

**GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)****Minutes of the Meeting****Tuesday, November 27, 2018**

Pursuant to the call, Graduate Council met at 9:00 A.M. in Room 230 of the Social Sciences and Management Building, Chair LeRoy Westerling presiding.

Present: LeRoy Westerling, Hrant Hratchian, Maria DePrano, Fred Wolf, Chih-Wen Ni, Rose Scott, Christina Torres-Rouff, Teamrat Ghezzehei, and Marjorie Zatz. Andy LiWang participated via Zoom. Consultant Erin Webb from the Registrar's Office was also present.

**I. Executive Session**

Members did not have an executive session on November 27, 2018.

**II. Chair's Report – *Chair Westerling***

Chair Westerling reported that the deadline for graduate student fellowship applications was not extended, despite previous discussion on this matter. VPDGE Zatz announced that the closing time for applications was mistakenly entered as Eastern Standard Time instead of Pacific Standard Time. The error was fixed, but she asked GC members to contact the Graduate Division if they have any questions or issues.

**III. Budget Work Group – *Hrant Hratchian***

GC Vice Chair Hratchian explained that thus far, the BWG meetings have consisted of conversations with the budget office and their description of their understanding of how components of the budget work. The budget office has done research on what other institutions are doing, discussed various models, and then opened the conversation to BWG. Nothing has yet been decided by the BWG.

One of the main topics of conversation in BWG meetings is instructional budget. The BWG began work on this last year. The budget office did not present a working formula to the BWG yet, but will be providing an update in early spring 2019. GC Chair Westerling stated that last year, the BWG was given a spreadsheet with average salaries for different ranks and multiplied them by number of individuals in those categories. Vice Chair Hratchian replied that the BWG has not yet been provided such specific information but he will keep GC informed.

In January or February, the BWG should begin to draft policy on indirect cost distribution and salary recovery and faculty release time. For the latter, the policy will specifically address how much it will cost faculty to buy out time. This is independent from release time expenditure. 50% of faculty salaries are supposed to be for research and 50% is for instruction time. If faculty want to buy out, they have to buy out with their salary. The difference in course load is supposed to map on to how much time faculty spend on graduate student mentorship in lieu of teaching. The next BWG meeting should provide clarity on this. Vice Chair Hratchian also stated that the BWG learned that companies can buy out faculty research time so they can own faculty's patents and licensing instead of the university. Concrete numbers should be discussed in future BWG meetings. The BWG also discussed how many NIH early career grants require buyout.

VPDGE Zatz reported that the graduate group chairs are speaking with department chairs to determine how many TA positions there will be each year so they know how many offers they can make. Vice Chair Hratchian stated that the instructional budget model has a formula for that. VPDGE Zatz replied that she is receiving

questions from faculty about this. Vice Chair Hratchian stated that he will contact the Senate Chair and emphasize the urgency in addressing this issue.

GC Chair Westerling inquired whether the Senate will be able to review the model that the BWG ultimately develops. Vice Chair Hratchian confirmed there will be Senate review, but the model will not be developed for a few months. The GC chair emphasized that GC's concerns need to be conveyed to the BWG. GC Vice Chair Hratchian stated that thus far, information has only been presented to the BWG as reports and nothing concrete yet; in the spring semester, concrete information will be available.

#### IV. Consent Calendar

- A. The agenda (11/27)
- B. Approval of the [revised policy regarding Non-Academic Senate Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses](#). The revisions, which were approved by the Policy Subcommittee on November 15, 2018, delegate the authority to grant exceptions to the Graduate Dean on behalf of Graduate Council, institute reporting of the percentage of courses taught by non-Senate faculty, and establish that Graduate Council review and approval is required if more than 10% (exclusive of research credit) of courses are taught by non-Senate faculty in academic (non-Professional) graduate programs. The petition form has also been established as a separate document rather than the final page of the policy.

**Action:** The consent calendar was approved as presented.

#### V. Management of Complex Systems (MCS) – *Hrant Hratchian*

The GC vice chair led the discussion due to the conflict of interest of the GC chair.

As per its approved CCGA proposal, [MCS requests](#) that applicants to the MCS Ph.D. program be permitted to submit either the GMAT or GRE for consideration in admissions. This would be an exception to current policy, which requires the GREs.

Vice Chair Hratchian recommended that GC approve the request from MCS. A motion was made, seconded, and was endorsed. GC Chair Westerling abstained from the vote. VPDGE Zatz requested that GC send her a memo so that her office can make the appropriate revisions to the website.

VPDGE Zatz announced that MCS was approved by the UC President.

**Action:** GC will issue a memo to VPDGE Zatz with GC's approval of MCS's request, and the VPDGE will ensure that the appropriate websites are updated.

