

GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)**Minutes of the Meeting****Monday, May 6, 2019**

Pursuant to the call, Graduate Council met at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, May 6, 2019, in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair LeRoy Westerling presiding.

I. Executive Session

Members did not hold an executive session at this meeting.

II. Chair's Report – Chair Westerling**A. [Divisional Council Meeting](#) (4/29)**

Chair Westerling reported on the April 29 Divisional Council meeting where the major topics of discussion were:

- Professor Roger Bales (Director of SNRI) attended the meeting. He serves on a systemwide committee that involves: 1) implementing the UC system's sustainability goals (including zero carbon footprint) and 2) a large systemwide grant that communicates the system's zero carbon and sustainability goals to faculty and engages the faculty in communicating those to students. UCOP has committed to investing to meet sustainability goals. The main goals are: by 2025 the UC system as a whole will be carbon neutral and UC Merced will reach that milestone by 2020 in its operation, not construction. The UC system is pushing for energy efficiency, but they are buying offsets. Divisional Council inquired about the tradeoffs if the UC is investing to achieve carbon neutrality by 2020, i.e. what other things are we not investing in? Professor Bales requested a statement from UC Merced endorsing this priority with language that states that the system will invest whatever necessary to achieve carbon neutrality goals by the respective deadlines. The endorsement will be transmitted to Academic Council so the Academic Senate can comment. Divisional Council will continue the conversation.
- The draft salary recovery policy was not endorsed by Divisional Council, and will be going back to the authors with questions and comments.
- Previous memo from FWAF regarding equity for Teaching Professors given the range of their workload. FWAF requested that the campus devise a policy that sets a campus-based workload standard for the Teaching Professor series.

B. [CCGA Meeting](#) (5/1)

Chair Westerling was unable to attend the May 1 CCGA meeting, so VPDGE Zatz updated GC members on the major items of discussion:

- Continued discussion on the potential UCSF-Dignity Health partnership and the issues surrounding Dignity Health as a faith-based organization that refuses to perform certain procedures or provide certain types of information to patients. These practices would bring it into conflict with the UC which is a public system, and would adversely affect UC employees seeking treatment.
- A proposal to add a Master's degree to an approved doctoral program, for students who want to get a Master's along the way or to leave. It was suggested that an inventory be conducted of the number of doctoral programs that do not have Masters degrees. This suggestion was not approved by all CCGA members, as the question arose as to who would do this lengthy and complicated inventory. The item was tabled to the next meeting.
- Continued discussion of an incarcerated student policy which the systemwide Senate Chair wants to implement. Under such a policy, students can be in residence electronically, without having to be physically present. Chair Westerling noted that if broadly written, this potential policy may lead to additional distance education programs. The next step is to develop principles surrounding the policy. VPDGE Zatz noted that while CCGA members were generally supportive for developing a policy for

incarcerated students, there is some debate on how to handle students who are political prisoners in other countries, and whether this would lead to the policy being applied to any international student who cannot get a visa for the U.S. The policy has the potential to become broad and unwieldy.

Chair Westerling reminded members of the draft GC memo in response to the Academic Planning Work Group report and asked if members had additional edits to the draft. No additional edits were suggested.

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

III. Consent Calendar

- A. The agenda
- B. Five CRFs:
 - [Public Health 295](#)
 - [Public Health 297](#)
 - [Bioengineering 295](#)
 - [Bioengineering 230](#)
 - [Bioengineering 210](#)
- C. Instructor of record petitions. All three have been approved by Chair Westerling.
 - [Reo Maynard](#) to teach Bio 141, Evolution in summer 2019.
 - [Ravi Singh](#) to teach Public Health 105, Introduction to US Healthcare Systems in fall 2019
 - [Bryan Amos](#) to teach Sociology 110, Social Movements in fall 2019.

Action: The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. Campus Review Items

- A. [Department Chair Duties](#) – *Chair Westerling*

GC members were asked to discuss [the proposed implementation sequencing](#) of the duties of department chairs. Chair duties are taken from APM 245 and 210.

Chair Westerling summarized the document for GC members. He noted that department chairs will have to coordinate heavily with multiple graduate group chairs. This coordination is not explicitly mentioned in the document, but department chairs will have to coordinate with various individuals in their Schools to ensure the success of both graduate and undergraduate programs. GC members briefly discussed compensation (course release and the possibility of a ninth during the year so it counts toward retirement). GC member Hratchian, the committee's representative to the Academic Planning Work Group, pointed out that the bigger compensation package was going to consist of a pool of money for the deans to individually negotiate with department chairs similar to the practice at other campuses. Another idea was an administrative sabbatical for chairs to take after their department chair role is completed, to work on their research program. This administrative sabbatical is separate from normal sabbatical credits they accrue as faculty members. GC members agreed that as this new administrative organization is implemented, that research agendas of the faculty members who assume the roles of department chair is not negatively impacted.

GC members also discussed staff support, and the importance of staff reporting to department chairs rather than the deans. Good staff support will be critical to the success of department chairs. GC members also pointed out that this proposed, new administrative organization on campus will take time to build efficiency, so it will be important to stage the implementation.

GC members supported the proposed department chairs duties document, but wish to highlight that those sections addressing coordination and promotion of research and teaching need to be phrased in a way that

makes explicit the collective nature of this activity. In terms of timing, GC members agreed that this proposed administrative structure will depend on staffing support. In terms of the scope of responsibilities, they need to be linked to resources and compensation.

