

**GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**Thursday, January 31, 2019**

Pursuant to call, Graduate Council met at 2:00 PM in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair LeRoy Westerling presiding.

Present: LeRoy Westerling, Hrant Hrachian, Maria DePrano, Teamrat Ghezzehei, David Ardell, Christina Torres-Rouff, Rose Scott and Chih-Wen Ni. Andy LiWang participated via Zoom. The Registrar, Erin Webb, was present as a consultant. Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Marjorie Zatz was not present, and Associate Dean Chris Kello attended on her behalf.

---

**I. Consultation with EVC/Provost Gregg Camfield**

EVC/Provost Camfield addressed GC's Fall 2018 memo concerning graduate student education and reaching R1 status. He restated UC Merced's goal to have one thousand graduate students on campus, as that will be another indicator of the degree to which the campus is a highly active research university. However, he advocates for aiming for more than one thousand graduate students.

EVC/Provost Camfield shared that he is now delving into budgetary issues. Most UC campuses use budget formulas that incentivize faculty output, e.g. the number of graduate students that faculty advise counts towards faculty teaching load. At UC Riverside and other campuses, the number of graduate students that faculty members have on grants also counts as teaching. By having these practices in place, campuses are institutionally acknowledging the amount of time that goes into acquiring graduate student funding support as a part of faculty teaching load. Decisions on what types of incentives should be created are best made at the local level, i.e. department faculty in concert with deans. Schools are ultimately responsible for meeting the goals. The EVC/Provost also stated the importance of adjusting expectations to the disciplines; for example, indirect cost return will not support the dean of SSHA as much as the deans of SNS and SOE, and summer school likely supports the dean of SSHA to a greater extent than the deans of SNS and SOE. The current formulation is a balance between PhD production and research activity measured in dollars. Focusing on those faculty who obtain grants leaves out the other faculty who are quite active producing PhDs. It would be an error to have a "one-size-fits-all" approach.

Associate Dean Kello asked whether any current formulation includes Master's students. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that for Carnegie classification criteria, they are not included. But, the campus should allow flexibility so that some programs can elect to fund more PhD students if they take more Master's students while other programs can choose not to follow this path. EVC/Provost Camfield asserted that the administration's obligation is to lay out options and provide support to faculty for the options.

A major concern that EVC/Provost Camfield hears at the Deans Council level is the need for support for faculty to pursue large, Center grants. Perhaps a technical writer is needed to help faculty create the proposals that take years to develop and revise. He agrees with GC's memo and is now determining where to get the resources to support faculty.

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that he consults with CAPRA often about how the Senate has a right to participate and advise (per Regental standing orders) on campus budget. We have not utilized CAPRA that way in the past; rather, CAPRA's role is traditionally to look narrowly at faculty FTE and advise the EVC/Provost accordingly. EVC/Provost Camfield wants to bring CAPRA into the full discussion on campus budget every year. He wants to institute a fully integrated planning process, with a clear time for a budget call. He is trying to craft a picture of interrelationships relevant to the budget so that when a budget call is issued, leadership has all the information it needs to make trade offs and hard decisions without too many unanticipated consequences. EVC/Provost Camfield reiterated that he wants the whole integrated process to be transparent.

A GC member pointed out that these plans require knowledgeable leadership at the local levels and asked what the EVC/Provost is doing to ensure this is occurring. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that it will be an iterative, long-term process to develop the deep, campus institutional knowledge that can be shared. Such knowledge will exist at the top and bottom levels of the university. He is currently working carefully on the transition to departments. The EVC/Provost added that he is working at the campus level to determine the amount of staff FTE lines that faculty need, but since the campus cannot afford all of the requests, he has to prioritize. He stated that the top priority is hiring staff support for faculty in the departments. Hiring of departmental support staff is already underway. He is also trying to determine what resources department chairs need to carry out their duties under APM 245. The APM states that department chairs manage budgets; however, at this time, we do not even have the campus-wide budget refined enough to devolve to the department chairs, so that is a work in progress. Last year, the EVC/Provost conducted workshops for department chairs, and he continues to consult with chairs on the types of support they need going forward. The campus is utilizing a lot of resources to ensure that the transition of authority to department chairs is efficient. The EVC/Provost stated again that CAPRA will be an important stakeholder in the campus budget process.

EVC/Provost Camfield reminded GC members of the existence of the three campus work groups from last year: Academic Planning Work Group (APWG), Budget Work Group (BWG), and School Reorganization Work Group. The work of all three groups was one step in the process of moving towards departmentalization. With regard to enrollment management, he is proposing, in consultation with the Senate, the empaneling of a small, strategic committee for enrollment management that will be charged with setting targets for enrollment, admissions, and retention. As a research university, we also need to remain focused on graduate and undergraduate research, and graduate student support. With all of these components in mind, we as a campus will be in a better shape to make long-term planning decisions.

