

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**Minutes of Meeting****Tuesday, October 18, 2018**

Pursuant the call, Graduate Council met at 9:00 A.M. in Room 397 of the Kolligian Library, Chair LeRoy Westerling presiding.

Present: Hrant Hratchian, Maria DePrano, Fred Wolf, Christina Torres-Rouff, Chih-Wen Ni, Rose Scott, and Marjorie Zatz. Andy LiWang participated via Zoom. GSA representative Thaddeus Seher joined the meeting at 9:45 a.m. Consultant Erin Webb from the Registrar's Office was also present.

I. Executive Session

Members did not have an executive session on October 18, 2018.

II. Chair's Report – Chair Westerling**A. Divisional Council (10/9)**

Chair Westerling updated GC members on the following major topics of discussion at the October 9 Division Council meeting:

- EVC/Provost Camfield discussed the Core Team/Academic Freedom Initiative
- Division Council approved the UC Merced Extension Child Development and Care Certificate Non-Degree Program Proposal
- Discussion on impending parking changes
- Draft policy for establishing new schools and colleges has been submitted to the administration. The draft will then come to the Senate for committee review.
- Discussion on whether School Executive Committee chairs should sit on Division Council in order to improve communication between Senate committees and the Schools.
- Discussion of including Unit 18 lecturers on Senate committees. Questions arose as to lecturers' workload if this service was added; moreover, lecturers are represented by a union and union rules must be followed.

III. PROC Liaison's Report – Maria DePrano**A. PROC Meeting (10/3)**

Maria DePrano reported on the October 3 meeting of the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC). The highlights of the meeting discussion included: academic advising on campus, including in relation to professional advising (pre-law advising); strategy for responding to WSCUC requirement for Interim WSCUC Report (they want an update on the 2020 plan in 2021); and charges to program review committees related to programs under review. The Center for Humanities will also be under review, and PROC members discussed the self-study document. Finally, the Social Sciences & Management self-study will be combined with the Economics' self-study to avoid duplication.

IV. Consent Calendar

- October 18 agenda
- Draft October 2 meeting minutes
- CRFs
 - ESS 202: Chemistry and Mineralogy of Soils
 - QSB 215: Principles of Biological Technologies
 - QSB 220: Cellular Microbiology

- [COGS 278](#): The Cognitive Science of the Emotions
- [COGS 279](#): The Cognitive Science of Religion

- Petitions to appoint graduate students as IOR for upper division courses in spring 2019
 - [Lucas Lopez, Psychology 130](#)
 - [Anabel Castillo, Psychology 181](#)
 - Stephanie Nail, reappointment to teach POLI 153/MGMT 153/ECON 153/COGS 170 Judgment and Decision Making
 - Ashley Metzger, reappointment to teach SOC 132 Sociology of Education

- [Petition to appoint](#) Alberto Aguilera, a non-Senate faculty member, to instruct PH 290: Biostatistics I.

Action: The consent calendar was approved as presented.

V. Instructional Budget Presentation

The individuals supporting the Academic Budget Planning Process attended the meeting to present the new instructional budget model: Kurt Schnier, Academic Senate Chair; Jenna Allen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration; and Romi Kaur, Executive Director of Financial Planning and Analysis. They focused their summary on the impact of the budget model on graduate resources (e.g. teaching assistantships) and curriculum. Senate Chair Schnier stated that this is the same presentation he and his colleagues gave to department chairs and graduate group chairs earlier this year, and, they are working with the deans as well. Today's presentation is part of a larger packet of information they will share with GC if the committee would like to review it.

The budget planning effort is a three-year phase project. Senate committees are strongly encouraged to be actively engaged in the process, as faculty input is important. Senate Chair Schnier provided background on how this process began. One of the major priorities that participants in the Fall 2017 Academic Retreat identified is academic budgeting, specifically, the need to establish a process for instructional budgets. The Budget Working Group (BWG) was empaneled and tasked with working on academic budgeting. The BWG then created a subcommittee, the Budget Development Team, to propose an academic budget planning process for AY 19-20.

