the nominee.
3. A memo of justification from the chair of the unit responsible for curriculum decisions that explains the unit's need and the merits of the nominee's credentials to teach the course(s) in question.
4. The appointment letter sent to the unit's control point (e.g., the dean of the college or executive vice chancellor).
5. Course evaluations in cases where the nominee has previously taught at UC Merced and renewal of teaching privileges is being sought.

In the memo of justification for the request, the unit chair must address each of the following:

- The staffing context in which the request is being made. Specifically, the request must address the sufficiency or insufficiency of the number of Academic Senate faculty available to deliver the graduate course and if the course for which the exception is being requested is a core (required) course of the curriculum or an elective.

- The teaching, research, and publication strengths of the nominee relative to the course in question. An explanation of such qualifications should be written for a non-specialist in the field.
- The prior experience of the nominee in teaching graduate students and/or undergraduates.
- Any professional background and experience the nominee may have as a practitioner that may be relevant to the course in question.

The period of approval granted by the Chair of Graduate Council is dependent on the merits and individual's qualifications presented in each case. Requests involving the first-time appointment of a lecturer, who has not previously been approved for graduate instruction, will normally be approved for one year only unless the person's credentials are outstanding.

The Graduate Council requires that individuals nominated to teach a graduate course hold a terminal degree-e.g., a Ph.D., Ed.D., or M.F.A.-appropriate to the course(s) in question. It is important that someone who is to be entrusted to teach graduate students actually have experienced the rigors of conducting extensive research, published the results of that research, and finished the dissertation or other work required for a terminal degree. Only in rare cases will an individual who lacks a terminal degree in the relevant discipline be allowed to teach a graduate course.

Graduate Groups are asked to submit non-Academic Senate faculty requests as far in advance of the semester of proposed appointment as possible, and allow at least four weeks for review. Last-minute requests may not be approved unless the graduate group shows acceptable cause why the appointment request could not be made on time. If a new appointment is to be made the graduate group should allow sufficient time to meet the appropriate HR hiring requirements.

Postdoctoral Scholars Teaching Graduate Students

Graduate Council appreciates the value of providing post-doctoral scholars with a learning opportunity, as well as the value to the program of their sharing specialized knowledge with graduate students. In order to maintain program quality and consistency, post-doctoral scholars are best utilized in elective courses in which they have specialized knowledge, rather than in core courses of the curriculum. Requests for a post-doctoral scholar to teach core graduate courses will be approved only in exceptional circumstances.

Graduate Students Teaching Graduate Students

Under no circumstance will Graduate Council approve a graduate student teaching other graduate students, as students should not be evaluating their peers via course grades.

REQUEST FOR THE APPROVAL OF GRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Please submit this form and required accompanying material to the Academic Senate for Graduate Council approval of appointment of non-ladder faculty (e.g., lecturers, adjunct faculty, non-UC visiting faculty of any rank, etc.) to teach graduate courses (UCM courses numbered 200 and higher). Instruction may be approved for up to three years, renewable.

Accompanying materials must include:

- current curriculum vita
- a memo of justification of the appointment from the Chair of the Unit responsible for curriculum decisions, indicating the Unit's staffing need and the teaching/research/publication merits of the nominee's credentials to teach the course(s) in question, prior experience teaching graduate and/or undergraduate students, professional background and experience as a practitioner that may be relevant to the course(s) in question
- copies of summarized course evaluations in cases where the nominee has taught at UCM
- a copy of the current appointment letter sent to the School

For additional information, refer to the [Graduate Handbook](#) section on the teaching of graduate courses.

UCM unit:

Date:

Name of individual:

UCM payroll title and code number:

Graduate course title(s), number(s), and semester(s) to be taught:

Approval is sought for: teaching of course(s) once repeated teaching of courses

If repeated teaching, please indicate time period requested:

one year two years three years

Has this person been approved to teach UCM courses in the past? If so, please list course(s) and period of approval. (If needed, attach a separate sheet with additional comments on individual's qualifications.)

Submitted by:

Signature, Unit Chair

Date

Name and email of person submitting the form:

Graduate Council Action: approved disapproved

Time period of approval: one year two years three years

Signature, Chair, Graduate Council

Date

Distribution: From Academic Senate to Unit with cc to the Graduate Division, School, and Academic Personnel