

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**Minutes of Meeting****Thursday, November 8, 2018**

Pursuant to the call, Graduate Council met at 9:00 A.M. in Room 317 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. Teamrat Ghezzehei, Andy LiWang, and Christina Torres-Rouff participated via Zoom.

I. Executive Session

Members did not have an executive session on November 8, 2018.

II. Chair's Report – Chair Westerling**A. CCGA (11/7)**

The major topics of discussion were the following:

- Self-supporting programs, specifically, whether they should exist and under what circumstances.
- Online programs.
- VPDGE Zatz reported that graduate deans are advocating for more on-campus review of graduate proposals and less review at the CCGA level in order to make the review process more efficient. Achieving timely campus-level review of proposals can be challenging. The GC chair asserted that CCGA level review is helpful as CCGA members view proposals through a different lens. Therefore, CCGA input on graduate proposals is typically quite enlightening.
- Academic freedom for librarians. T
- The UC President has empaneled a task force to look into SATs and ACTs, and may look into the GREs. GC may want to consider in the future whether GREs should be kept as an admissions requirement for graduate students. Other campuses now vary as to whether they require GRE scores for admission.
- Status of the UC-Elsevier negotiations and the potential for losing access to new journals.
- The MCS MS and PhD program was approved by CCGA.
- UCEP representative – and UC Merced faculty member – Anne Zanzucchi discussed TA and GSI training.
- UBEN 250 form “Declaration of Domestic Partnership for Purposes of UC Retirement Plan Benefits” must be completed and signed to determine domestic partners’ eligibility for survivor and death benefits.

B. Divisional Council (11/6)

General Education (GE) representatives updated Divisional Council to announce that GE does not yet have a governance structure in place and that the Executive Committee has not yet been empaneled. They are working to redress this and will work with UGC. The GC chair also shared that the draft, proposed procedures for establishing new Schools and Colleges will soon be circulated for Senate review. GC member and LASC chair DePrano attended this Divisional Council meeting to update members on the status of the UC-Elsevier negotiations.

III. PROC Liaison's Report – Maria DePrano**A. PROC Meeting (10/31)**

GC member DePrano reported that the majority of the meeting focused on assessment for administrative offices.

IV. Consent Calendar

- A. The agenda (10/18)
- B. CRFs approved by the GC Subcommittee on 11/5:
 - [PH 211](#): Introduction to Statistical Methods in Public Health
 - [PH 212](#): Advanced Statistical Methods in Public Health

Action: The consent calendar was approved as presented.

The GC chair announced that committee member Rose Scott has agreed to chair the GC CRF subcommittee.

The GC chair granted, per VPDGE Zatz's request, a deadline for continuing student fellowship extended to Monday, November 26. GC members then began a discussion about whether faculty are notified about the fellowship deadlines, and the importance of faculty awareness to support student applications. VPDGE Zatz will speak with University Communications about the various electronic communications and how best to ensure faculty are involved. VPDGE Zatz will report back to GC on this matter.

V. Graduate Funding Models – VPDGE Zatz

- A. Overview of two potential funding models ([see attachment](#))
- B. Discuss both models (pros and cons) -noting other campuses tend to provide a higher per student funding level and generally to cover NRST, at least in first year
- C. Discuss revisions we might want to make to them
 - a. NRST coverage
 - b. Incentivize/reinforce grant GSRs and fellowships
 - c. Incentivize timely degree completion
 - d. Incentivize modest increase in paying master's degree students
 - e. Include graduate group dissertation fellowships in models or keep separate?
- D. Eugene Cote Roble – discuss potentially altering support from years 1 and 2 to years 1 and 4
- E. Next steps – NRST

VPDGE Zatz reported that the amount of funding per student has declined despite enrollment growth. Also, NRST funding has been considered as potential revenue rather than honoring the agreement that the funding is exclusive to the NRST program itself. VPDGE Zatz stated that the budget office and the EVC/Provost are now aware of the issues that arise when viewing NRST as revenue. Leadership has requested that UC Merced should re-examine its graduate funding models especially given the campus's increasing graduate student enrollment. Following a review of UC campus models, VPDGE Zatz determined that the models of UC Riverside and UC Irvine are the most appropriate. (Details on both models were made available to GC members prior to this meeting.) Riverside's model is cohort-based, with money allotted to a set of newly-enrolled cohort of students for their entire time to degree. Those funds are solely earmarked for that cohort, and the graduate group decides how to use the money (fellowships, summer funding, etc.) over the time the students are enrolled. The Irvine model involves a funding formula that takes into consideration the number of degrees conferred and other attributes of program enrollment. UC Merced's multiplier equivalent of Irvine is almost \$2,500. Both models are quite transparent. Regardless of which model UC Merced follows, NRST needs to be separated out.

The GSA representative on GC noted that Riverside's cohort model would be positive for students, as it places less emphasis on enrollment growth in order to focus on individual students. The Irvine model is weighted such that the campus would be incentivizing enrollment growth with less focus on individual students. Some GC members were concerned about the cohort-based Riverside model because a focus on degree completion rates may ensure the wrong incentive.