A GC member stated that the document assumes that all departments are dedicated to the same academic field. In many academic units at UC Merced, there are amalgamations of several fields which, at other, mature campuses, would each be their own departments. Excellence in teaching and research are different across fields, so this must be taken into account for future department chairs. Another GC member pointed out that there are two major assumptions contained in the proposed department chair duties document: 1) department chairs and deans are dedicated to the well-being of their faculty, and if the chair is not doing his or her job, the dean would intervene to rectify the situation. 2) within the proposed compensation package description is an implicit acknowledgement of interdisciplinary complexity such that the department chair could compensate vice chairs who would be responsible for coordinating subfields within the department.

Chair Westerling also emphasized that due to the complexity of proposed department chair duties, along with the time it will take to ramp up staff support, careful attention must be given to the timeline by which the new administrative structure is implemented.

Action: GC analyst to draft a memo based on committee members' aforementioned comments. The draft memo will be circulated among committee members via email for review and comment. The final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by Wednesday, May 8.

B. [Economics B.S. Proposal](#) – *Member Christina Torres-Rouff*

GC members were asked to discuss [Economics' response](#) to [Graduate Council's February 22 request](#) for a teaching plan to illustrate the ability of the department to deliver the B.S., and existing B.A. and B.S. degrees, as well as implementing the M.A. and Ph.D. degree programs.

Member Torres-Rouff noted that the committee asked for a five-year teaching plan, but the response from Economics only included a three-year plan. GC members suggested they vote to endorse UGC's ultimate decision rather than endorse the revised proposal, and to note that GC looks forward to the implementation of the Economics master's and Ph.D. degrees in the near future.

A motion was made to endorse UGC's ultimate decision on the revised Economics degree program, the motion was seconded, and unanimously passed.

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

V. Systemwide Review Item

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.

Member LiWang summarized the UC Sacramento Center report for GC members. The only relevant component for graduate students is TAs or invitations to deliver talks. The report does suggest potential future programming and research opportunities for graduate students.

GC members noted that the Center provides educational opportunities for students, especially those at

Merced, that do not have the resources to offer equivalent educational opportunities. For some students, UC Center Sacramento experiences have proven transformative. As such, it is a matter of equity that the Center continue to serve the entire UC. GC members emphasized the importance of ensuring both that the Center is financially sustainable and that its duty to students at campuses across the UC, particularly those like Merced, be preserved going forward.

Action: GC analyst will draft a memo and circulate to committee members via email for review and comment. The final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

VI. [Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) – Vice Chair Hratchian

GC members were asked to consider revisions proposed by Graduate Division to the *Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook*.

The GC policy subcommittee carefully reviewed the proposed revisions to the Handbook. The subcommittee wishes to raise the following issues for discussion by the GC as a whole:

- Issues surrounding students who want to apply for multiple graduate programs, e.g. application fees and conflicting expectations amongst programs. GC members suggested flexibility, i.e. allow programs the authority to waive application fees on a case-by-case basis for students who want to apply to multiple programs. VPDGE Zatz supported this suggestion, but stated she prefers that the language in the Handbook remain unchanged, so it states that students apply for one program only, but that exceptions can be made.
- Official transcripts have to be submitted for applications but in practice, unofficial transcripts have been accepted, particularly in the cases of international students. The GC policy subcommittee suggested continuing to allow the receipt of unofficial transcripts with the rule that *official* transcripts must arrive before the students can commence graduate studies.
- TOEFL score requirements. Member Hratchian discussed UC Merced’s policy of specifying a speaking score as well as an assessment. GC recommended allowing the current language to stand.
- NRST waivers. Existing policy is that waiver follows students if move. Continue to treat as exceptions at do now. Too few to make policy.
- Instituting the title of Graduate Student Assistant Researcher (GSAR). These are graduate students who work, for example, for IT in a position related to their field. The GSR title does not apply to these students, because they are not working on their dissertations in these positions.

Action: GC members unanimously voted to endorse the implementation of the GSAR title.

- GC members agreed with current Handbook language that students should be allowed to get two degrees (e.g. two Master’s degrees or two Bachelors degrees) but not in the same field.
- Language requiring all PhD students to have a faculty advisor. Some first year students lose their primary advisor and are placed on unsatisfactory progress until they locate a new advisor. Chair Westerling stated that some programs have a policy in which students who lose their advisors are advised by the graduate group chair or the chair’s designee. GC members suggested that this policy be adopted campus-wide, and be in place for the students in question until either the end of the academic year or an additional semester, whichever period of time is greater. GC members and VPDGE Zatz agreed that this should be a campus-wide policy.

Action: GC members unanimously voted to recommend that this become a campus-wide policy.

- The Handbook conflates “university and/or graduate group” criteria under the section for conditions of appointment. If graduate groups have a requirement that is specific to their groups, the requirement should be listed in the groups’ policies and procedures or it will not be enforced. If their policies are the

same as university policies and criteria, these policies should be listed in the Graduate Handbook.

VII. Graduate Funding Model – Chair Westerling

GC members were asked to discuss the proposed [graduate student funding model](#) presented at GC's April 8 meeting.

Chair Westerling raised a concern that the benefit of the proposed model is too diffuse. If the campus wants to incentivize faculty to apply for large grants on the path to R1 status, some of that indirect cost should go back to the faculty members' graduate group, deans, and labs. The policy should also apply to grants that pay less than the full overhead so as not to disadvantage faculty members who have these types of grants.

VIII. Consultation with VPDGE Zatz

The Graduate Division will have Graduate Research Orientation Week (GROW) start the first day the students are insured, which is August 15. They have to be in the payroll system by August 16. The Graduate Division will work with HRPC to get the students into the system in a timely manner.