GRC Minutes
AY 2008-2009

September 10, 2008
October 15, 2008
October 29, 2008
November 12, 2008
November 26, 2008
December 10, 2008
January 14, 2009
January 28, 2009
February 11, 2009
February 28, 2009 (Draft minutes only. Committee to approve)
February 25, 2009 (Draft minutes only. Committee to approve)

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, September 10, 2008 2:10 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 326 – Kolligian Library, West Wing

Call-in Information: 1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

AGENDA

ACTION		ITEM	PAGE
Information	I.	**Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert* Welcome and Introduction of New Members	
Discussion	II.	**Serving on Systemwide Committees** These committees need to be populated by GRC members: • University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication • University Committee on Computing and Communications	
Information/ Discussion	III.	**2008-2009 Meeting Format**	
Discussion	IV.	**Priority Tasks for 2008-2009**	
Information/ Discussion	V.	**VC for Research/Dean of Graduate Studies** – *Sam Traina* (Scheduled for 2:30 pm)	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
September 10, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:10 pm on Wednesday, September 10 2008, in Room 326 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Leppert welcomed and introduced new committee members.

III. System-wide Committees

Chair Leppert announced that two system-wide committees need to be populated by GRC members: the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) and the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCLSC). A committee member suggested the possibility of a member of the UC Merced library staff serving on UCLSC.

Action: Chair Leppert will ask Professor Qinghua Guo (not present at today's meeting) if he is interested in serving on the UCCC. It will be determined whether a library staff member can serve on the UCLSC.

IV. 2008-2009 Meeting Format

Chair Leppert announced she would like to have two meetings a month. The first meeting will be for routine business (e.g. course approvals) and the second meeting will be reserved for broader issues (e.g. reviewing graduate program proposals). If there are no broader issues to discuss, the second meeting will be cancelled unless an emergency issue comes up.

V. Announcements/Priority Tasks

VC for Research/Dean of Graduate Studies – Sam Traina

- We have nine graduate areas and Environmental Systems (ES) is the only real graduate program.
- The graduate emphasis areas are operated under the umbrella Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP). The Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has stated that this umbrella practice cannot continue and that it wants

the emphasis areas to go up for formal approval to become real graduate programs.

- Quantitative and Systems Biology (QSB) and Social & Cognitive Science likely can go up for approval this year.
- A few key program elements that CCGA is looking for are sufficient faculty, sufficient coursework for students, program coherence, and sufficient justification for why the program is needed. CCGA's website offers proposal submittal guidelines. Faculty are encouraged to look at UC Merced's ES proposal as an example of a successful submittal. In addition to writing the proposals, we have to build the resource streams to support them, both in the Schools and centrally.
- Dr. Traina announced that to get the emphasis areas started in the approvals process, his office will be conducting program reviews. UC Davis's graduate program review document will be used as a guideline and will be distributed to GRC. The program reviews will contain quality assessments of students in each emphasis area and will ensure that the faculty are aware of the policies and procedures.
- As of now, UC Merced has about 76 new graduate students, bringing the total to about 192. The campus needs to decide what the enrollment targets will be for next year. It must be decided whether we have the space for potentially 100 new graduate students and how they will impact faculty workload.
- The Budget Office should determine by mid-October what dollars are available to support graduate students.
- Graduate emphasis areas will be asked to create a formal policy on how they prioritize awarding non-resident tuition. The University's policy, as approved by GRC, is that the institution will pay non resident tuition for two years. If the students advance to candidacy, they get a waiver for three years. After that, the non resident tuition must be paid. GRC should decide whether a new model needs to be proposed.
- UC President Mark Yudof has signed an agreement with the Chilean government that would send 150 Ph.D. students a year to UC campuses, all expenses paid for four years. This is a recruiting opportunity for UC Merced.
- A committee member inquired as to how our interdisciplinary graduate groups will fare in the approval process. Dr. Traina replied that it depends on the culture of the faculty. Presumably a program would be designed in which there is some logic in the series of courses the students take. It is not an issue with CCGA. They are more interested in the research portion of any given field.
- In light of the situation with the chemistry graduate student, there has been a discussion that graduate students should be fingerprinted and background checked before they become UC Merced employees. The faculty may need to

weigh in as it could impact the culture at this campus and our ability to recruit students.

- It appears likely that postdocs will belong to the Postdoctoral Researchers Organize/United Auto Workers (PRO/UAW) union.
- UC Merced has no real policies on the formation of institutes and centers. The only system-wide rules that exist are for the establishment of Organized Research Units (ORUs) and Multicampus Research Units (MRUs). GRC should weigh in on this issue.
- GRC should decide if it wants to continue the campus's procedure regarding limited submission opportunities for grant proposals, or change it. Last year, the procedure was to let each School submit the maximum number of nominees for the campus. Those proposals went to Sponsored Projects and Dr. Traina set up an ad hoc review committee to review them. Dr. Traina pointed out that it is not an Academic Senate function, but the Senate can take over the process if it desires. Chair Leppert suggested asking the faculty in the Schools if they are satisfied with the current process.
- Dr. Traina made the unofficial announcement that the Office of the President (OP) is going to discontinue the practice of centrally retaining the 6% in indirect cost return. President Yudof said he will begin giving that money to the campuses. There will be staff reductions at OP and certain programs (e.g. Discovery program and the MRU program) will be reformulated and restructured.

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

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, October 15, 2008 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 232 – Kolligian Library

Call-in Information: 1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION		ITEM
Information	I.	**Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert* • Introduction of GRC Student Representative
Action	II.	**Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from September 10 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/October 15)*
Information	III.	**CCGA Report** – *Valerie Leppert*
Information	IV.	**UCORP Report** – *Patti LiWang*
Action	V.	**CRF approval** • WCH 221: U.S. Latino/A Literature (New) *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/October 15/CRF-WCH 221)* • ES 252: Remote Sensing of the Environment (Revised) *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/October 15/CRF – ES 252)* • MEAM 211: Nonlinear Controls (New) *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/October 15/CRF – MEAM 211)*
Discussion/ Action	VI.	**Appointment of a CRF Subcommittee**
Discussion	VII.	**Strategic Academic Planning** GRC's written response to DivCo required by October 20 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	VIII.	**Report on the Professional Doctorate** GRC's written response to DivCo required by November 3 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resource/Professional Doctorate)*
Discussion	IX.	**School of Management Proposal** GRC's written response to DivCo required by November 21 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	X.	**GRC Call for Proposals (Research and Travel Grants)** *(Last year's Call document posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources)*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
October 15, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, October 15, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

- Chair Leppert introduced Ryan Lucas, GRC student representative. Lucas is a graduate student in the Environmental Systems Graduate Group.

