

**GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**Thursday, February 28, 2019**

---

**I. Executive Session**

Voting members only. No minutes taken.

**Action:** GC chair to draft a memo to the proposal's authors requesting a teaching plan.

**II. Chair's Report**

Chair Westerling reported on the February 20, 2019 Divisional Council meeting. The major topics of discussion were as follows:

- systemwide effort to encourage multi-year budget planning.
- The Governor's first budget did not include funding for faculty raises. UCOP may still mandate faculty raises, but the individual campuses would have to identify the funding.
- Status of the UC-Elsevier negotiations.
- The Senate Chair discussed linking budget requests to quality metrics, i.e. graduation numbers and post-graduation job placement. UC Merced's student to faculty ratio is not optimal.
- The Teaching Professor working title for L(P)SOEs. One Divisional Council member suggested the campus should re-institute the Research Professor title.
- Request from unit 18 lecturers to be involved on some Senate committees.

Chair Westerling also thanked Graduate Council members for their review of the graduate recruitment fellowship application rankings at the specially-convened February 20 meeting. He announced that VPDGE Zatz and Graduate Division staff will give GC an overview of the process at the next GC meeting followed by an open discussion on ways to conduct the graduate fellowship process going forward.

**III. LASC Report – *Maria DePrano***

The UC-Elsevier negotiations have broken down, and a letter from the UC negotiating team is available on the Senate website. A letter from Elsevier was submitted to editors of Elsevier journals at UCs campuses which referred to Elsevier's negotiations with the California Digital Library. The letter was interpreted as misleading, as it implied that Elsevier was only negotiating with the California Digital Library rather than the UC system as a whole. LASC is now working with University Librarian Haipeng Li on a letter to UC Merced faculty. If UC faculty's access to Elsevier journals is cut off, UC faculty will still have access to all materials dating December 31, 2018 and earlier; the materials from January 1, 2019 onwards will be unavailable. Interim measures to ensure UC faculty access to journal articles are underway, and there are two different services the campus could subscribe to: Rapid ILL and Rapid Reprint.

**IV. PROC Report – *Maria DePrano***

There are two upcoming program review site visits: QSB (March 6-8) and Psychological Sciences (March 13-15). The Psychological Sciences review team requested to meet with more faculty to balance the number of administrators they were scheduled to meet. GC chair Westerling and member DePrano are meeting with both site teams. The PROC analyst and GC analyst are currently trying to identify additional faculty to meet with the site teams.

GC members then discussed GC's role in the program review site visits and how GC can learn about campus graduate programs in a lasting way, given that the committee's membership changes annually. A GC member pointed out that the programs currently under review are being reviewed for the first time, so we are learning as we go along. Another GC member requested clarity on what site team liaisons are supposed to do during a site

team visit. GC member DePrano replied that it can depend on the particular review team; during the pre-visit conference call, site team members may make various requests that the liaisons could assist with.

#### V. Academic Planning Work Group – *Teamrat Ghezzehei*

GC member Ghezzehei reported on the activities of the Academic Planning Work Group (APWG). He reported that three town halls have been held in each of the three Schools to solicit feedback from faculty on planning priorities. Reaching R1 status is a goal shared by many faculty, however, the pace by which the campus should meet that goal and by which criteria, are still being discussed. A set of criteria will be circulated to the campus by the APWG. A common point of feedback from faculty is breadth of programs, and whether the campus is delivering the undergraduate programs we currently have. There was not much discussion on graduate programs, although there was one suggestion that we review the CCGA proposals of current graduate programs to examine whether they are delivering what they promised with current resources. Member Ghezzehei suggested that GC discuss this point. He also suggested that PROC reviews of programs may be helpful to examine, to assess whether programs are delivering what they should be. VPDGE Zatz mentioned that she, too, is involved in plans in drafting criteria and indices of success that align with Carnegie metrics. To highlight the campus's research strengths in a strategic way, VPDGE Zatz stated that she would like to include, if faculty agree, the training grants that tie in to infectious disease research, tobacco and alcohol research, and data science work that is already being done on campus, as those grants count towards attaining R1 status.

#### VI. Consent Calendar

- A. 2/28 Meeting Agenda
- B. Approval of Course Request Forms (CRFs): [Math 221](#), [Math 222](#), [BioE 215](#), [BioE 231](#), [BioE 232](#), [BioE 291](#), [BioE 293](#), [QSB 248/ES 248](#), [ES 264](#), [QSB 278](#), [Math 231](#), [Math 232](#); [MIST 264](#); [MIST 295](#); [PS 293](#)
- C. Psychological Science [Policies and Procedures](#)
- D. Applied Math [Policies & Procedures](#)
- E. Physics [Policies & Procedures](#)
- F. Petitions for Graduate Students to Teach Undergraduate Courses
  - Neama Alamri - [CRE 102](#)
  - Brandon Bratzloff - [Cog 105](#)
  - Melissa Baker - [PS 123](#)
  - Michelle Yeung – [Soc 182](#)
  - Jamin Shih – [CRES 101](#)

**Action:** The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

#### VII. Campus Review Items

##### A. [Proposed Space Planning Documents – Andy LiWang](#)

Lead reviewer LiWang summarized for the committee the two draft campus space planning documents: the *Office of Space Planning's Role in the Faculty Hiring Process* and *Space Allocation and Assignment: Definitions, Process and Standards*.

GC members took issue with the document *Office of Space Planning's Role in the Faculty Hiring Process* and the proposal that the Office of Space Planning would have the authority to contact faculty candidates and the search committees. Such communication should remain the purview of the search chair and dean. The deans of each school are in charge of resource allocation for new hires, and are best suited, in consultation with department chairs, to weigh competing objectives. Delegating this role to the Office of Space Planning is problematic because they have no accountability for consequences of these decisions on the strategic objectives of the Schools. GC members agreed that the faculty hiring process would be better served by having the Office of Space Planning consult after the hiring process is complete at the program level.

A GC member also pointed out that in the process of requesting space during the hiring process, junior

scholars and those candidates who are hesitant to ask for what they need might be disadvantaged, particularly if UC Merced's spatial constraints are shared.

Another GC member pointed out that the recommendations in the proposal with regard to involvement in the faculty hiring process conflicts with the APM and the authority of departments.

A motion was made to oppose the recommendations presented in the two space planning documents, the motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

**Action:** GC analyst to circulate a draft memo to GC members for review and approval via email. A final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

#### **VIII. Consultation with VPDGE Marjorie Zatz**

VPDGE Zatz announced that there are 34 SIRs as of today. She also reported that 102 students participated in graduate visitation weekend. She discussed the possibility of dividing visitation into two separate weekends, to make planning and participating easier. She also met with the Budget Office about TA budgets, and that office is working on locating funding. She then shared with GC that the Graduate Division was approved for three new staff positions: academic counselor, data analyst, and postdoc coordinator. VPDGE Zatz also stated that the graduate policies and procedures handbook in the Graduate Division will have proposed revisions this semester. She also requested that GC review graduate programs' policies and procedures to determine if they contain program requirements for academic advisors. The GC chair also requested that the GC analyst review graduate programs' policies and procedures to ensure they include other components, i.e. what is the minimum passing grade. VPDGE Zatz stated that she will coordinate with the GC analyst to begin the process of revising the handbook.

**Action:** GC analyst will work with the GC chair and VPDGE Zatz to review graduate program policies and procedures and to assist in the coordination of revisions to the graduate handbook.