

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)
Minutes of the Meeting
Wednesday, September 11, 2019

Pursuant to the call, Graduate Council met at 1:30 p.m. in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair LeRoy Westerling presiding.

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| I. | Executive Session | 0 Min |
| II. | Chair Report – <i>Chair Westerling</i> | 5 Min |
| | A. Divisional Council meeting (9/4) | |

The Chair reported that Divisional Council discussed goals and identified campus leaders to invite to a Divisional Council. Staff issues were raised as a concern and the Chief Human Resource Officer has been invited to Divisional Council. The chair also noted that the Scholars at Risk Network was discussed and the need for a faculty member to function as a point person locally.

- | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|--|
| III. | Consent Calendar | |
| | A. The agenda (9/11) | |

The consent calendar was approved as presented.

- | | | |
|------------|---|---------------|
| IV. | Campus Review Items | 10 Min |
| | A. LASC Bylaw Revisions - <i>Shawn Newsam</i> | |

A member summarized the rationale for and history of the [proposed revisions](#) to [Senate Bylaw II.IV.4.A](#) addressing the membership of the [Committee for Scholarly and Library Communication](#) (LASC). The revisions increase the faculty membership of the committee to five from four, and change the composition to being broadly representative of the schools (and populated by the Committee on Committees) from being composed of a representative each from the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, the Committee on Research, Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council. Additionally, the Chief Information Officer (CIO) has been removed as an ex-officio member, at the CIO's request. A small revision has been made to bylaw II.IV.4.B.2 addressing the committee's role in the Library's budget.

After some discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to endorse the proposed changes to the bylaws as presented.

ACTION: The GC chair will communicate GC's endorsement of the proposed revisions to the Senate Chair by October 8, 2019.

- | | | |
|-----------|--|---------------|
| V. | Managing Non-Senate Faculty Appointment Process – <i>VPDGE Zatz</i> | 15 Min |
| | Last year, Graduate Council revised its Non-Academic Senate Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses Policy to delegate appointment authority to the VPDGE with the expectation of an annual report. Graduate Division has developed a draft reporting process for GC's consideration. The reporting structure was discussed. | |

ACTION: The VPDGE will add to the data reported to GC the kind of program the course is taught in (PDST, SPP, State Supported) and return it to GC for consideration, on next consent calendar.

VI. Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook**10 Min**

At its August 28 meeting, Graduate Council approved removing from the *Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook* the requirement that, to be eligible for teaching assistant and GSR funding, continuing graduate students have achieved a minimum letter grade of B or S in all courses completed. This (now eliminated) requirement also applies to the appointment of continuing graduate students as Readers and Tutors ([Handbook](#) p. 21 – 22 and 22-23, respectively). A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to revise the funding eligibility criteria for Readers and Tutors such that, as for teaching assistant and GSR appointments, the Satisfactory Progress criterion suffices for both academic standing and funding eligibility.

ACTION: The Chair will communicate Graduate Council's decision to Graduate Division.

VII. Consultation with VPDGE**5 Min****A. New Central Valley Fellowship**

A new fellowship, for students from Central Valley doing work to benefit the Central Valley. There will be one fellowship for fall and spring, with funding from a donor and matching funds from the foundation.

B. Academic Counselor and Data Analyst hires are ongoing, Fellowship Coordinator will be posted next month.**C. Cohort tuition discussions and graduate students**

The regents are discussing a cohort tuition model – tuition is set with the cohort you come in. Graduate deans are opposed to applying it to graduate students, as it creates a significant administrative burden. For example, if faculty is trying to put students on a grant their costs will vary with their year (say first or fifth). The graduate deans have urged the regents to leave the graduate students out, but conveyed that it is reasonable to have a set amount of increase to tuition on a yearly basis.