III. Consent Calendar

Minutes from the September 10, 2008 meeting.

Action: Committee approved the Minutes as presented.

IV. CCGA Report – *Valerie Leppert*

- UC will take a cut of $108 million. There will be more cuts in February, April and over the next two years. They might cut the Education Abroad program. There will be no new infusion of research money. The Discovery program has been modified.
- The staff at OP has been cut from 1,800 to 700.
- According to the new VP for Research, Steve Beckwith, the OP plans on continuing supporting technology transfer for the campuses.
- OP will be asking the campuses to decide how to increase the rate of community college transfers, particularly of under-represented students.
- A systemwide school of Global Health is going to be developed and will incorporate several campuses. CCGA will be reviewing that program.
- According to Mary Croughan, Chair of the Academic Senate, President Yudof seems supportive of the faculty's opinion not to move to a tiered system. He also seems interested in shared governance.
- The OP is trying to increase graduate student support by $10 million. CCGA has written a memo to President Yudof asking that the funding be tagged to ensure that the money goes directly to graduate student support. His response is that we urge our Provost to ensure this. A committee member pointed out that

on our campus, the money goes toward the support of only two students per graduate group even if the group only has two students.

- CCGA is reasserting its authority to review professional programs. This is in relationship to the initiation of UC Riverside's medical school. However, CCGA does not have control over professional degrees that the Regents specifically authorized.

V. UCORP Report – *Patti LiWang*

- UC runs the two defense national labs – Lawrence Livermore National Lab and Los Alamos. The OP decided to award research grants with the $20 million it receives in fees from the labs. The RFP came out in June. The money will be in the campuses' hands by January or February. Proposals could be up to three years, so do not expect any new RFAs.
- The OP is going to open a new office: the Proposition Application Review Center. That is the group that will handle all aspects of peer review that deal with the OP and the Office of Research.
- The Academic Senate told the OP that it must put the multi-campus research units up for peer review and defund some of them to free up money for those that are doing cutting edge research. There will be an open competition for all of them except an observatory and the White Mountain Research Station. The draft RFP should be on the website now. The six categories are: international collaborations, California issues, arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, biological and health sciences, emerging science and technology especially physical sciences and engineering.
- There was discussion about the professional doctorate (e.g., doctor of physical therapy, doctor of audiology) and whether the UC should be involved in awarding those doctorates.
- In order to protect animal researchers, there is a new law in which people are not allowed to post where academic researchers and their families live and where the researcher works. They are trying to strengthen the law's language on the intent to cause harm.
- A University of Tennessee professor will be imprisoned for 118 years for violating the terms of the government contract he was working under. He employed foreign graduate students and took his laptop out of the country.

VI. CRF Approval

Action: Committee approved the following courses:

- WCH 221: U.S./A Literature
- MEAM 211: Nonlinear Controls

XI. Strategic Academic Planning

- Chair Leppert asked that committee members submit their comments to Committee Assistant Simrin Takhar by Friday, October 17. Committee's formal response to DivCo is required by Monday, October 20.
- This document is a roadmap for how resources are going to be constrained
- The most controversial component of the SAP is the research pillars. What if your research area doesn't fit into one of the pillars? Does that mean the university won't put resources towards it? Do you need to modify your research to fit one of the pillars? There are discussions in the document on what defines a Bylaw 55 unit. How do we structure the Schools and the flow of resources?
- The recommendations in the document advocate a move towards School-specific allocation. With the structure we have now, and considering how our groups and programs are still loosely defined, the graduate groups might be left out of the resource allocation.
- Many SAP committee members think that the discussion on pillars lacks substance. It falls short on research and on science and engineering. Research areas should not be a popularity contest.
- DivCo got this document on very short notice. The Chancellor wants to get it done quickly. This is cause for concern as this document deserves more time for review.
- Faculty should have been informed by the Administration as to which parts of the document specifically affect them. Is this a meaningful document, or something that will gather dust and brought out in the future to justify something somebody wants to do?

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, October 29, 2008 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 460 – Kolligian Library

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION		ITEM
Information	I.	**Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert*
Action	II.	**Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from October 15 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/October 29)* • CRF Approval – CSE 275 Matrix Computation *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/October 29/CRF – CSE 275)*
Discussion	III.	**Report on the Professional Doctorate** GRC's response to DivCo required by November 3 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resource/Professional Doctorate)*
Discussion	IV.	**GRC Call for Proposals (Research and Travel Grants)** *(Last year's Call document posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources)*
Discussion	V.	**School of Management Proposal** GRC's response to DivCo required by November 21 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	VI.	**Long Range Development Plan Draft** GRC's response to DivCo required before December 1 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	VII.	**UC Accountability Framework Draft** GRC's response to DivCo required by November 21 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
October 29, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, October 29, 2008, in Room 460 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

- Chair Leppert asked the committee if it wanted to change the November meeting dates to November 5 and November 12, or, keep the current schedule of November 12 and 26. Committee Assistant Simrin Takhar will electronically poll the members after today's meeting.

