

**GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)****October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016****Documents available at: UCM Box "[GC AY 16-17](#)"**

Pursuant to call, the Graduate Council met at 10:04 AM on October 20, 2016 in Room 228 of the Student Services Building, Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam presiding.

**I. Consultation with Provost/EVC**

A committee member asked about how to accomplish a better alignment of graduate programs within departments? Are these departments aligned with graduate groups? Provost Peterson replied that this is one of the most important questions regarding restructuring. The administration and faculty working group is tasked with developing ideas to be vetted by all senate committees on the structure for the academic side of campus. It is well known that the current structure, in place since the campus opened, cannot continue without additional academic leadership at a level below the deans. Providing discipline-specific orientation and maintaining a clear inter-disciplinary culture is key to this. This is evident when comparing undergraduate groups to graduate groups. The Provost hopes for positive faculty input for this restructuring effort. The next phase of the process is where additional faculty can be involved. Regarding the budgetary structure, and the support needed for junior faculty, the Provost wants the conversations to not occur in isolation, and recognizes that internal support for graduate students needs to improve.

Regarding the make-up of the administration and faculty working group, the deans and two faculty members from each school were invited, and the Provost believes the Executive Committees were consulted. A concern was expressed that the committee does not represent the diversity of ideas and conflicts, and the Provost recommended that the committee membership be informed of ideas and conflicts that arise, copying him and the Senate office for clear documentation that an issue is being asked for consideration.

Responding to the belief that communication is not occurring adequately because the restructuring is being rushed to implementation, the Provost stated that this will be implemented when it is ready, and there is nothing being rushed to meet a deadline. He expressed his concern about the potential rumor of the deadline being rushed. Within the structure that the academic chairs proposed, there was a multi-year plan for how the restructuring could evolve, which may be the genesis of this rumor.

Chair Balasubramaniam raised the question about what the instructional budget is and what TA availability is. Up to now, groups have been providing multi-year offers on faith that the funds will be available. Programs that are very well aligned with their undergraduate counterparts will have much more transparency, however interdisciplinary programs may not see the same transparency. The Provost stated that the campus has enough history and predictability that there should be a baseline usable to anticipate the level of resources assured to a program. Fundamental to that is knowing what the budget is going to be from one year to the next, which has been a challenge. GC felt that this was a reasonable approach to take. VPDGE Zatz expressed that the deans have been supportive, with some progress being made last year. The issue of having the instructional budget increase when the undergraduate budget increases was raised, but with no clear answer, tying back to having no overall budget in place. VPDGE Zatz

noted that across the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, students could be receiving a greater level of support.

A member expressed the interest in expanding a master's program, and their group is wondering about a revenue mechanism, or if their students would be on their own. The Provost stated that there will be a retreat with the Dean's Council and Senate Chair and Vice Chair, with the entire focus being on budget. This is one topic to be discussed at that retreat. The Provost mentioned that there seems to be a sentiment that there are "secret pots of money" and how those sources can get into academic units. Mature universities have Indirect Cost Return sharing models, our campus does not, and this will also be a topic at the retreat, as well as how the expansion of a master's program as a revenue source would work out. The question of a timeline is not yet agreed upon, but the retreat is expected to identify things to consider early on.

A member asked about sharing what information is currently available, so that people would know what is possible in terms of budgetary constraints. The Provost referred this to the deans, as there is no prohibition in sharing, though it is most likely that nothing is being shared because no formal budget exists. The Provost will communicate to the Deans explicitly that they are free to share any information they do have. He also noted that he spends time dispelling rumors and reinforcing that administration is doing what is in the best interest for faculty. Chair Balasubramaniam noted the atmosphere on campus that there is a split between the administration and faculty. Transparency would help, though he understands this may not be possible without a budget. Faculty hear a common response to their questions being "we don't know", but perhaps communication could be shared out regarding what the budget is, what is being done, and a reminder that we are here together. The Provost mentioned that he has been criticized for not communicating enough, as he prefers to only communicate when he has facts. He does recognize that even sharing the status when there are no new facts would be of use to faculty.

A member asked if it was possible to homogenize the offer announcements, perhaps during the visitation weekend, to avoid offers being made at different times. The Provost noted that the timing of those decisions is made by the graduate groups themselves. Recommendations to graduate groups could best come from the Graduate Division and the graduate groups.

A member asked about how faculty lines are calculated. The Provost stated that he did not have a formula, certainly allocation directly to disciplinary units is a significant path. In a 140-150 position allocation, fewer than 30 total have been allocated to a cluster-hiring approach to date. Undergraduate student demand is an important factor. The Provost also made a point highlighting that faculty cannot make the argument for increasing ladder-rank faculty, and then argue that ladder-rank faculty have no responsibility to teach the undergraduates. There are many programs where the role of the ladder-rank faculty is near zero.