#### VI. Campus Review Item

##### [Posthumous Degree revisions](#) - *Chih-Wen Ni*

Members were asked to discuss [revisions to the campus's policy for awarding posthumous baccalaureate degrees](#) proposed by Undergraduate Council. The proposed revisions follow a [request from Academic Council](#) for campuses to review their policies in light of a model policy developed by the University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP).

The GC lead reviewer stated that the proposed revisions do not greatly differ from the original policy. But, he requested input from GC members about how the revisions apply to Masters and PhD students. VPDGE Zatz raised a concern about the revisions allowing Student Affairs' review

of posthumous graduate degrees; she asserted that at a minimum, such review by Student Affairs should be in consultation with the Graduate Division. A GC member also suggested that school Deans should be part of the process.

Graduate Council elected to endorse the revisions, but request the following language to be placed in the memo to the Senate Chair:

1) The previously removed footnote on page 3 of the original request is to be reinstated in the body of the policy text, reading “Student Affairs will confirm with the Registrar whether the specified criteria are met and forward the request to the appropriate Dean who will then instruct the Registrar to issue the designated degree or certificate.” 2) Change the phrase “who will” to “who may” in the same sentence.

A motion was made to include the aforementioned language in GC’s memo to the Senate Chair, the motion was seconded, and endorsed.

**Action:** GC will issue the memo to the Senate Chair that offers its endorsement of the proposed revisions, with the addition of the two, aforementioned points.

#### VII. Systemwide Review Item

##### [Draft Report on UC ANR](#) – *Chair Westerling*

Members were asked to discuss the [draft report and recommendations](#) from the Advisory Committee for UC’s Agriculture and Natural Resources Division (UC ANR). The report responds to a charge from President Napolitano to consider options for UC ANR’s structure, governance, and funding.

Comments from GC are due today, as Academic Council will discuss the Divisions’ comments tomorrow. Chair Westerling stated that he would like to consult with Professor Roger Bales in the School of Engineering, who will have valuable insight into ANR. It was also mentioned that Professor Josh Viers was just appointed to a systemwide task force on ANR and will be providing comments via that channel. UC Merced currently has three ANR positions. GC member Ghezzehei stated that he would like additional time to review the ANR report.

**Action:** GC Chair Westerling will consult with Professor Bales, and member Ghezzehei will review the report; both will email any comments to GC for transmittal to the Senate Chair by close of business today.

#### VIII. Policy Issues Items

Members were asked to review the draft graduate funding memo. The memo responds to the action item stemming from Graduate Council’s discussion of the graduate funding models at its November 8 meeting.

Per the action item from the November 8 GC meeting, the ad hoc committee drafted a memo for GC’s review which addresses resource issues that affect graduate student support on campus which includes USAP funds. The draft memo argues that the mechanism by which funding is delivered is less important than the amount of funding available. More funds mean more flexibility. The ad hoc committee’s memo also discussed other sources of funding like grants, and pointed out that if the campus want more grant funding for graduate student research support, we need more GSRs and reduce the number of TAships. GC Chair Westerling stated that the campus has a disproportionate number of junior faculty, and instead of senior faculty focusing on preparing grants, they are doing more service work. Staff support for developing and/or administering grants is also uneven. We need to discuss potential fixes even if faculty numbers stabilize by

2021 or 2022. Questions that the campus should be asking: Can we offload staffing? What items really need faculty input? Can we offload certain duties onto the VPDGE? GC Chair Westerling asserted that

development efforts on campus also needs to be bolstered. VPDGE Zatz mentioned that graduate student support has not been prioritized in the past. GC Chair Westering agreed and stated that funding for graduate student fellowships needs to increase. He added that the campus previously hired a consultant firm and offered training for faculty; GC Chair Westering attended a training and stated that the firm was not well-versed in the UC's research mission or graduate student needs, nor the distinction between graduate and undergraduate student needs. The ad hoc committee suggested in the memo that the campus develop a compelling and inspiring initiative that it publicizes with the goal of raising visibility of graduate student research. The framework is achieving R1 status: the campus's research support and support for graduate students has to be improved in order for UC Merced to attain R1.

The memo also provides excellent talking points for the VPDGE to use in her discussions with campus entities about graduate student research and reaching R1 status. VPDGE Zatz added that the UC President is an advocate for graduate student funding.

GC members were in agreement with the language in the draft memo. A motion was made to endorse the memo, the motion was seconded, and was endorsed.

**Action:** GC's memo will be transmitted to Divisional Council.

**IX. Consultation with VPDGE**

VPDGE Zatz had no additional updates beyond what she has already mentioned in today's meeting.