III. Report on the Professional Doctorate

- A committee member stated that the report was well written and offered excellent recommendations.
- Senate Bill 724 (enacted in 2005) authorized the California State University to offer the Doctor of Education degree. A committee member pointed out that in the past, CSU could offer these programs jointly with the UC. By granting the CSU the power to independently offer a doctorate, this is a way of taking control of the process and circumventing the master plan.
- There was some discussion about the accreditation process for these professional doctorates. There could be legal issues in the future.
- There will be a committee to consider on a case by case basis which degrees are appropriate for CSU, which are appropriate for joint degree programs, and which should be the domain of the UC. The composition of this committee is important as the pedagogy should be sound. We do not want a lot of programs being constructed just because they were economically expedient only to end up with poor quality programs with the UC's name attached.
- A committee member mentioned the need for safeguards that would protect the UC's existing Ph.D atmosphere. A committee member pointed out that the document did not mention that the programs would be reviewed by the Academic Senate.

Action: Chair Leppert will put the committee's comments together and distribute a draft for approval.

IV. GRC Call for Proposals (Research and Travel Grants)

- There was some discussion on how GRC awarded grants last year. There were two reviewers per proposal. Those reviewers reported their recommendations to the committee as a whole. One of the two reviewers was from the same School as the PI.
- The committee discussed several possible changes to the Call for Proposals document: strengthening the language to read that proposals in excess of $5,000 will not be considered, restricting the number of larger grants funded, restricting the dollar amount of the larger grants, awarding one grant per person as opposed to one per proposal, restricting the award to assistant professors, requiring PIs to be more explicit about other sources of funding, requiring PIs to include evidence of having previously tried to secure funding and being unsuccessful, and changing the submission deadline to February 2.

Action: Chair Leppert will put the committee's suggestions together and distribute a draft for approval.

V. Consent Calendar

--Approval of Minutes from October 15 meeting:
Action: Tabled until the next meeting.

--CRF Approval. CSE 275 Matrix Computation:
Action: CRF subcommittee requested returning the CRF back to the Graduate Group to fix the inconsistency between lab and lecture hours. Committee as a whole agreed to approve the CRF subject to this change being made. Upon receiving the corrected CRF, Committee Assistant Takhar will forward it to UGC. GRC does not need to deliberate on it again.

VI. School of Management Proposal

- Committee members are concerned with typos, misspellings, and grammatical errors.
- Chair Leppert suggested reviewing this proposal in conjunction with the CCGA handbook. The handbook lists the criteria for reviewing programs and what is expected in proposal documents. (The CCGA handbook is posted on the GRC portion of the Academic Senate's website)
- A committee member suggested seeking the advice of other UC campuses that have management schools.
- Engineering is prominent in the proposal. The idea seems to be to try to leverage the faculty resources we already have. It would be beneficial for engineering, but would this make for a good management school?

- UC Merced will have to distinguish its management school from all the others in the UC system. If the proposal go to CCGA for review, it has to stand up to rigorous analysis.
- Chair Leppert announced that this item will be placed on next meeting's agenda for further discussion.

VII. Long Range Development Plan

- Chair Leppert asked committee members to review the Plan. Item will be placed on next meeting's agenda.

VIII. UC Accountability Framework

- President Yudof is publishing an accountability report card on how the different campuses are performing.
- It is still in draft form so we have the chance to provide input on what they should measure. It is important that UC Merced not be short changed by the type of metrics that are being used. For example, it could be suggested that the framework report on the number of research dollars per faculty rather than per campus.
- There was some discussion as to whether the amount of papers published is a good measure of academic excellence. We could suggest that the framework break it up by rank because our assistant professors probably get more research dollars than colleagues of comparable rank.

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, November 12, 2008 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 232 – Kolligian Library

Call-in Information: 1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#
All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION		ITEM
Information	I.	**Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert*
Action	II.	**Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from October 29 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/November 12)*
Discussion	III.	**WASC Requirements for Graduate Courses** *Presentation by Laura Martin, Faculty Development and Assessment Coordinator & WASC Coordinator*
Discussion	IV.	**School of Management Proposal** GRC's response to DivCo required by November 21 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	V.	**UC Accountability Framework Draft** GRC's response to DivCo required by November 21 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	VI.	**Education Abroad Program Business Plan** GRC's response to DivCo required before December 1 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	VII.	**GRC Call for Proposals (Research and Travel Grants)** *(Last year's Call document posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources)*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
November 12, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, November 12, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Nothing to report.

III. Consent Calendar

Minutes from October 29, 2008 meeting. Item will be placed on next week's agenda.

IV. WASC Presentation

Dr. Laura Martin, Faculty Development and Assessment Coordinator and WASC Coordinator
Karen Dunn-Haley, Faculty Development Coordinator

PowerPoint presentation posted on ucmcrops.

Before the presentation, there was a brief question/comment and answer period between committee members and Martin and Dunn-Haley.

Comment: WASC wants to implement a Substantive Change policy that would require new graduate programs to go through WASC approval as well as CCGA approval.
Response: That is accurate. Every new undergraduate and graduate degree program will have to go through this process. In the case of graduate programs, there should be a great deal of redundancy with the CCGA material that you are already producing. We are here to help you replicate that and get it ready for WASC. While you are applying to CCGA, you should be simultaneously letting WASC know so you can get on their schedule and apply for substantive change. No program should be launched before WASC and CCGA approval is obtained.

Question: Isn't faculty concerned that WASC has so much control over curriculum and whether we can have new majors and graduate programs?
Answer: Yes. We are here to support you. WASC is not evaluating the content of your program. They are checking whether UC Merced has the infrastructure in place that is being asked for in the report. (UC Merced is going through the Capacity and

Preparatory Review process which will be followed by the Educational Effectiveness review for the campus's initial accreditation) The substantive change is showing that UC Merced has the infrastructure in place to enable educational effectiveness. The federal government, specifically the Department of Education, asked WASC and the accreditation agencies to be more stringent about new degree programs. Our accrediting agency was set up by universities to avoid having the Department of Education regulating us directly.

Question: How long will it take for new programs to get approved?
Answer: As an example, Anthropology is applying under fast track review. If it gets approved, then for the next four years, any other new degree programs will be expedited in 1-45 days. Anthropology will be reviewed in March and we will know shortly thereafter. If we have expedited status, we can start getting programs through.

