

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**Minutes of the Meeting****Thursday, April 18, 2019**

Pursuant to the call, Graduate Council met at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 18, 2019, in Room 397 of the Kolligian Library, Chair LeRoy Westerling presiding.

I. Chair's Report – *Chair Westerling***A. Divisional Council Meeting (4/15)**

Chair Westerling reported no items.

B. Meeting of the Division (4/15)

Chair Westerling debriefed GC members on the April 15 Meeting of the Division:

- The annual Senate awards were announced.
- GC's proposed revisions to Part IV. Section II of the Merced Division Regulations (Master's Degree Requirements) were approved.
- Chancellor Leland's report included the following announcements/information:
 - update on 2020 progress and she thanked faculty for their collaboration and involvement.
 - UCSF-Fresno will establish a medical clinic at UC Merced for faculty and staff.
 - Faculty and administrators in the UC system are advocating for a new Dream Act which would apply to many of UC Merced's current students. The Chancellor asked for faculty to voice their support when the appropriate bill moves through Congress.
 - The Governor's proposed budget included more UC funds than previous budgets did, but no funding for new enrollment growth or faculty raises. Changes to the budget are pending the May Revise.
 - Chancellor Leland has been advocating for summer Cal Grants for students. Many of UC Merced's students depend on a financial aid package that includes Pell grants and Blue and Gold grants; if the students cannot obtain Cal Grant aid in the summer, they cannot take summer programming such as study abroad, undergraduate research, or summer bridge programs.
- EVC/Provost Camfield announced the creation of a new administrative position: Associate Vice Provost for Academic Planning.

II. Budget Work Group Report – *Vice Chair Hratchian*

Member Hratchian was absent from today's meeting. No report provided.

III. PROC Report – *Maria DePrano*

Member DePrano reported that the QSB external review team's report has been received. The review team found much to praise about QSB but recommended that the program develop a unified vision. Other recommendations from the review team included: faculty should define and embrace the QSB brand to create unity for graduate student recruitment; the campus should recruit faculty who are dedicated to QSB's interdisciplinary training; graduate students need more clarity, cohesion, and consistency; and recommendations about curriculum.

A GC member noted that one challenge is the lack of alignment of particular graduate programs with departments. The member was hopeful that the review team's report could help inform future structure.

Member DePrano then asked GC members if they had any comments she could report back to PROC. GC chair

Westerling raised a concern about the scheduling of site visits this year, and the lack of continuity that occurred due to different GC members attending different sessions of the various review teams' site visits. The lack of clarity of expectations for GC members' involvement was also an issue.

Action: Member DePrano will inform PROC that GC members request to be included in the development of future site visit agendas. Next year, GC will discuss how best to be involved in the site visits and clarify the overall process.

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Meeting agenda

B. [Petition](#): Byran Furhmann, instructor of record, EnvE 184, fall 2019.

Action: The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

V. Campus Review Items

A. [Proposed Salary Recovery Policy](#) – *Chair Westerling*

GC members were asked to discuss the draft [Salary Recovery Policy](#) developed by the Budget Working Group. The objective of the policy is to provide structure to both faculty and central administration around the process for enabling faculty to buy out an instructional course, or engage in protected research time, so that more time can be spent on conducting research activities.

Chair Westerling summarized the policy for GC members. The policy outlines two forms of salary recovery: course buyouts and protected research time. GC members agreed that the policy would benefit from some additional clarification regarding the purpose of the policy with respect to what it seeks to incentivize. Members also requested that the specific intentions of this policy, as well as the design of the policy in achieving these ends, be clarified, e.g. making transparent the relationship between faculty rank and policy goals. As currently formulated, it could be prohibitively expensive for senior faculty—particularly those not funded by for-profit industries—to purchase protected research time, raising the question as to whether a goal of the policy is to dis-incentivize use of the policy by senior faculty funded by public and non-profit entities, and to incentivize its use by junior faculty and faculty funded by industry.

GC also believes that clarification and specification will help the campus evaluate the efficacy of the policy in supporting desired ends, including as relate to reaching R1 status.

GC members also noted that the ability and incentive to purchase protected research time could vary with grant type (federal, state, non-governmental non-profits, and industry), and recommends that the policy be revised to reflect this point. For a senior faculty member, protected research time could perhaps be affordable and allowed on an industry grant but not on a state or federal grant.

Action: GC will transmit a memo with the above recommendations to the Senate Chair.

