

Graduate Council (GC)
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, January 22, 2014

I. Chair's Report – Professor Valerie Leppert

- CCGA (1/8)

Chair Leppert reported on CCGA's discussion regarding the revised Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) and the proposed revisions to the Self-Supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP) Policy. CCGA members had significant concerns with the proposed policies, including the potential impact on the academic quality of the self-supporting programs.

- Strategic Focusing Initiative Update (1/21)

Chair Leppert announced that feedback should be going out to proposing groups in the near future. The Strategic Focusing Work Group will need to make sure the feedback and next steps are clear. A GC member raised their concern that proposing faculty of stand-alone graduate programs are citing their proposed strategic focusing plan in their CCGA Proposals and revisions will need to be requested as the resources have yet to be committed. Members agreed that proposing faculty should plan their resource needs based on previous fiscal year resource allocations.

- Chair Leppert thanked members for attending the lunch session interview with the first candidate for the Vice Provost of Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate Division position. Members were reminded to attend the January 30 lunch session from 12:00-1:30pm with the second candidate.

II. Graduate Dean Kello Report

- Graduate Student Summer Funding

Graduate Dean Kello indicated that funding levels for graduate student summer funding will be similar to last year. All funds have been allocated directly to graduate groups and no call for summer funding will be disseminated. Graduate students should contact their graduate group chairs for information on the plans for allocations of those funds. Members raised their concern regarding the lack of information conveyed to students.

Action: Graduate Dean Kello will schedule a meeting with the Graduate Group Chairs to request that information for funding be communicated to their graduate students.

- AY 2014-2015 Graduate Group & Student Funding

Graduate Dean Kello announced that the same funding model (from AY 2013-2014) would be used to determine the AY2014-2015 funding levels for graduate groups and students. Dean Kello anticipates that even with the hiring of the Vice Provost of Graduate Education/Dean of the Graduate Division there should be no extreme changes to the funding model, as it will be a transition year for the Graduate Division.

III. Consent Calendar

- The agenda was unanimously approved as presented.

- The December 12 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.
- The CRFs listed below were approved as presented.
 - ES 244/QSB 244 Phylogenetics
 - ES 245/QSB 245 Biogeography
 - ES 249/QSB 249 History, Philosophy & Practice of Science

IV. Campus Review Item: WASC Five Core Competency Expectation

WASC's recently redesigned the reaccreditation process. Among several new accreditation expectations is that institutions must ensure the development of the following "five core competencies" in all baccalaureate programs: written communication, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy and critical thinking. UC Merced will be part of the first set of institutions to meet these expectations for all five competencies. By spring 2017, the time of UC Merced's Off-Site Review for reaccreditation, WASC expects UC Merced to have assessed four of the five competencies. By the time of our Accreditation Visit (in spring 2018) all five competencies will have been assessed. VPDUÉ Whitt and ALO Martin have drafted a proposal to help meet these new WASC expectations. GC reviewed the proposed plan and had no concerns/comments.

Action: GC will send memo to Senate Chair López-Calvo by January 22.

V. Systemwide Review Items:

A. Proposed revisions to APM 025, APM 670 and Proposed New APM 671

The proposed revisions are in response to campus administrators and faculty requests to clarify the purpose, scope, and compliance requirements concerning conflict of commitment policy for general campus faculty and for Health Sciences Compensation Plan faculty. Members reviewed the documents listed below and had not concerns/comments.

- Revised APM 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty
- Revised APM 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan
- New APM 671, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities of Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants

Action: GC will send memo to Senate Chair López-Calvo by January 31, 2014.

B. Proposed revisions to the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Policy (PDST) and new Presidential Implementation Protocols

Graduate Council was asked to comment on the proposed revisions to the PDST Policy and recommended policy implementation protocols to President Napolitano. The draft policy is a result of the recommendations by the University PDST Task Force. The revised policy applies to state supported professional programs that have additional costs not covered by the regular tuition and allows such programs to charge a different tuition rate without generating revenue. The major issue that created the need for revisions to the PDST Policy is that very few programs request to become a PDST program as the Regents review the tuition rates once per year and the delay in approval can be detrimental to the existing PDST programs.

Members were concerned with the differentiation in professional degree programs in terms of the type (PDST and SSGPDP). Why should there be two models for professional degrees? Although, PDST and SSGPDP programs have different budget models, it's not clear at an academic perspective what the difference is.

Action: Senate Analyst will draft memo based on member's comments for forwarding to the Senate Chair López-Calvo by February 14, 2014.

VI. Graduate "Minor" Request Update

Graduate Council received a request to consider the possibility of establishing graduate minors from a graduate group. ALO Martin was asked to provide a synopsis to GC on the memo from the Office of Assessment. If the campus wants to create a designated emphasis WASC would need to be consulted and depending on the request from the originating faculty graduate group, the campus would need to: (1) create a campus policy and (2) consult with WASC if a substantive change proposal will need to be submitted. As the campus does not have a general degree authorization, any change to a graduate group might trigger a substantive change.

Members discussed if establishing designated emphasis and/or certificates would be needed. A member acknowledged that, for international students and interdisciplinary programs, having something appear on the transcript would be beneficial as Ph.D. graduates are at times asked to provide a copy of their Ph.D. Degree Certificate and Ph.D. transcript when applying for a post-doctoral program and/or faculty positions. GC agreed to continue the discussion at the next GC meeting.

Action: Chair Leppert will follow-up with the originating faculty graduate group.

VII. Discussion Items:

A. UCM Medical School (SB 841)

As introduced on January 7, SB 841 would appropriate \$1,855,000 each fiscal year, commencing with 2015-16 to expand the San Joaquin Valley PRIME program to admit up to 12 students per year and operate the program with up to 48 students across the four-year curriculum annually. In addition, the bill would provide a one-time appropriation of \$1 million to support a 2-year planning effort to establish a medical school at UCM. The University would then be responsible for submitting a report to the appropriation policy and fiscal committees by March 1, 2016.

Members discussed the bill as introduced and had the following comments/concerns:

- This bill is positive for our campus as it would not only expand funding for PRIME, but provide another source of funding.
- If a medical school is initiated in the near future, would it be part of the current footprint for the campus and as a result limit the growth of the campus?
- Individuals who are part of the planning process should ensure a Medical School is not established at the detriment to other programs (specifically hiring and advancement of the campus).
- The campus needs to ensure that the most effective plan is put forward that will actually increase the delivery of health care in the valley and doesn't detract from our research mission.
- The campus needs to clarify who should be involved in the initial stages of planning as medical education is interdisciplinary.

- Rather than just basing our activities around responding to the bill and the medical school issue, we should take development of a potential campus task force as an opportunity to examine what is really possible in terms of developing our broader health sciences efforts.
- Will the model for a future medical school follow a distributed model?
- In general, it would be helpful to receive more information on the PRIME program.

Action: Vice Chair Hull will convey member’s concerns at the DivCo/FWDAF meeting scheduled on February 5, 2014.

VIII. Joint Program Review Committee Charge

A motion was made, seconded, and carried to approve the revised Program Review Committee Charge.

Action: GC will send the revised charge to UGC and PRC.

IX. Executive Session- GC Members Only

No minutes were recorded for this portion of the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes Prepared by:

Mayra Chavez, Senate Analyst