D. VPDGE also reported that all campuses on quarter systems are experiencing problems with Iranian students being unable to board planes to come to the US. UCM was not affected, but does have a number of students (about 20) who ultimately are not arriving. The majority are Iranian, Chinese, and Indian students, particularly those in EECS. Some were denied or waiting for visas, others for funding. A member noted that Chinese and Iranian students are being issued one year visas, and must reapply if they go home to visit their families. Students with multi-year visas must also reapply if they are out of the country for five months. Charles Nies (Student Affairs) is providing financial support for students (for example, cover students' flight cost difference up to \$1000, with a repayment plan). Faculty may reach out to Charles Nies, although customarily Graduate Dean is the conduit. Suggestions to address this issue included putting together best practices, and reaching out to US Senators and Representatives.**VIII. Consultation with APAPB Schnier****45 Min****A. Graduate Funding Model**

The Chair summarized the history of this work, including that the Provost has made a commitment, ensuring GC that per student support will not decline over time but will gradually increase. The APAPB provided an overview of the model presented to graduate council last year and the new model, and the proposed addition of paying masters programs. Members discussed the overhead rates (about 30% on average, not the oft-quoted 55%) and how it compares to other UCs; Return to Aid (50% going back to support graduate students via Graduate Division); and GSRs (with the idea that a portion of the remaining tuition revenue being paid by grants would be returned to the graduate division

to support graduate programs and students). The Return to Aid funds most of graduate fellowships, as well as the 25% the graduate division pays for tuition and grants. What is left after these other obligations are paid is called USAP (the APAPB's preferred name for it is Graduate Student Support). APAPB demonstrated how the model produces different revenue projections based on different rates of external grants as the funding source (currently about 8.8%).

The VPDGE noted that by increasing the number of grants and number of grant funded students, the time students spend on research will increase, which helps the campus's goal to reach R1. It would allow for the growth of graduate student population without relying on the growth of the instructional demand from undergraduate programs. APAPB made the clarification that the proposal to allocate an additional portion of the grant funds (beyond the 50%) only applies to the increment that is above the base rate (currently 8.8%); doing so would not be removing funds from existing obligations, but would incentivize faculty to seek external grants. He noted that campus revenue from grants is at about 20% for Riverside and Santa Cruz.

A member expressed his concerns about centralized use of grant revenues, when there are significant differences in how much different graduate groups contribute. To incentivize groups that bring in more grants, these groups would likely want to see more of the money flow back to them. The model does not provide incentives for particular departments to increase funding for GSRs or to improve grant awarded rates. VPDGE and APAPB responded that the model is still evolving, and the next version would accommodate different flows – programs, departments, deans, etc., for different incentivization. The Chair noted that the goal of the funding model is to identify a funding stream that allows us to grow the per student funding (about half of what other campuses have), and it needs to be separated from other questions, such as what happens with the indirect costs or flexible funds (model is only about tuition money), and how to incentivize faculty to seek external grants.

APAPB asked the following questions to aid further development of the model:

1. What is a healthy balance of Master's program vs Ph.D. when focusing on attaining R1? What are the thresholds of student to faculty ratios for Master's and Ph.D. students?

Answers: It is discipline dependent and it would be useful to look at other campuses, although UCM is in a unique situation of being a new campus. For EECS it may be 5-6 Masters per faculty. It is not desirable to over-incentivize Master's at the expense of PhD students, but self-paying Master's program would help fund doctoral students.

2. What else needs to be worked into the model? Localized flow of resources, and Master's incentives, need to be integrated. The Chair pointed out that the model will capture the natural revenue growth, from the junior faculty, who are the majority of UCM hires, improving their ability to obtain grants, but there is no mechanism that incentivizes individual faculty to seek grants. This mechanism would come from the localized flow of resources, where the Principal Investigators who bring in the grants have some of the "indirect cost returns" be returned to them (their labs or graduate groups). VPDGE agreed, but pointed out that, in the absence of the change in the indirect cost return rates, there needs to be other ways to increase graduate student funding, and there needs to be a "balance"--some of the funding needs to be for the entire graduate student population, not individual labs. APAPB added that the model makes it possible to see, in numerical terms, what that "balance" may look like, and make a collective decision on it.

B. Non-Academic Senate Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses Policy

The [policy](#) expects requests to appoint non-Senate faculty to come to Dean Zatz from Graduate Group Chairs. However, department chairs are responsible for hiring lecturers, leading to the potential need to revise the policy.

This item was not discussed due to lack of time.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:01PM. Attested by Chair LeRoy Westerling.