Question: Is this being imposed on other UC campuses?
Answer: We are not yet accredited so all our programs in effect are new degree programs. Those universities that have long standing accreditation and a significant number of approved programs do not have to jump through the same hoops we do. A couple of things can trigger substantive change review: a change in modality, if more than 50% of your class is online, and if more than 50% of your program is taught at another campus location more than 25 miles from campus.

There was some discussion about the role of GRC in approving graduate courses. GRC's role is to set the policy. Chair Leppert suggested that GRC can amend its CRF policy to include WASC requirements and circulate it to the Schools.

Dr. Martin stated that Dr. Sam Traina will lead the development of program learning outcomes for the over-arching umbrella IIGP program. There will be one set of learning outcomes that covers all the graduate programs as they currently exist. Learning outcomes will be developed as graduate groups go through the process of becoming a degree granting program. When faculty members develop courses, they are asked to think how the course relates to the program learning outcomes.

There was some concern among committee members that the graduate groups are not aware of accreditation and graduate programs. Dunn-Haley will inform the WASC steering committee that communication is a prevailing concern.

From now on, whenever a course is taught, there needs to be student learning outcomes in the syllabus. GRC can be the gatekeeper for new courses. This will reflect well on UC Merced's accreditation effort.

A policy needs to be established for the graduate groups that currently exists at the undergraduate level: creating a repository for syllabi where faculty members can deposit their syllabi. This needs to be done every semester that a course is taught.

If UC Merced fails to receive accreditation, the federal government will not award grants (including Pell grants) to our undergraduates. The lack of accreditation could also have negative implications for international graduate students in terms of homeland security.

There was some discussion about accreditation deadlines. The timeline is posted on UC Merced's accreditation website: http://accreditation.ucmerced.edu/.

A committee member inquired how difficult is the concurrent submission requirement to CCGA and WASC. Dunn-Haley answered that there is no requirement that it be concurrent but it would probably be desirable from the faculty's perspective to have both approval processes going at the same time.

V. School of Management Proposal

- The committee was concerned with the typos and grammatical errors.
- The proposal discusses the opportunities for leveraging existing programs in Natural Sciences and Engineering but does not articulate which courses could be used for to fulfill the management degree requirements. The proposal mentions that there will be 10-11 units of upper division. But in Engineering and Natural Sciences, most of the upper division courses have prerequisites. The proposal makes no mention of how management students will be able to complete these prerequisites.
- The proposal mentions several programs within the management school. The committee would like to see examples of specific courses.
- There is a question as to whether the School will have the resources to deliver a management degree.
- A committee member stated that she would like to have seen more discussion in the proposal about the academic merit of the proposed degrees. The degrees should offer intellectual challenges that are worthy of a UC campus.
- There needs to be a discussion in the proposal about alternative scenarios in case the fundraising and development efforts do not succeed.
- The committee was concerned with the School's operating costs and the amount of money coming from the campus general fund. The UC budget will already be negatively affected by the systemwide cuts.
- The proposal discusses service science but there does not appear to be faculty buy-in from the existing Schools.

- Several committee members mentioned the campus's space problem. There is barely enough space for current faculty and it is believed that the new Social Sciences and Management building will be filled one year after it opens. There might not be enough room for new management hires.
- The committee would like know how the campus is prioritizing building new programs versus serving the needs of existing faculty. The proposal claims that the School of Management will help existing faculty and will propagate existing programs so it will be mutually beneficial but does not specify how.

VI. UC Accountability Draft

- The committee members felt that different metrics should be reported to make the report fairer for UC Merced. The following discussion took place:
    - Metrics such as graduate rates and retention of new freshmen do not make UC Merced look good, but other metrics like the diversity of student body and median income of parents reflect favorably on us.
    - The student to faculty ratio metric could hurt UC Merced since it is used for funding decisions. A better metric for us would be the number of courses taught per faculty member.
    - Research expenditures per faculty member (rather than total research expenditures) would be more relevant to UC Merced.
    - Instead of using Nobel Prize winners as a metric, we could suggest using the number of Young Investigator awards.
    - In terms of minority retention, a better metric for us is to show the percentage of minorities we have in each individual class. (Freshman, Sophomore, etc.)
    - The giving metric is not yet relevant for UC Merced.

Action: Chair Leppert will draft a memo and circulate among the committee for review.

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, November 26, 2008 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 326 – Kolligian Library
1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION		ITEM
Information	I.	**Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert*
Action	II.	**Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from October 29 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/November 12)* • Approval of Minutes from November 12 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/November 26)*
Action:	III.	**CRF Policy and WASC Requirements** *(current policy posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/CRF general information)*
Action	IV.	**CRF – QSB 282** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/November 26/CRF)*
Action	V.	**Request from the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC)** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Request from ITAC)*
Discussion	VI.	**Education Abroad Program Business Plan** GRC's response to DivCo required before December 1 *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	VII.	**GRC Call for Proposals (Research and Travel Grants)** *(Last year's Call document posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources)*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
November 26, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, November 26, 2008, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Nothing to report.

III. Consent Calendar

- Approval of Minutes from October 29 meeting
- Approval of Minutes from November 12 meeting

Action: Item will be placed on next meeting's agenda.

IV. CRF Policy and WASC Requirements

Revisions posted on crops

- There was some discussion whether a syllabus needs to contain program learning outcomes of the whole major. Committee members agreed that Schools are responsible for ensuring that program learning outcomes are being met in syllabi. Many of our programs are still in development and program learning outcomes are not fully defined.
- A committee member suggested adding a line that beginning in Fall 2009, syllabi will be required to show program learning outcomes. This would show WASC that while our programs are not yet developed, we are thinking about them.

Action: Chair Leppert will revise the document to include the line about requiring program learning outcomes beginning in Fall 2009. Committee voted to approve the revisions.

V. CRF – QSB 282

- Committee wanted more clarification about why this is a five unit course and how discussion depends on enrollment.
- Committee agreed that WASC requirements should be included in this CRF.