EVC/Provost Camfield stated that he wants the campus to have 5-year horizons for budget planning with CAPRA as an important stakeholder from the Senate. A robust planning regimen and a longer planning horizon will help the campus reach its goals.

The GC chair raised a suggestion that the committee included in its memo: hiring a mix of tenured and untenured faculty in the next hiring cycle. Hiring additional tenured faculty would address multiple needs, including more time for mentoring junior faculty and graduate students, and time for grant writing. Some of our tenured faculty arrived at UC Merced as assistant professors and were promoted through the ranks here; they have no experience working at other UC campuses and therefore no experience with institutionalized, administrative procedures. That may affect how well departments will run if there is no prior knowledge or experience of procedures.

A GC member stated that some established institutions have well-known faculty who attract graduate students and therefore increase graduate student enrollment. EVC/Provost Camfield replied that well-known, senior, bench scientists require a great deal of start up money and laboratory space; UC Merced's budget cannot afford many of this type of faculty. If the campus wants to hire this type of faculty, then we would have to agree to reduce hiring other types of faculty in that particular year. This would then become a larger, campus decision rather than a departmental one. The EVC/Provost stated that after this academic year, he does not want CAPRA or himself to decide on allocating individual faculty FTE lines, but instead will allocate the equivalent in dollars to the Schools and the Schools will work with departments to decide optimally how to allocate that money. The Schools will have to make and live with the decisions; the EVC/Provost cannot make a "one-size-fits-all" decision.

A GC member asked how the committee can help the EVC/Provost going forward. EVC/Provost Camfield responded that GC's memo was very helpful. He wants to deeply involve CAPRA in academic budget planning, and encourages faculty to communicate with each other. The GC chair pointed out that the Senate is composed of the faculty, but they are not elected. In addition to needing communication between the Senate and the administration, we need engagement. The EVC/Provost agreed and stated that academic leadership turns over fairly rapidly. A 5-year planning horizon would build longer, institutional knowledge. He also suggested that the Senate should consider extending the length of committee terms if the Senate believes it would be of value.

He added that he hopes to remove much of the administrative, transactional type work that faculty are currently burdened with which would allow faculty to serve on a committee for a three-year term and do meaningful work.

The GC chair thanked EVC/Provost Camfield for being responsive and attending today's meeting.

## II. **Executive Session**

Members did not have an executive session on January 31, 2019.

## III. **Consultation with Associate Dean Chris Kello**

Associate Dean Kello provided GC with updates on behalf of VPDGE Zatz.

With regard to graduate student admissions, we have 737 applicants. Both he and VPDGE Zatz would like that number to increase. If we receive 800 applications by the end of April, that would slightly exceed the number of applications at that time last year. As of now, we have 95 admits which is moving apace. The new admissions system, Slate, appears to be working well.

An email was recently issued to graduate group chairs and other faculty that the nominations for recruitment fellowships are due February 1.

Graduate Student Visitation Weekend is on February 22-23 and the planning is moving apace. Associate Dean Kello encourages faculty members to attend.

The GC chair asked if we need more targeted graduate student recruitment. Associate Dean Kello suggested we follow a multi-pronged strategy of being widespread in recruitment yet more targeted plus increasing faculty involvement in recruitment. He announced that there is an extra staff member who is working on the recruitment process. The GC chair mentioned that he is giving talks at UC Davis and Fresno State this spring, and the recruiting staff from Management is accompanying him. He encouraged UC Merced faculty members to take recruiting staff with them when they give talks at other campuses, especially if graduate students from those campuses were the ones who invited them to give the talk. Another GC member shared that she attended a robotics event and met recruitment staff from several campuses in different states. Associate Dean Kello replied that the Graduate Division does maintain a recruiting calendar and the recruiting staff travels a great deal. But he does encourage faculty members to contact the Graduate Division with suggestions on additional recruiting efforts. Associate Dean Kello also suggested that when UC Merced faculty give talks at other institutions, they could include a slide in their presentation that contains information on UC Merced as a way to encourage admission.

A GC member noted that the number of IH applicants is down by about half from last year. Another GC member pointed out that that is caused by various factors, i.e. certain faculty not recruiting. Associate Dean Kello also stated that fluctuations are part of the process. GC members briefly discussed that applications for other programs are also down, including a few science programs. A GC member asserted that she would prefer the quality of applicants to increase. Associate Dean Kello stated if the campus can increase SIRs, that would be important. Last year, the SIRs went up 12-13%.