The main goals of the budget process are: to create predictable ties to curriculum for budget, allocate the budget a year in advance (early February) to allow for planning, create rational process for augmenting the budgets, and improve flexibility in the Schools to make decisions where resources are needed. The overarching goal is to integrate this model into one coherent, academic budget process. In order to ensure that the budgeting process is supporting the mission of the campus, we need to create the infrastructure in order to do so.

Phase 1 of the three phases of the budget process is curriculum-based. In SSHA, labs and discussions are treated in the same manner, 4 a year per TA. In SNS and SOE, the breakdown is 4 labs a year and 6 discussions a year. Threshold for course enrollment is 60 and 180. While some majors/programs diverge from these breakdowns, the budget development team, at this stage, is just trying to establish general rules to create a budget allocation. Senate Chair Schnier explained that the central budget office wants to establish a dollar amount that Schools can use to allocate TAs as they see fit.

GC Chair Westerling asked about incentives and predictability, specifically, incentives to structure curriculum in such a way that allow resources to flow and pay for the program. He voiced his

concern about the plan for money to be allocated in one block to the school deans – who apparently have the discretion to allocation as they see fit. He pointed out that faculty have been told that department chairs would have authority over allocation. Director Kaur responded that the budget development team will have a discussion on what incentives are available as the incentive structure is not yet fully developed. But for the present time, the team needed to establish general rules that are tied to curriculum so that deans have flexibility. Senate Chair Schnier replied that faculty eventually will have discussions with their deans, and instructional budgets and resources will ultimately be under the authority of the department chairs. But for right now, at the beginning of the three-year phase, the budget development team is opening the dialogue on these issues. The goal for now is for faculty to offer a mirror of the curriculum that they have been offering from the budget perspective. We will eventually move to a system where budgets are departmentally owned.

GC Chair Westerling inquired about the source of this flexibility and whether a slush fund exists. Senate Chair Schnier answered that there will be virtual deficits and surpluses for the first few years of this process as we learn how we get to a more steady state. After the third phase is completed, we hope to reach a state where there are binding constraints. Director Kaur added that the budget development team is estimating how much the slush fund should be. The team has been going off expenditures in the absent of a real budget to use as an example. GC Chair Westerling noted that the campus is adding 60 to 80 new faculty which means the addition of new courses and new programs. AVC Allen stated that the campus has a process to plan for the addition of new faculty and estimated costs.

Senate Chair Schnier encouraged GC to think about how this proposed model would affect graduate education. A GC member pointed out that there are multiple graduate programs in SNS and SOE that depend on other programs to support their own students with TAs. Senate Chair Schnier stated that deans and departments need to have open communication, because this situation occurs in all three Schools. Another GC member pointed out that the discussion on academic budget planning has revolved around undergraduate programs. Senate Chair Schnier replied that undergraduate curriculum generates a lot of financial support for graduate programs, though it is not necessarily aligned with the desired research direction. The expectation is that conversations will occur between the Schools and deans on these matters. Also, the budget model will bring predictability for graduate student support. VPDGE Zatz noted that the proposed budget model will be challenging with regard to research interests of interdisciplinary programs that do not align with the instructional missions of the schools or specific undergraduate programs. AVC Allen replied that the first year of the three-year process will help reveal these kinds of issues to allow the campus to address learning, for instance how much we use TAs to support graduate programs and how it differs across programs. Senate Chair Schnier requested input about how faculty would monitor whether or not interdisciplinary programs are being supported properly through this budget process. The GC Vice Chair recommended that the budget development team contact faculty in programs who may be disadvantaged under this budget model to consult with their colleagues at other institutions about how well their budget processes work. AVC Allen stated she would like to run a work section on the graduate side to start to generate some rules around these issues in January or February. GC Chair Westerling raised a point about dean turnover, and suggested the need to establish standards for how discussions on planning will going forward.

Senate Chair Schnier suggested further dialogue with GC, perhaps in January. A GC member pointed out that graduate students are not accepted in relation to the undergraduate curriculum. She cautioned the budget development team to remember the timeline: undergraduate curriculum is being requested in September, but programs accept graduate students in January, and programs do

not have a budget until February. Director Kaur replied that this is a baseline to start off with. The budget development team is not making any significant changes even in this year.