- A committee member suggested sending a memo to all faculty informing them that WASC requirements need to be included in all CRFs.
- Committee agreed that a credit policy should be discussed in a future meeting and to involve UGC in the discussion.

Action: The CRF will be sent back to the graduate group for more clarification on the five units and to request that WASC requirements be included.

VI. Request from ITAC

IT request posted on crops. GRC was asked to contribute to the memo DivCo has begun in response to IT's request. DivCo memo posted on crops.

Committee members had the following suggestions for IT:

- IT should come to the Schools for half a day and fix computer problems.
- IT needs to institute a system for measuring how well they are meeting academic needs. Currently, there is a lack of accountability.
- There needs to be better training of IT technicians. There is a lack of knowledge of Macs and Linux.
- IT needs to offer more support for research needs in terms of software and school-based licenses.
- A budget committee needs to be on the advisory committee.
- A committee member inquired about the link between the advisory committee and IT. Will the advisory committee's suggestions actually be taken into consideration by IT?

VII. Education Abroad Program Business Plan

- A committee member suggested asking for budget details so GRC can have a discussion as to how this plan impacts graduate students.

VIII. GRC Call for Proposals (Research and Travel Grants)

Revisions posted on crops.

- Committee wants to make it more explicit that proposals per faculty member cannot exceed $5,000.
- The document should require explanation as to why the proposed project cannot be supported by existing funding.
- The committee discussed graduate student funding for conference travel. It was agreed that Vice Chancellor for Research/Dean of Graduate Studies Sam Traina should attend a future meeting to discuss the following specific issues:

the possibility of expanding the total amount of graduate student funding and raising the cap, how much funding is currently available for graduate students, whether he can increase support to graduate groups in proportion to the number of students they have and let the graduate executive committees disperse the funds however they decide, provide links on the Graduate Studies website to external sources of funding, and how many non resident tuition (NRT) waivers we are getting this year and the allocation process.

Action: Committee voted to approve revisions. Chair Leppert will circulate the revised document among the committee. Chair will also draft a memo to VCR/Dean Traina to invite him to a future meeting.

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

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, December 10, 2008 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 232 – Kolligian Library
1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION		ITEM
Information	I.	**Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert* CCGA Meeting – December 2
Action	II.	**Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from October 29 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/November 12)* • Approval of Minutes from November 12 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/November 26)* • Approval of Minutes from November 26 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/December 10*
Discussion	III.	**Request from Graduate Division – Dates and Deadlines** VCR Sam Traina, 2:00 pm. *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from Graduate Division)*
Discussion	IV.	**Graduate Student Funding** VCR Sam Traina
Discussion	V.	**Procedure for Establishment of an ORU** *(Policies posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/ORU)*
Action	VI.	**CRFs** • **QSB 282** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/November 26/CRF – QSB 282)* • **QSB 280** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/December 10/CRF – QSB 280)*
Action	VII.	**CRF Policy and WASC Requirements – Final approval** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/CRF information/CRF_process_0809_final.doc)*
Action	VIII.	**GRC Call for Proposals (Research and Travel Grants) – Final approval** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Call for Proposals Call for proposals_0809.doc)*
Discussion	IX.	**Request from DivCo – Long Range Development Plan** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo)*
Discussion	X.	**Review of Psychology Program Proposal** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Graduate Groups Bylaws, Policies and Procedures)*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
December 10, 2008

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, December 10, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

December 2 CCGA Meeting:

- Due to budget cuts, this will be a difficult year to start a new program. As such, CCGA will be focusing on resource issues when it reviews proposals.
- There is a $10 million dollar incremental increase for graduate student funding. It is proportionate to the number of graduate students at each campus. UC Merced's portion is about $57,000. VCR Traina mentioned that the OP distributes the money in proportion to each campus's contribution to the total number of Ph.D. students in the UC system.
- CCGA is concerned that the money will not go directly to graduate students and has sent a memo requesting that the money be used strictly for registration fees. Dr. Traina pointed out that the mandate from the OP is that the money has to be spent on graduate students themselves.
- Academic Council is inquiring if GRC or CCGA can create a different distribution model. It will be difficult to do because it takes money away from the other campuses and they are also experiencing budget cuts. Dr. Traina mentioned that there will likely be a 10% increase in the ed and reg fee next year.
- Chair Leppert inquired of Dr. Traina what arguments we can use to change the distribution model.
    - Background: The amount of money each campus receives from the state to fund graduate students is based on a per capita basis. UC Merced has the smallest population of graduate students so it receives the smallest amount of money. The main source of funding for graduate students is T.A. appointments. In addition, UC Merced has a certain amount of fellowship money. We have three fellowship programs that are supported by funds from the OP. We are eligible for a fourth which is given out proportional to the number of Ph.D. students we have. We don't have any development funds on this campus yet towards graduate education.
- The current $10 million increment coming out of the OP does not require a match. Because our Ph.D. numbers have increased relative to the whole system,

we received more money. Dr. Traina is arguing for an increase in the allocation for UC Merced. They should make these numbers a moving window, so as we grow every year, they recalculate the distribution for the UC system. The probability of us getting more is low because the other campuses will have to agree to give it up.

- Chair Leppert mentioned that at a CAPRA meeting, the faculty asked EVC Keith Alley to consider using a portion of the indirect cost return to offset the FICA cost that we are responsible for. Dr. Traina replied that he has been speaking with the EVC about building a budget model to create a pool of money to pick up those additional costs.
- Dr. Traina mentioned that the university is required to pay ed and reg fees if you have a student on a grant. It is a requirement in the union contract around the T.A.s. Also, the state does not give us money to pay those fees. Typically, it comes from the general operating budget.
- Non resident tuition is another source of funding. Last year, we had funds for about 18 students. This is why we are adamant that students have to get off non resident tuition after two years when they advance to candidacy so the money is freed up for new students. (According to university rules, non resident tuition is only funded for students for two years.) That pot of funds is getting incrementally smaller each year. Last year's GRC discussed how to allocate this money. It was decided to distribute it equally between programs.
- One last source of money is block grants. It is discretionary aid money that can be used to support graduate students. It comes from the OP and is a per capita allocation. We get very little money in block grants. Graduate groups agreed to put their block grants in non resident tuition and that gave us enough money to bring in three non resident tuition students per graduate group.
- Dr. Traina should know by the beginning of January 2009 how many slots we will have this year. GRC can work with the graduate groups and can decide on whatever model it wants for the distribution of those dollars. It can be a universitywide policy or a graduate group policy. Chair Leppert stated that the central question is how to proportion it between graduate groups.
- Chair Leppert inquired what GRC can report back to CCGA. Dr.Traina replied that it is critical that the money goes to graduate students, not infrastructure or paying the salaries of staff members. He is in favor of something where the money is tracked to ed and reg fees. Those have to be paid somehow, as the graduate deans do not pay it.

