GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)
Minutes of Meeting
Thursday, December 6, 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, and Christina Torres-Rouff. Andy LiWang participated via Zoom, as well as Associate Dean Chris Kello who attended as a guest.

I. **Executive Session**

 Members did not have an executive session at the December 6 meeting.

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

 Chair Westerling gave an update from the December 5 CCGA meeting. The major topics of discussion were:
- Graduate student enrollment system wide was increased by 600 students this year.
- Federal government fears of industrial espionage, and how proposed solutions could potentially affect graduate students. There are field-specific issues related to industrial espionage that may not be identified by campus administration which is a concern to faculty. There are also concerns about corruption with regard to large grants, e.g. individuals obtaining NSF funding for projects that are also funded by another country and the PIs subsequently set up an overseas "shadow lab".
- Status of the UC-Elsevier negotiations. There are concerns over disruption of faculty access to articles if negotiations fail. There is opposition to the fact that faculty have to pay publication fees from their grants for certain journals. This may harm the trajectory of junior faculty, graduate students, and post docs.
- Budgetary issues. Funding available for faculty raises will be used to increase on-scale salary rather than creating a pool of money to rectify inequities. The gap in pay with the UC and its comparator institutions has shrunk because the latter's pay is growing at a slower pace.
- VPDGE Zatz discussed a proposal for including quality of graduate student mentorship as a factor in faculty personnel reviews.
- Discussion on whether to keep the GRE and SAT as requirements for admission.
- Discussion about changing high school requirements for area d (science) for admission to the UC.

 Chair Westerling then debriefed GC members on his meeting with CIO Ann Kovalchick regarding Curriculog. After that meeting, the Senate Director proposed the empaneling of an ad hoc committee comprised of the Registrar, IT representatives, and representatives from UGC and GC to review the first year of Curriculog implementation.

III. **Consent Calendar**
 A. The agenda (12/6)
 B. Three Extension items approved by the GC Subcommittee on 12/3:
- EDU X313: Technology Supported Project Based Learning
- EDU X400: Research Methods in Education
- EDU Courses Renumbering Request: Made at the request of the Registrar, Extension has revised the numbering of four courses GC previously approved. This is an administrative change only; nothing about the content of the courses has been revised.

 Action: The consent calendar was approved as presented.

IV.   Revisions to Fellowship Application and Review Process – *Associate Graduate Dean Chris Kello*

Associate Dean Kello gave an update on the graduate fellowship review process for continuing students. The Graduate Division has implemented the Slate system for graduate admissions and is now using it for the review of continuing fellowships. This year, our current students uploaded their fellowship applications through the Slate system. Slate was implemented one year earlier than expected, due to the previous system having major challenges. The Graduate Division wants to consult with GC on updates to Slate for next year.

Associate Dean Kello reported that this year, students submitted one application for multiple fellowships. This change is positive, because based on past experiences, students were frustrated with having to repeat the same application process for multiple fellowships. In previous years, there have been differences between fellowship requirements, e.g. page limits, so this year, all applicants have the same page limit for each document. This will make the review process easier, as reviewers will only evaluate each applicant once; based on that evaluation, reviewers will make a decision on how to allocate the fellowships.

Associate Dean Kello stated that the diversity statement is required for two fellowship applications and is optional for the others. He asked for GC's input on whether this practice should remain. A GC member suggested either requiring diversity statements for all fellowship applications or remove the language that the statements are optional. Having clarity on this topic would save graduate students' time and avoid ambiguity. GC members agreed that if diversity statements are not required, they should not be requested in the applications. If we make them optional, then in the review process, we need to separate the statements out of the fellowship applications that do not require them. Associate Dean Kello stated that he can make the diversity statement requirement visible only for the two fellowship applications that require it and hide the requirement for the other fellowships.

A GC member mentioned that his students are often confused when answering the application question about finances as they are unsure what type of information they need to provide. Associate Dean Kello agreed with the concern, and pointed out that the financial question was included in the fellowship applications back when UC Merced was first established and utilized models from other UC campuses. Associate Dean Kello stated that the Graduate Division is open to making changes to the financial question and the diversity statement requirement as GC advises. He also offered to gather information on what exactly is required with regard to the finance question and report back to GC so that GC can advise him accordingly.

