

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, February 4, 2021

2:00 – 3:30 PM

Zoom URL: <https://ucmerced.zoom.us/j/2092009728>

Zoom Phone: 1 669 900 6833, Meeting ID: 209 200 9728

Documents available in [Box](#)[Graduate Council Duties](#)

Pursuant to the call, the meeting was convened at 2:01, with Chair Hratchian presiding.

I. Executive Session (2:00-2:10)—MEMBERS ONLY—**A. Revised MDSA Program Proposal—*Member Chen***

The program proposers have [responded to GC's recommendations](#) for revision, and submitted a [revised proposal](#).

ACTION: Analyst will forward the proposal to the Senate Chair.

Regular session began at 2:10PM.

II. Chair's Report (2:10-2:30) -*Chair Hratchian*

A. CCGA discussed the need to articulate better when program modification should be treated as a new program. Some programs have changed substantially without going through CCGA. It also discussed the parameters for deciding whether a “self-supporting” program merits continued support from the campus, and to what extent. A CCGA workgroup will issue guidance. There were updates on COVID vaccination and instruction plans for the fall. Vaccination plans seem to differ greatly across campuses, and there is no system level guidance on the status of grad students in terms of vaccination. Interim Dean Kello stated that, at UCM, graduate students are considered employees, like faculty and staff. Chair also reported that the UCOP and CCGA are making ongoing efforts to engage the regents in conversations about how research and teaching are intertwined at the graduate level, to facilitate greater understanding by the regents of the distinctiveness of graduate education as opposed to undergraduate education.

The Chair also clarified that the CCGA approval of CCB name change is for the department name change, and not for the graduate program. The Graduate Group will propose its name change in the near future.

B. DivCo 1/25 Meeting laid out action plans for the semester, and continued consultation with the provost on budget and graduate student admissions planning. Chair believes GC needs to provide guidance from the faculty perspective, and help plan far in advance for next AY, by having conversations with the deans and chairs in the summer.

C. Curriculum-exploring the possibilities: The Chair had a productive meeting with the Registrar. One possibility is to use the unused Curriculum licenses for streamlining processes that are currently handled via email.

D. Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) Workgroup: Chair is waiting for two people to confirm their membership. Chair will send a one-page charge to GC members, which is to examine the status and effectiveness of the current TPP and offer suggestions for the modifications to the current policy.

ACTION: Chair will circulate the charge for the TPP Workgroup, for approval by consent calendar.

III. Vice Chair's Report (2:30-2:45) -*Vice Chair Hestir*

A. Graduate Group (GG) Chairs Meeting—1/26. Virtual Visitation Week is underway with lesser impact on the environment (as some GGs, at the urging of their students, chose not to give the small gifts that often accompany conference attendances), fellowship reviews are also underway. As for admissions, some GGs took the enrollment management spreadsheet literally and did not heavily recruit. Some GGs have requested help with meeting the enrollment targets and with improving the accuracy of projections. Interim Dean Kello

confirmed he was working with individual groups. Vice Chair encouraged members to provide feedback to their GGs on the Strategic Planning Phase II.

- B. [PROC request](#) for GC to consider institutional guidance or coordination for preparing graduate student for teaching responsibilities and grant-writing—PROC suggested the below questions for GC consideration:
1. To what extent could preparation for teaching responsibilities be handled at the campus level, and to what extent does it need to be carefully tailored to each discipline?
 2. What are the respective roles of the Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning, Graduate Division, graduate program faculty, and undergraduate program faculty?
 3. How can development of teaching skills be integrated into course assignments and other areas of the graduate curriculum?

PROC provided [a compilation](#) of related recommendations and action items from academic program reviews completed in the past three years, as well as recommendations and action items related to [training in grant-writing](#).

Interim Dean Kello stated that at campus level only one half-day training in teaching is being offered. He has convened a workgroup composed of Jackie Shay from CETL, the VPDUE, James Zimmerman, and representatives from schools, to review a teaching training proposal. Experienced TAs will offer expertise to new TAs, per school/discipline. Interim Dean Kello will send the proposal out for review by Chairs and GC. Discussion on how to prepare graduate students for writing grant/fellowship applications ensued. There are discipline-specific pedagogical aspects, but it is not efficient or economical for each department to offer a course. Members discussed who was responsible for graduate student professional development. In some programs, it is implicitly expected that graduate students help their professors with grant proposals as a part of their training, but this expectation is not clearly communicated. There are examples of successful intensive workshops on grant writing at other campuses, focusing on NSF, for example. Chair added that CCGA recommended that APM should include specific expectations for mentoring but the proposal was rejected by UCAP. Since PROC reviews have repeatedly raised the need for more student training, campus does need to take actions. However, for a program to offer a course would not on its own be a thoughtful and sufficient response to the assessment outcome. Resource implications also need to be factored in.