## IV. **Chair's Report – Chair Westerling**

The Chair encouraged committee members to review the email containing EVC/Provost Camfield's request to develop UC research investments framed as SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound). GC members' input is requested by Monday, February 4. The GC chair stated that graduate group chairs were also invited to submit input. Submissions will be compiled into a memo for GC's review on Tuesday, February 5. A final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by Wednesday, February 6.

**V. Budget Work Group Report - *Hrant Hratchian***

Vice Chair Hratchian reported no updates as the BWG has not met since the last GC meeting.

**VI. PROC Report - *Maria DePrano***

GC member DePrano reported that the charges to external review teams for the QSB and Psychology programs have been distributed. Input on revisions to the charges was sought from deans and VPDGE Zatz. The charges differ significantly from the original versions. The site visits for both programs are in March. PROC also discussed changing the role of faculty liaisons in program reviews. Traditionally, the liaisons were asked to attend each session of the site team visits. Due to competing demands of faculty members, this was not realistic. The liaisons are now asked to participate in the following: pre-visit conference call with the external review team, the check-in with the review team at the end of the first day, and a check-in with the review team on the second day when the team begins to draft their report.

**VII. Consent Calendar**

- A. Agenda (1/31)
- B. Petitions: Appointment of Graduate Students as Instructor of Record for Summer 2019
  - 1. Ashley Baker, PSY 120 Health Psychology
  - 2. Gerald Eisman, PSY 152 Culture, Racial and Ethnic Diversity
  - 3. Won Kay Kim, SY 156 Social Psychology
- C. Call for Nominations: 2018-2019 Senate Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award

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

**VIII. Proposed Concentration in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) – *Chair Westerling***

Members were asked to discuss [the proposal](#) for a concentration in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology in the Quantitative and Systems Biology graduate degree program. As per Graduate Council's [procedures for establishing a new concentration](#), comments were solicited from [CAPRA](#), the [Office of Periodic Review, Assessment and Accreditation Support \(OPRAAS\)](#), and [the Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Education](#). The description of a concentration appears in section 2a (p.1) and the process for establishing a concentration, including the elements required in a proposal, in section 3 (p.2) of GC's procedures.

GC members noted that the proposed EEB concentration is interdisciplinary by design and will have a distinct intellectual presence on campus. A motion was made to approve the EEB concentration, the motion was seconded, and endorsed.

**Action:** GC's approval of the EEB concentration will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

**IX. Systemwide Review Item****Proposed Presidential Policy for Open Access for Theses and Dissertations – *Teamrat Ghezzehei***

Members were asked to discuss [the revised proposed Presidential Policy](#) for Open Access for Theses and Dissertations. The [cover letter](#) provides the context for this second, systemwide review of the policy. Graduate Council's and Divisional Council's comments during the first review of the policy are [here](#) and [here](#). Academic Council, Senate divisions, and systemwide committees' responses to the first systemwide review of this policy are available [here](#).

GC members suggested two changes to Section 3, paragraph D of the revised policy: 1) It should be the purview of the author and/or their committee chair, rather than their academic advisor or program administrator, to request an embargo on their dissertations and theses from open access publication after graduation; 2) The embargo of theses and dissertations from open access publication should be lengthened to serve those disciplines where monographs, which often take more time to go to press, are the main form of publication. Specifically, the stated

length of the embargo, two years, should be increased to three to five years' time.

GC members agreed that these two revisions would create a greater sense of control by junior scholars entering the academic job market and navigating the hiring processes and create equity and accessibility intended by the open access policy itself.

A motion was made to recommend the above two proposed revisions, the motion was seconded, and endorsed.

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

**X. [Proposed Diversity Plan for Program Review](#)**

The policy subcommittee has reviewed the diversity plan for program review proposed by the Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E) and developed a set of [recommendations](#) for strengthening the effort. GC members were asked to discuss the policy and the policy subcommittee's recommendations.

GC members agreed with the policy subcommittee's draft memo to the D&E chair. The overarching recommendation was to make the plan more narrative-based for reflection and planning analogous to statements prepared by faculty for merit reviews. Specifically: 1) combining sections I (Unit Self-Assessment) and II (Unit Goals) and into a single section providing the opportunity for future goals to emerge from consideration of past successes and challenges; 2) encouraging a narrative response for the current section III (Strategies to Achieve Diversity Goals).

A motion was made to recommend the above revisions, the motion was seconded, and endorsed.

**Action:** GC's memo with suggested revisions to the proposed diversity plan for program review will be transmitted to the D&E chair.

**XI. New Business**

The GC chair asked for a volunteer to replace Christina Torres-Rouff as GC's representative on the APWG.

**Action:** GC analyst will email the APWG meeting schedule to GC members to seek a volunteer.