A GC member pointed out that graduate programs have historically been a secondary consideration in our planning. He argued that UC Berkeley and UT Austin are not good models for UC Merced due to a variety of factors. Senate Chair Schnier replied that we are not using them as models, rather, we are only learning from them in general terms. Senate Chair Schnier emphasized that we do not want undergraduate based budget to drive graduate resourcing. AVC Allen added that the team wants to ensure that the ties between undergraduate and graduate programs are not driving each other in perverse ways.

ACTION: Budget Development Team will consult again with GC in January to share updates.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

A. [Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment](#)

Members are asked to review and comment on the proposed revised [Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment](#) (change tracked copy [here](#)). As per the [accompanying cover letter](#), the revisions address comments received in response to a Management Review of the policy earlier this year, as well as changes required by the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights in its February 2018 resolution agreement with UC Berkeley and recommended by the California State Auditor in its June 2018 report on UC's response to SVSH complaints.

The GC lead reviewer summarized the policy revisions. She stated that she found nothing problematic and recommended that the committee endorse.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to endorse the proposed revisions.

Action: The Chair will transmit GC's comments to the Senate Chair by November 20, 2018.

B. [Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7 Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information](#)

Members are asked to review and comment on the proposed revisions to [Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7 Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information](#) (change tracked copy [here](#)). [The cover letter](#) provides context and background. The revised policy addresses the following key issues:

- Combines and updates BFB-RMP-7, Privacy of and Access to Information Responsibilities; BFB-RMP-11, Student Applicant Records; and BFB-RMP-12, Guidelines for Assuring Privacy of Personal Information in Mailing Lists and Telephone Directories
- Incorporates the UC Statement of Privacy Principles and Values
- Clarifies the roles of Privacy Officials, Records Management Coordinators and Information Practices Coordinators

The GC lead reviewer summarized the policy revisions. He stated that he found nothing problematic and recommended that the committee endorse.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to endorse the proposed revisions.

Action: The Chair will transmit GC's comments to the Senate Chair by November 20, 2018.

VII. [Unit Requirements Masters Degrees](#) – Chair Westerling

Per the September 18, 2018 action item, [Chair Westerling solicited feedback](#) from the Graduate Group Chairs regarding the unit disparity between the two types of master’s degrees as [outlined in the UCM Division Regulations](#): Plan I (thesis, 24 units) and II (comprehensive exam, 30 units) of the Master’s Degree Requirements. [Following email discussion](#), responding graduate group chairs supported the following proposal: Bring the minimum number of units for Plan II down to 24 so that 1) coursework can be finished in one-year and 2) the number of units is divisible by 12 (the number of units considered full-time for a graduate student). Seven of the 15 [graduate group chairs](#) participated in the email conversation. The total number of units required at other UC campuses is provided [here](#).

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to revise the Regulations.

Action: The GC analyst will revise the regulations, distribute to Graduate Council for final review, and then distribute for campus review.

Action: VPDGE Zatz will create a spreadsheet summarizing the degrees offered and will decide whether to make it available on a website as appropriate.

VIII. Consultation with VPDGE

The VPDGE stated that at the next meeting she will discuss graduate funding models. Her office and the central budget office have been speaking to other campuses to learn their processes. They talked to graduate group chairs yesterday, and will speak to graduate group chairs and deans in a meeting at the end of the month to talk about models that would make sense for UC Merced. VPDGE Zatz and the budget office will also speak with the GSA, and ultimately, the Senate. VPDGE Zatz will distribute materials to GC members before the next committee meeting and requested advance preparation.

VPDGE Zatz announced that she has taken over the role of co-chairing the search for the Campus Diversity Officer with the departure of VC Veronica Mendez.

GC Chair Westerling requested from VPDGE Zatz a “mini agenda” to better structure her time for the next GC meeting.

IX. New Business

As an informational item, the GC Vice Chair announced that he would like to meet with GC representatives from different Schools in preparation his work on the Budget Work Group.

The Vice Chair will attend the next Division Council meeting in the Chair’s stead.