A motion was made to 1) recommend to the Graduate Division that the diversity statement requirement only be made visible in the system to students applying to the two fellowships that require the diversity statement and 2) GC reviewers agree not to read diversity statements for fellowship applications that do not require them (to ensure a fair review). The motion was seconded and endorsed.

V.   Campus Review Items

A.   Proposed Policy for the Establishment of New Schools/Colleges - *Vice Chair Hratchian*

Vice Chair Hratchian shared his input on the section of the proposed policy that includes a list of individuals who should be consulted in the pre-proposal stage and the review stage. He suggested that the VCORED and the University Librarian should be included in the pre-proposal stage, as both individuals would have significant input on the resource implications of establishing a new school or college. He also inquired whether the VPDUE and VPDGE should be included in the pre-proposal stage and if the University Librarian should be part of the administrative review. He also suggested minor editorial changes to make the format consistent throughout the document. He had a concern about the requirement for a school-wide vote to assess faculty's support for a given proposal and inquired if that is necessary. Finally, GC vice chair Hratchian suggested that in section VII, the proposal should identify an administrative point of contact, or administrative office, to support the development of the proposal.

GC members were in agreement with the above points.

GC members agreed that the committee's memo to the Senate Chair should include the following points:

- To the bulleted list in section II.C, add the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget as individuals to be consulted in the development of the proposal.

- To the bulleted list in section III.B, add the University Librarian as a recipient of the pre-proposal for administrative review. GC recognizes that a letter from the University Librarian is a required component of the pre-proposal, but notes that the final pre-proposal could potentially differ from that originally discussed with the library.

- Revise the bullets in section III.B to lower case Roman numerals to be consistent with the larger document.

- In section VII, identify an administrative point of contact, or administrative office, to support the development of the proposal.

- Differing points of view on the requirement for school-wide faculty votes will be reflected in the memo. GC members in favor of the all-faculty vote believed that such a vote enables all faculty to be consulted on the formation of a new school, noting that school executive committees may not represent the range of perspectives a full vote would bring to the discussion. GC members questioning the proposed school-wide faculty vote questioned whether it is reasonable to expect all faculty members to be fully informed about a proposal prior to voting, and how that would potentially affect the meaningfulness of their vote.

Action: GC analyst will circulate a draft memo to the committee members for one more review. The final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

B. **Campus Space Management Principles** – *Member Andy LiWang*
Member LiWang summarized the document for GC members. He raised a few points for discussion:

Section 1.3: The list should be numbered, not in bullet points. Bullet points give the impression that each item has equal priority. Numbers would make it clear that the first on the list is the top priority. However, GC members disagreed on whether the first bullet, "facilitate faculty and student research", should be the top priority or whether the final bullet "enable significant interpersonal interactions among faculty, students and/or staff" was most important.

Section 2.7 and 4.2 appear to be the same with regard to space being reassigned or reallocated. In addition, this section should include the process for an appeal of a space decision.

The document needs to be revised to take into account the campus's shift to departments and the role that department chairs will have for space planning and management.

GC members agreed with the above points, but additional work is needed in order to finalize the memo to the Senate Chair.

Action: GC analyst will circulate a draft memo to the committee members for additional review. The final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

VI. **Systemwide Review Item**

A. **[Presidential Task Force Recommendations on Universitywide Policing](#)** – *Member Rose Scott*

GC member Scott briefly summarized the task force's recommendations and stated that they were straight

forward and reasonable. The recommendations pertained to the larger issue of transparency, including independent oversight of university policing and a systemwide review of the use of force and further training. She recommended that GC endorse the task force's recommendations.

A motion was made to endorse the task force's recommendations, the motion was seconded, and endorsed.

Action: GC's endorsement memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

VII.   **Public Health: Request to Change Degree Name –** *Member Teamrat Ghezzehei*
GC member Ghezzehei confirmed that the requested name change is a simple one. GC members agreed.

A motion was made to approve the name change, the motion was seconded, and endorsed.

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

VIII.   **Identify Replacement CRF Subcommittee Member –** *Chair Westerling*

A current GC member who is on the CRF subcommittee will be on sabbatical in spring 2019. A new committee member is scheduled to join the committee in January. GC members suggested that the new committee member be asked, at the meeting in January 2019, whether he would like to fill the vacated spot on the CRF subcommittee.

Action: GC members approved this plan. The new member will be invited to join the CRF subcommittee at the meeting in January 2019.

IX.   **New Business**
There was no new business.