The question was raised about the closure of a program review, especially when a program review recommends faculty lines. The Provost pointed out that, by definition, program review will always say the Provost needs to allocate money to a particular place. This information is important and should be shared with CAPRA. We want to avoid taking the recommendations from external committees solely for how faculty lines get allocated.

The Provost wanted to end his conversation with GC regarding morale on campus. He is very concerned about the sentiment of an adversarial relationship between academic leadership and the academy. He hopes that it will be understood everyone is working towards the same goal. He asked the committee members to discourage conversations of an “us against them” nature. If it is true that the leadership cannot deliver, he expressed that it then is time for a change in academic leadership. It is hard for him to define a good working relationship when sometimes the only voices heard are those of dissent, not based on fact. The 2020 project is an example, viewed as a “glowing signature element” that is not functional for faculty and students, ignoring academic needs. Chair Balasubramaniam noted that while there is always a vocal minority, people in general do not respond well to uncertainty. Having even some information would be helpful. The Provost gave credit to VC Feitelberg, who has developed a long-term projection over multiple decades, that includes the 2020 project and faculty hiring, showing that the campus will remain solvent.

A member expressed that having the Provost attend the GC meeting gave him added confidence. If more information can be shared, more faculty may also feel better. The Provost does not view questions directed to him as confrontational, and wants to dispel rumors as much as possible. He hopes that everyone understand that even all the Senate Committees do not represent all faculty, so members should share the information they have as well. The Provost is happy to come back if the committee is interested or has more questions.

## II. Chair’s Report – Ramesh Balasubramaniam

Chair Balasubramaniam welcomed Fred Wolf to the Graduate Council, and updated GC members on the following topics:

- a. October 6 Division Council meeting
  - i. A lot of conspiracies were discussed.
- b. October 5 CCGA Meeting
  - i. Systemwide, very interesting discussions were had regarding self-sustaining programs. The Public Health proposal has been assigned a Lead Reviewer by CCGA and will go for peer review.
- c. Review items for GC this year:
  - i. There will be three CCGA proposals this year: MIST, EECS, and BEST, which has been revised and now under a different title, “Materials and Biological Engineering” (MBE), ready to be submitted to GC in October.
  - ii. Grad Group Policies & Procedures and Graduate Advisor’s Handbook will be moved to email discussion and approval. VPDGE Zatz requested articulation on how students that have difficulty making progress can be assisted.
- d. Graduate students TAing Graduate courses:
  - i. There are five Grad Groups that have expressed their concerns regarding the [policy as written](#). A member conveyed his observations about this issue and how it would impact the future of teaching one of his courses. VPDGE Zatz expressed the need for being conscious of power differentials, having a clear split between the student that would be TAing and the students taking the course (doctoral student TAing a Masters course). Chair Balasubramaniam noted that a Grad Group expected to not be able to offer a particular course if they could not get TA support. The Grad Group would be modifying the respective CRF so the course would only take students from their specific Grad Group, hurting students from other programs. A member asked about

conjoining courses, and the response was that the University is trying to limit conjoined courses as much as possible. Further discussion among the committee showed that there is enough interest to revise this policy, and Chair Balasubramaniam will draft a modified version for Policy subcommittee review.

**III. Vice Chair's Report – Teamrat Ghezzehei**

- a. October 10 PROC Meeting:
  - i. Closing the loop on program reviews.  
This topic is very important, but was not able to be discussed at the PROC meeting.
  - ii. How do we include a process for students who are not progressing successfully towards graduation?  
VPDGE Zatz noted that this information should be shared throughout the course of the student's time on campus, as well as having this information in the Policies and Procedures is very important. Chairs are also supposed to verify that all steps have been completed by the student.
  - iii. Discussion on streamlining paperwork and checking requirements across grad programs.

**IV. Consent Calendar**

- a. The September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting minutes were approved as presented.
- b. The October 20, 2016 meeting agenda was approved as presented.
- c. QSB 214 – Tissue Engineering Design was approved and will be forwarded to the Registrar.

**V. Professional Development Course offered by Graduate Division (GradDiv)**

- a. This topic was tabled for the next GC meeting.

**VI. Systemwide Review Items**

- a. [Presidential Policy on International Activities](#)
  - i. A memo will be sent to the Senate Chair that GC has no comments.
- b. [Proposed revisions to APM 015, APM 016, and Senate Bylaw 336](#)
  - i. A memo will be sent to the Senate Chair that GC has no comments.

**VII. Consultation with VPDGE Zatz**

VPDGE Zatz shared the file titled, "[UC Long Range Enrollment Plan 2013-2014 to 2020-2021](#)".

**VIII. Upcoming Business**

**IX. Other Business**

**X. Executive Session (Voting members only)**

GC entered Executive Session at 11:18 AM. No minutes were recorded.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:34 AM.

Attest:

Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Chair