B. [Draft Policy on the Establishment, Disestablishment, and Review of ORUs](#) – *David Ardell*

GC members were asked to discuss the [draft policy](#) for the establishment, disestablishment, and review of Organized Research Units (ORUs) developed by the Committee on Research.

A GC member had a question about ORUs in relation to non-academic vs. academic

programs. It was pointed out that ORUs are constituted independently of departments and programs. A GC member clarified that there is a Presidential, systemwide policy that stipulates that an ORU may not offer formal courses for credit for students of the University or the public unless specifically empowered to do so by the President after consultation with the Academic Senate and Chancellors.

Being that there were no additional comments or concerns, a motion was made to endorse the policy, the motion was seconded, and unanimously passed.

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

C. [Academic Planning Work Group Proposal](#) – **Chair Westerling**

GC members were asked to discuss the [Academic Planning Work Group's proposal](#) outlining campus goals, criteria to support school-level planning and evaluate progress toward campus goals, and a process to support multi-year resource allocation.

Chair Westerling stated that the goals and associated criteria included in the report reflected the outcomes of the faculty town hall meetings held earlier this year. GC members generally supported the plan to shift individual FTE allocation decisions to the Schools. The proposal indicates that CAPRA will have a more enhanced role in academic planning in the future; the future process will differ from the current one in that, in consultation with the EVC/Provost, CAPRA would recommend allocation of large pots of money, but decisions on individual FTE allocation would be left to the Schools. GC members advocated for CAPRA membership to be expanded so that it is more representative and inclusive of minority viewpoints.

Some GC members also expressed the general concern that documentation from the campus's previous rounds of academic planning (both SAFI and earlier efforts) is not taken into account in the current proposal. That documentation was carefully drafted and approved by faculty, and approved by former members of academic leadership, so it is frustrating to some GC members to see that none of it was included in the Academic Planning Work Group proposal. GC recommends that the current proposal needs to more clearly connect intellectually with the campus's preceding priorities, and that, to address the historical lack of inclusivity, a process needs to be established to update previous priorities so that they are inclusive of minority voices.

Finally, GC members requested that the term "UC quality" be defined.

Action: GC's memo containing the above recommendations will be circulated to GC members for additional comment.

VI. **Systemwide Review Items**

A. [UC Sacramento Center Review Process](#) – **Andy LiWang**

GC members were asked to discuss [the report](#) summarizing the UC system's assessment of the UC Center Sacramento. As per the [associated cover letter](#), the assessment is part of President Napolitano's efforts to determine whether and how to transition selected systemwide programs to campuses.

Action: Due to time constraints, this item was tabled for the next meeting.

VII. Fellowship Reviews

Graduate Division staff member Eric Cannon attended this portion of the GC meeting to discuss the rankings for the continuing student fellowship, Outstanding Teaching Award fellowship, and the Will Shadish Graduate Student fellowship. GC members reported problems in accessing the applications and were unable to complete their reviews.

A GC member raised a concern about applicants submitting one application for two different fellowships that have different objectives. The member is aware that this practice is supposed to reduce workload burden but it may be doing a disservice to students who apply for the fellowships. She also objects to providing ratings to letters of recommendation, and instead recommends assigning scores to the whole application.

Graduate Division staff member Cannon reported that the ceremony for awarding graduate students these fellowships is on May 6, so GC member rankings must be submitted before this date.

Action: GC analyst to schedule a special meeting for GC members to discuss their rankings before May 6.

VIII. [Curriculog Enhancement Report](#) – Chair Westerling

At Chair Westerling's request, a review of the Curriculog and the CRF process was initiated one year after the launch of Curriculog. [A preliminary report](#) was drafted, after consultation with campus stakeholders, outlining the process of the review and the preliminary findings.

Attending this portion of the meeting were two members of the Curriculog planning and implementation team, Joshua Reinhold in the Registrar's Office and Melissa Tessier from IT. Reinhold stated that some adjustments requested by stakeholders to Curriculog can be made over the summer. Reinhold added that many questions he received from stakeholders were about policy and process. Senate Director Martin suggested constructing the workflow so that there is role clarity among all Curriculog users; this would also determine whether each step is necessary and consistent with policy.

Action: GC chair Westerling suggested that a work group be formulated in the next academic year that includes a member of UGC, GC, Senate staff, Registrar, and curriculum staff from each of the Schools.

A GC member asked whether the Curriculog system could be altered so that cross-listed courses only have to be uploaded once. Other members replied that the system would then need the ability to send the course for approval by both departments/programs.

Another GC member asked if information from Curriculog could be exported to Cat Courses to create a skeleton syllabus.