III. <u>Request from Graduate Division – Dates and Deadlines</u>

- Dr. Traina related that the Registrar's Office wants fixed dates for these activities. These deadlines also provide important deadlines for the advancement to candidacy. A student has up until the last day of instruction in a current term to

file the completed paperwork for advancement to candidacy. That makes them eligible for non resident tuition waiver the following semester.

Action: GRC will review the Dates and Deadlines and opine at the January 14 meeting.

IV. Procedure for an Establishment of an Organized Research Unit (ORU)

- DivCo requested that GRC develop an ORU review policy in anticipation of the Biomedical Sciences Research Institute.
- Dr. Traina offered background on ORUs. UC Merced's only ORU is the Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI). ORUs have very specific rights and privileges as well as responsibilities. They can have faculty line FTEs, can offer degrees, and they can serve as the centers for grants. SNRI only has the capacity to serve as the center for a grant. ORUs no longer require approval of central administration. ORUs are campus specific (only MRUs require CCGA input). An ORU has to be a center or an institute but not all centers and institutes are ORUs. There is no formal required Senate approval for a non ORU.
- Chair Leppert pointed out that the CCGA handbook mentions things that don't require systemwide review but still should be referred to Academic Senate for consultation.
- Dr. Traina stated that the Chancellor charged him with determining if faculty are happy with the model that was originally proposed. That model is two or three years old and ought to be revisited as there are more faculty on campus now. Chair Leppert inquired whether GRC should develop a flow chart for the evaluation criteria.

Action: Chair Leppert will draft a review process and circulate to GRC members for approval. It will be discussed at the January 14 meeting with Dr. Traina.

- Dr. Traina mentioned a new requirement being imposed on faculty by Congress and the NSF. Beginning January 5, if faculty write a proposal, they are required to include a description of a formal mentoring program that they must develop for their post docs and must report on it in their annual report. (Announcements were sent out to faculty in October and a reminder will be sent) We are getting templates from other campuses as guidance. In addition, Dr. Traina is asking UC Merced's grants writer to develop a set of boilerplates faculty can use for their proposals.

V. Consent Calendar

Minutes from the October 29, November 12, and November 26 meetings.

Action: All minutes were approved.

VI. CRF Policy

At the last meeting, committee voted to approve pending revisions. Committee members had no further comments.

VII. GRC Call for Proposals

At the last meeting, committee voted to approve pending revisions. Committee members had no further comments.

VIII. CRFs

- Professor Guo requested that German Gavilan attend a future GRC meeting to discuss the development of a web-based CRF system for graduate courses. Committee Assistant Simrin Takhar will contact Gavilan and ask him to attend.

QSB 282:

- The committee discussed the issue of overlapping courses and the role of the faculty and Schools' curriculum committees in reviewing CRFs. It was agreed that graduate groups should have a body that conducts due diligence, especially in light of the WASC-required program learning outcomes.

Action: Committee approved QSB 282.

QSB 280:

- It was discovered that the language in the Academic Integrity sections of QSB 280 and QSB 282 are the same.

Action: Committee approved QSB 280 pending Professors Colvin and Ardell citing sources for their respective Academic Integrity sections. Committee Assistant Takhar will submit their revised documents to the Registrar's Office.

IX. Long Range Development Plan

- Professor Dawson suggests a stronger statement that there will not be any use of invasive species and that all plants should be native to California.
- Chair Leppert took issue with Section 4 regarding Academic Planning. GRC has stated its problems with the Strategic Academic Plan and it was not approved by faculty. Yet, this section uses the research themes contained in that Plan. Also, there is no presence of science and engineering; it is embedded in other areas. Lastly, as Professor Forte pointed out in a previous meeting, there are proprietary and labeling issues with using the term "World Heritage".

- Student Representative Lucas pointed out that Section 4 does not mention graduate studies, yet there is a subsection for undergraduate education.
- Chair Leppert mentioned that in Section 3.3, they list health science students as being enrolled last year but UC Merced does not offer a degree in health science.

X. <u>Review of Psychology Program Proposal</u>

- Professors Leppert, LiWang, and Forte will be the reviewers for the proposal. This subcommittee will make initial comments and GRC as a whole will opine at the January 14 meeting. GRC should complete its review by the end of January.

There being no further business, committee adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Committee Assistant, Simrin Takhar

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, January 14, 2009 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 324 – Kolligian Library
1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION	TIME	ITEM
Information	2:00-2:03	I. **Chair's Report from January 6 CCGA Meeting** – *Valerie Leppert*
Information	2:03-2:06	II. **UCORP Report from January 12 meeting** – *Patti LiWang*
Action	2:06-2:10	III. **Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from October 15 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2008/October 29)* • Approval of Minutes from December 10 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 14)*
Action	2:10-2:15	IV. **CRF Approval** • **BEST 226** – Nanodevice Fabrication: Bridging Research and Education *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 14/CRF – BEST 226)*
Discussion	2:15-2:20	V. **Formation of a Senate IT Committee**
Discussion	2:20-2:25	VI. **Accountability Framework** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from DivCo/ Draft Outline for May 09 Accountability Framework)*
Action	2:25-2:35	VII. **Review of Physics and Chemistry Revised Policies and Procedures** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Graduate Groups Bylaws, Policies and Procedures/Physics and Chemistry)* **Guest: VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion	2:35-2:50	VIII. **Review of Psychology Program Proposal** Report from Review Subcommittee: Leppert, LiWang, and Forte *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Graduate Groups Bylaws, Policies and Procedures/Psychological Sciences)* **Guest: VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/ Action	2:50-3:05	IX. **WASC Review and GRC policies** **GRC's response required by January 30** *(WASC info posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/WASC Accreditation/Capacity Prepatory Review report)* **Guest: VCR Sam Traina**
Action	3:05-3:10	X. **Request from Graduate Division – Approval of Dates and Deadlines** **Guest: VCR Sam Traina** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from Graduate Division)*

