GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)
Minutes of Meeting
March 15, 2016

Pursuant to call, the Graduate Council met at 1:30 pm on March 15, 2016 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Michael N Dawson presiding.

Nancy Burke absent, Angela Krueger attending on behalf of ALO Martin.

I.   **Chair's Report**

Chair Dawson updated GC members on the following:

a.   Vision Summit
From the faculty summit held on March 9th, two main points were raised:
   1) shared governance would benefit from additional development on campus. It is not clear if the current senate structure would be contributing to the visioning, and the GC may wish to consider making a voluntary contribution to the visioning process.
   2) workforce planning should be revisited in terms of actual needs from the educational, research, and service mission of the university. The role of faculty is not being coordinated with the current workforce planning structure, or the SAFI process.

A Council member pointed out the disconnect between the SAFI and the 2020 project, and the need for a concrete academic plan for programming at the graduate level.   There was agreement, and it was noted that these issues have been raised previously, but with no traction. The member suggested the structuring of SAFI hires to facilitate the growth of programs. Another member stated that additional planning would need to go into the second and third years of the SAFI, as the first year has been exploratory.

The Chair asked if council members thought having some kind of communication with administration about visioning and consultation with the senate would be valuable. Council supported the suggestion, perhaps with a joint-session including the administration and senate.

ACTION: Chair will consider meeting with Chancellor, Provost, VC Reese, and Division Council Chair Ricci. Provost/EVC Peterson to be invited to attend the next GC meeting before the next Vision Summit event.

II.   **Consent Calendar**

Today's meeting agenda and the March 8th meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III.   **Course Conventions document**

a.   At the February 2 meeting, Registrar Laurie Herbrand and Associate Registrar Josh Reinhold presented this document for Graduate Council's input. GC members are asked

to submit their suggested revisions to GC analyst. UGC has also reviewed this document and had no comments.

ACTION: GC will charge the Registrar with sending the document to UGC biennially as part of a continuing discussion, and communicate with UGC on what is expected.

A Council member stated that the proposal of new courses is not currently addressed in the document, and asked if professional courses should be going through GC, or whether there is a separate process.

The Chair asked about getting general guidance from the Registrar regarding grading conventions. A member agreed, and supported having standardized grading and distribution of grades. An example was brought up to move away from A, B, and F as only options; faculty can choose to give only an A, B, or F, but they should choose from all traditional grade options available.

A member brought up lack of consensus on + and -, the Chair pointed out that the Registrars' site is ambiguous as to what is and is not a passing grade at the graduate level. A member recommended that all CRFs that come through would indicate that a B- is failing.

ACTION: Chair will contact the Registrar and discuss improving the Registrar website for clarity with regards to graduate level passing grades.

The Chair questioned "topics" and "courses" (page 8-9): they do not necessarily need to be called "topics". Course development should be handled separately from a topics course. Another Council member noted that the terms "topics" and "courses" are place holders to assist new faculty who have not yet submitted a CRF. The Council agreed that trial courses should be under "92", topics courses could be under any listing.
Another Council member requested clarity on the definition of "Topics".

ACTION: Chair will talk with the Registrar for additional information, will draft a document to better define how these terms are used, and will circulate for the Council's review.

IV.   **Senate Awards**
   a.   The call for nominations for the annual Senate Awards was submitted to Senate faculty in February. GC is responsible for the review of the nominations for the award for Distinguished Graduate Teaching. Nominations are due to the Senate Office by March 28th and the winner will be announced at the May 9th Meeting of the Division.

V.   **Graduate Fellowship Awards [Timeline]**

The Chair announced that Cycle 3, which consists of continuing fellowships, includes 75 applications. He suggested that each application be reviewed by two Council members and a third member will be added as necessary. The Chair pointed out that there may be a need to solicit reviewers outside of Graduate Council for the next cycle (Cycle 4), which include the Outstanding TA awards and the Rose R. Ruiz fellowships. For

example, LPSOEs and LSOEs may provide assistance in reviewing the TA award nominations. The Chair will speak to Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Camfield regarding this idea.

Graduate Division staff member Eric Cannon, who attended today's meeting, indicated he had a draft timeline for Council review of the last cycle of awards: by April 11, Council members will have access to the fellowships with a deadline of May 2 to send a ranked list back to the Graduate Division. Cannon will work with the Senate office on refining the timeline.

Committee agreed on proposed method for Cycle 3 and Cycle 4 reviews and timeline.

ACTION: GC Analyst will obtain a list of current LPSOEs and LSOEs from VPF Camfield's office and forward the list to the Council Chair.

VI.   **Draft review assignments**
   a. Graduate Advisor's Handbook
   b. Graduate Group Policies & Procedures
   c. Graduate sections of the AY 16-17 university catalog

   Prior to this meeting, Chair Dawson drafted a spreadsheet of suggested reviewers for each of these categories. During the meeting, Council members revised the spreadsheet.

   ACTION: GC analyst to submit the revised spreadsheet to Council chair for final review.

   May 1 – Deadline for GC to send finalized catalog copies to Registrar's Office. (Registrar's publication deadline)
   May 17 – GC to finalize all Graduate Group Policies and Procedures.
   May 17 - GC reviewers will finalize their sections of the Graduate Advisor's Handbook.

   ACTION: Chair will draft a memo to synthesize the process and expectations and will meet with the GC analyst to plan the Senate office's role in the review of the documents in all three aforementioned categories.

VII.   **TOEFL Speaking Score   for Admission and TAships**

   Current Graduate Council policy states the minimum TOEFL score for admission is 80, with a Speak Score of 26.

   VPDGE Zatz stated that she would not oppose lifting the requirement for a minimum Speak score of 26 for students who were not TAs, so long as they met the overall requirement of a TOEFL score of 80.

   Council members discussed the possible interim solution of adding new language to the application section of the Graduate Division website that describes alternatives/exceptions to the TOEFL speaking score.

        ACTION: Chair will work with VPDGE Zatz on the text for the Graduate Division website and will submit to the Council for review.

VIII.   **Consultation with VPDGE Zatz**
  a. Interdisciplinary small grants competition
      1) Deadline for proposals will be extended.
  b. Data to be included in the annual review of graduate groups
  c. Graduate Resource Advocacy Day at the State Capitol – All of the UC Graduate Deans are requesting additional funds for the support of 600 graduate students across the system.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Attest:
Michael N Dawson, Graduate Council Chair