ACTION: draft a response to PROC, for review and discussion at the next meeting.

IV. Consent Calendar (2:45-2:45)

- A. The agenda (2/4/21)
B. [Minutes](#) from the 1/21 meeting

The consent calendar was approved as presented.

V. Systemwide Review Item (2:45-2:50)

New [Presidential Policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials](#)

This new policy describes the responsibilities of the campus leadership and its researchers concerning the access to, and retention and maintenance of, Research Data and Tangible Research Materials produced during the course of University research. The policy affirms that the Regents of the University of California owns all Research Data and Tangible Research Materials, but Principal Investigators may generally take copies of Research Data generated under their research projects when Principal Investigators leave the University.

Members discussed how this policy intersected with the campus initiatives/discussions on conflict resolution, and the communication issues when data is transferred from one management system to another (a member was not aware that such a transfer had occurred to their data and believed it was lost).

ACTION: All members to send comments by 2/9 noon. Memo will be approved by consent calendar.

VI. Discussion Item: Review of CatCourses Auto-Populated Information and Review Policy (2:50-3:00)

Members continued the discussion on [CatCourses](#). The suggested possible additions to the CatCourses informational tab are track-changed in the proposed [revised policy document](#). Members reviewed the proposed revised policy document, and discussed the newly proposed contents. The Registrar stated that her office will be collecting attendance data for all faculty, and a memo to this effect will be issued in the next two weeks. Vice Chair recommended that GC develop an attendance policy after reviewing the memo. By unanimous consent, the draft policy document will be transmitted to UGC and AFAC for their consideration.

ACTION: Transmit the proposed revised policy document to UGC and AFAC for their consideration.

VII. Consultation with VPDGE (3:00-3:15)-Interim Graduate Dean Kello

- A. [Applications](#) Breakdown—the number reached over 1000 applications for the first time. UCM’s increase in application is unmatched (compared to other UCs). Some programs did not grow because international student applications decreased. URM and first generation increased significantly more than overall, also female more than male. The URM increase has been noted across UCs. A member asked for data on “first generation” for graduate school. Interim Dean Kello will provide data by next week.
- B. UC Graduate Student Experience Survey (UCGSES)- survey [summary](#), [draft questions](#), and [comparison](#) with UC Merced’s survey were provided to the members. The Graduate Division (GD) has been conducting surveys and has had a good response rate historically (about 50%). This year, the systemwide survey is being launched. It allows each campus to add campus-specific questions. The UCOP survey is already quite long. The GD asked GC members for feedback on which campus survey items, if any, should be added to the UCOP survey, as the GD will no longer run campus level survey. None were suggested at the meeting.

VIII. Report on [Faculty-Graduate Student Conflict Resolution Infrastructure \(CRI\) Workgroup \(3:15-3:30\)- Member Chen and Guest Karla Seijas, GSA representative to the workgroup](#)

The Workgroup discussed its [Progress Report](#) at its 1/26 meeting. GC has been asked to collaborate with GSA in creating an Advisor/Advisee Rights and Responsibilities document, taking elements from the [draft Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities document](#), as well as [GC’s Mentoring Guidelines](#). GSA representative Seijas presented GSA’s plan to revise the Student Rights and Responsibilities document. There will be a committee in charge, but all graduate students will be invited to participate in the process. GSA will bring the draft to GC when it is ready, to ensure its alignment with the existing policies, including the Mentoring Guidelines. GSA had not planned to draft a third document. Interim Dean Kello, who had previously suggested the creation of the third document, stated that he supported the GSA’s proposal.

Member Chen added it is important to develop these documents so that there is a process that is universal and clear, and clarified that while there will be a campus level guideline, graduate groups will have flexibility, much like the relationship between the Graduate P&P Handbook and graduate group P&Ps. Interim Dean Kello added that the graphic presentation of the conflict resolution process clearly starts from the local level up (consult the advisor, and/or the advisory committee first). He will present it to GC when the ongoing revision is complete. Interim Dean Kello emphasized that it is a guideline, not a requirement.

Members urged that Postdoctoral researchers be included in the workgroup’s consideration. They too are the responsibilities of the Graduate Council and the Graduate Division, and they also are trainees. When they are on training grants, mentoring is a part of grant requirements. Interim Dean Kello, who is a co-chair of the workgroup, stated that while post-docs are not a part of the charge for the workgroup, he is open to working on a separate document next year. Chair concurred that, as postdocs differ significantly in their status compared to students, a separate document would be necessary.

IX. New Business? There was no new business.**X. Informational Items**

- [CCGA Concurrence](#): Name Change - Chemistry and Chemical Biology to Chemistry and Biochemistry

- [PROC Closure](#) of QSB Program Review
- [PROC Memo](#) on substitution of ABET accreditation reviews for Materials Science and Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Environmental Engineering PROC review

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:37pm. Att. by Chair Hratchian.