Discussion	3:10-3:20	XI. Graduate Student Support Update Guest: VCR Sam Traina
Discussion	3:20-3:30	XII. Chancellor's Discretionary Funds Guest: VCR Sam Traina

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
January 14, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, January 14, 2009, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Nothing to report.

III. Consent Calendar

Minutes from October 15, 2008 and December 10, 2008 meetings.

Action: Committee approved both sets of minutes.

IV. CRF Approval

BEST 226

- Committee members pointed out that the course description is the same for both the undergraduate and graduate version. Course description is also vague; a committee member suggested the instructor use some key words from the weekly topics section in the course description.
- The CRF lists the effective date as January 1 which needs to be changed.
- The course instructor had to iterate several times with the Registrar's office because the course is co-listed with an undergraduate course. The Registrar is being strict on making sure the CRFs are consistent and that they list both courses.

Action: Chair Leppert will contact the course instructor to make these changes. The revised CRF will be electronically distributed to GRC for an email vote.

V. Formation of a Senate IT Committee

- Background: The Academic Senate was asked by the Chancellor to nominate a faculty member to serve on an IT advisory committee. GRC provided input on what issues the committee should look at.
- DivCo has declined to appoint a faculty member to the advisory committee because there have been faculty representatives to the committee in the past and the result was unsuccessful.

- DivCo is proposing that the Senate form its own IT committee to provide focused input. It will let COC find members to serve. The IT committee's recommendations will go from DivCo to the Provost or the Chancellor.
- Chair Leppert asked if GRC recommends forming an IT Senate committee and to whom it should report.

Action: GRC voted in favor of forming an IT Senate Committee and decided that it should report directly to DivCo.

VI. Accountability Framework

- Chair Leppert requested that committee members send her their comments by Friday, January 16.

VII. Review of Physics and Chemistry Revised Policies and Procedures

Changes:

- A set of rules has been added if students want to be granted waivers on any graduate courses.
- Physics course requirements have been changed to: three core courses, three electives, and no compulsory requirement to present a seminar. (It used to be: five core courses, two electives, and a compulsory seminar presentation.)

Action: Committee voted to approve revisions.

VIII. Review of Psychology Program Proposal

- Reviewer #1:
    - The group did a very thorough job and there is no issue with the academics. They are proposing three tracks and they all seem synergistic. In terms of the CCGA review criteria on faculty size and experience, the graduate group has two senior faculty and four junior faculty. They have already delivered a lot of the graduate courses listed in the proposal. In terms of the CCGA review criteria on applicant pool and placement, psychology is the second most popular major on campus after biology. Their graduate student to faculty ratio is consistent with the rest of the UC system. The main issue of concern is facilities and budgets. They claim they will run out of space by 2010 even with the new building. Also, their FTE scenario doesn't reflect the current budget situation. CAPRA will suggest that the graduate group revise the proposal to make it in line with current budget projections.

- Reviewer #2:
  - There is concern about the graduate group having a couple of hundred undergraduates plus a graduate program with only six faculty. Reviewer #2 shared Reviewer #1's concern about budget issues and has the same request that the group revise their proposal to reflect the current budget situation. Reviewer #2 also pointed out that some of the numbers don't add up for the units and there is no explanation.
- For every program proposal CCGA reviews, it is asking the campus for a letter that documents whether the resources actually exist for their programs.

Action: Chair Leppert will combine the subcommittee's comments and distribute to GRC as a whole for approval. GRC's comments will then go to the Psychology graduate program along with CAPRA's comments.

IX. WASC Review and GRC Policies

- It was suggested that UC Davis's program review policy can be edited to make it apply to UC Merced and submit it to GRC for approval. If GRC approves it, the document could be used as a piece of evidence for WASC.
- It is a UC requirement for every campus to have a formal program review policy for established programs, therefore, UC Merced needs to formulate one.
- Committee members agreed that even if UC Merced doesn't have a program review policy in place by the WASC deadline of January 30, we should still show WASC that we are working on one.
- A set of overarching graduate student learning objectives for the Ph.D. and M.A. is being created.
- The Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities is posted on the Graduate Division website. The document is from UCLA. It was suggested that GRC look at it. Some campuses have a one or two page document on graduate mentoring responsibilities and perhaps GRC should decide if it wants the same.
- GRC is lacking in policies and by researching what Graduate Councils do on other UC campuses, we could see what policies our committee needs. It was suggested that GRC could write a policy around its fellowship review and awarding procedures from last year. A committee member suggested GRC could put into policy general items such as the assembling of subcommittees and how they operate.
- Graduate group bylaws might have to be reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with the Graduate Advisor's Handbook. There also may be topics that the groups should address from a WASC standpoint.

- Chair Leppert requested that committee members vocalize any suggestions they have on how GRC policies need to be changed or on new policies that should be adopted.

X. Request from Graduate Division – Approval of Dates and Deadlines

- VCR Traina clarified for committee members a few items regarding advancement to candidacy.

Action: Committee voted to approve Dates and Deadlines

XI. Graduate Student Support Update

- Committee members were given the current application sheet that listed domestic, international, and total applicants in the nine graduate areas. The campus is four students from where it was last year and has a higher percentage of domestic students this year.
- GRC perhaps should opine on two issues: a policy for the dispersal of NRT slots (there will be nine slots for new NRT this year); and whether NRT waivers should be restricted to international students pursing a Ph.D. as opposed to just an M.A.
- Chair Leppert requested that the NRT allocation issue be placed on the next meeting's agenda. The graduate groups have been asked by GRC to send the committee their NRT allocation policies. GRC might suggest to them that they need a policy in place if a faculty member is getting a waiver from another group and if the NRTs are being allocated according to seniority of the faculty or quality of the student.