The GC chair stated that Merced's main concern should be reaching R1 status and having robust academic and research programs. To achieve R1 status, the campus needs to focus on the *amount* of money, not how the small pot of money is distributed. There are a few areas of concern, such as service loads on faculty who have students on grants and how the service burden hinders faculty's ability to work on multi- investigator grants. Another issue is that the campus has interdisciplinary programs that are not based on disciplinary programs, and they have sub cohorts of students that require training for disciplinary-based job markets. These students have to take "boutique" courses that are essentially service for the faculty teaching them due to low enrollment of those courses. The GC chair asserted that GC should draft a global, constructive memo that looks at all these issues as a package: service load, the insufficient grantsmanship, the ratio of junior to senior faculty, and the impact of student cohort sizes in disciplines on the quality of the graduate student experience. The campus needs to allocate more money to graduate education. The main issues that should be captured in the memo are reaching R1 status, funding for graduate students needs to be increased, NSRT needs to be separated out, and new groups should be bolstered.

A GC member expressed concern over the Riverside model that incentivizes time to degree completion. She prefers Irvine's model because it incentivizes improvements in program quality over time.

VPDGE Zatz stated that currently, the campus incentivizes putting students on grants by paying 25% of their tuition. After speaking with graduate group chairs, she is proposing that if faculty charge full tuition to their grants, they will receive \$1,000-\$2,000 back in research funds. A GC member responded that this model would be beneficial to faculty members who have small grants.

Action: GC Policy subcommittee and VPDGE Zatz will draft a memo on GC's comments about the UC Riverside and UC Irvine models; the memo will also include GC's suggestions for prioritization: achieving R1 status is critical, funding for graduate students needs to be increased, NSRT needs to be separated out, and new groups should be bolstered.

VI. Systemwide Review Item

[Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 \(Use of Vehicles and Driver Selection Policy\)](#) – *Teamrat Ghezzehei*

Members are asked to discuss proposed revisions to BFB-BUS-46 policy, which aim to increase accountability for vehicular usage, to improve safety, reduce vehicular accidents, and create cost savings to the University. Key revisions to the policy include:

- The inclusion of the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Negligent Operator Treatment
- System (NOTS) as a standard for eligibility to drive on behalf of the University.
- Implementation will apply to all drivers on University business – not solely employees.
- Establishment of Vehicle Collision Review Committees to review collisions, determine preventability, and promote driver safety awareness.
- Establishment of guidelines for drivers involved in preventable collisions including training suspension, and potential revocation of driving privileges.

The policy applies to the use of any UC vehicle (owned or leased) and any personal vehicles used in the course of University business.

The GC lead reviewer submitted his written comments prior to this meeting, which the GC chair summarized for the committee in his absence.

The GC lead review suggested that the policy may provide superficial peace of mind when sending students to conduct field work, but it only collects information from CA drivers, not out of state or international, which may lead to disproportionate restrictions to long-term California residents. Another issue is the unfair application of the accrual of points in terms of age and residence of the driver.

Other questions to consider are:

- 1) can out of state records be retrieved to make this fair to everyone involved;
- 2) how far back does the NOTS record go, i.e. will individuals over a certain age be punished for a longer driving record?
- 3) why does the University need its own review committee? Can this information be obtained from insurance or police?
- 4) is there a chance that the findings of the review team can be used by the University to transfer liability to drivers?

The answers to these questions may affect students' willingness to drive.

A GC member noted that undergraduate and graduate students drive for research study. She as a PI does not want to be required to evaluate all student driver licenses as part of the hiring process. This is potentially discriminatory. If an individual is legally able to drive, they should be able to drive for the UC.

The lead reviewer concluded that overall, the policy is good in principle but without having detailed knowledge of how it will be implemented, he recommends GC not endorse at this time.

Action: GC will inform the Senate Chair that the committee has several questions about the policy and requires additional information.

VII. Campus Review Item

[Proposed Principles to Guide the Conduct of Executive Session](#) – *Chair Westerling*

Members are asked to discuss the proposed [Principles to Guide the Conduct of Executive Session](#). The principles and associated practices are intended to establish for committee members, consultants, guests, and the broader campus community, a set of expectations for how executive sessions are conducted in the Senate, and to promote consistency in the implementation of executive sessions across Senate committees. Should the principles be endorsed by the Senate, they will be posted to the Senate website in partnership with the [Guide to Committee Membership](#), which includes an overview of the purpose of executive session.

GC members noted that the proposed principles do not constrain the practice of executive session.

Action: GC's endorsement of the proposed principles will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

VIII. Online Non-Degree Programs – *Chair Westerling*

University Extension is planning to develop a distance education version of its [Teacher Preparation Program](#) approved by Graduate Council and [the Senate](#) in spring 2018. The GC chair asked GC members to discuss whether developing an online/distance education version of an existing program should be considered a new program, and thus require a proposal. The policies governing the preparation of a new program proposal and separately its approval are available on the Senate website under [University Extension Non-Degree Programs](#).

It was pointed out that WSCUC considers online programs distinctive from on-campus programs. Since the Senate has already reviewed and approved the on-campus version of the proposed program, the GC chair suggested that the committee suggest to University Extension that they create an appropriate document for WSCUC approval, containing answers to questions that WSCUC would normally require the program to complete, including resources. Also, GC should suggest to the program that in their document, they should point out specifically which elements of the online version are distinguishable from the other version of the program.

Action: GC's aforementioned recommendations will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.