XII. Chancellor's Discretionary Funds

- The Chancellor has proposed to fund what he calls "blue sky research". He wants to put in $50,000 in the fund this year and $100,000 next year. He wants this money to lead to the submittal of future competitive grant proposals. We have a half time grant writer who was hired to help. The grant writer might conduct grant writing workshops and prepare boilerplate materials that faculty can use for NSF proposals.
- The Chancellor has asked DivCo for its opinion and would also like GRC's opinion as to what would be the most important way to invest the research dollars.
- Some committee members expressed concern that the money is being put towards the grant writer rather than the supporting of research.
- Some committee members preferred the grant writer's time be increased to 100% so she can help with the larger grant proposals.

- Committee members discussed the lack of staff on campus that can fix lab equipment. There are also no grants for infrastructure.
- A committee member inquired if we could alter existing staff members' job descriptions so that they could help with lab maintenance and that we are not breaking union rules by doing so. Chair Leppert requested that this issue be placed on the agenda for the next few meetings, as there are other issues around infrastructure support. The Senate Committee Chairs are going to meet with the Administration and the Chancellor soon so we can generate ideas about what actions the campus can take right now to support the research enterprise. Another issue is the external contracts that are done for lab renovations that cost much more than they should.
- Committee members discussed getting a machine shop.

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

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, January 28, 2009 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 232 – Kolligian Library
1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION	TIME	ITEM
Information		**I. Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert*
Action		**II. Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from January 14 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 28)*
Discussion/Action		**III. Request from Graduate Division – Approval of Dates and Deadlines** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Requests from Graduate Division/ Graduate_09-10_Deadlines)*
Discussion/ Action		**IV. Review of Psychology Program Proposal** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Graduate Groups Bylaws, Policies and Procedures/Psychological Sciences)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/ Action		**V. WASC/GRC Policy Review** **GRC's response required by January 30** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/WASC Accreditation/Capacity Prepatory Review report)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion		**VI. Washington Advisory Group Report** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 28)*
Discussion/Action		**VII. Graduate Student Support Update/NRT allocation** **VCR Sam Traina** *(Graduate Group NRT policies posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Graduate Groups Bylaws, Policies and Procedures/NRT Policies)*
Discussion/Action		**VIII. Chancellor's Discretionary Funds** **VCR Sam Traina** *(Draft memo posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 28)*
Discussion/Action		**IX. QSB proposal – indirect cost return** **VCR Sam Traina** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 28/ Request from QSB_ICR and CampusResearchSupportPolicyReport3-1-05)*

Discussion/Action **X. CRU Policy**

VCR Traina

(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 28/CRU_Policy_Proposal and Process for Establishing CRU)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
January 28, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, January 28, 2009, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

GRC Call for Proposals

- The GRC Call for Proposals deadline of February 1, 2009 falls on a Sunday. Committee agreed to move deadline to Monday, February 2. An announcement will be sent to Academic Senate members via the Academic Senate listserve.
- A committee member suggested changing the deadline to "1st Monday in February".

New GRC meeting time

- A committee member has a class conflict and can no longer attend the current meeting time. Chair Leppert asked Committee Assistant Takhar to poll committee members on other days and times.

III. Request from Graduate Division – Dates and Deadlines

The Graduate Division previously submitted 09-10 deadlines and a revised version of the 08-09 deadlines.

- Revised version of 08-09 deadlines specify that filing for candidacy is only for Ph.D. students. Last day to file is one month prior to the start of the next term.
- A committee member pointed out some column alignment errors and typos on both sets of deadlines.

Action: Committee voted to approve 2009-2010 deadlines and the revised 2008-2009 deadlines. VCR Traina will have the errors fixed.

IV. Review of Psychology Program Proposal

- CAPRA has now reviewed the proposal. CAPRA drafted a letter detailing what it wants the graduate group to clarify and change. Letter is available on crops.
- CAPRA is also requesting a letter from the EVC/Provost, as CCGA will be reviewing the resources issue carefully.

Action: Chair Leppert will attach CAPRA's comments to GRC's and ask the graduate group to revise the proposal. She will also request that the graduate group

include on a cover sheet the revisions they make and where the revisions are located in the proposal.

V. WASC/GRC Policy Review

- At the last GRC meeting, the committee discussed whether it should construct policies based on other campuses to fill in GRC's policy gaps. Dr. Laura Martin from the WASC committee said it was sufficient if GRC creates a cover letter that identifies which issues the committee doesn't have a policy for. Example: UCM has no program review policy because we do not have any graduate programs eligible for review yet.
- The actual WASC deadline is in March rather than the previously stated January 30.
- A committee member reiterated that if GRC consents, UC Davis's program review policy could be edited to make it applicable to UCM.
- In regards to the substantive change issue, a committee member was told by an administrator at UC Santa Cruz that that campus considers M.A. s equivalent to B.A.s in terms of evaluative process. We will lump them together with doctoral degrees. We will not have to have site visits. It will still cost us a $1,000 per degree to get them to evaluate and approve a degree.
- A committee member inquired if GRC should request that Nancy Ochsner provide assistance to graduate programs with their proposal process. It was suggested that GRC send Ochsner and the Graduate Division a memo asking that both groups provide what resources they have in assisting graduate groups.

Action: Chair Leppert and Committee Assistant Takhar will collect GRC's policies for WASC. In the cases where GRC lacks policies, GRC will construct them. For policies that are not possible to create, Chair Leppert will note them in the cover letter and explain to WASC that we will be developing them later.

VI. Washington Advisory Group Report

- A committee member inquired if GRC has purview and was told that it does because this is research related, but GRC has no purview over medical education.
- A committee member pointed out that WAG's proposal is not something GRC has to stick to, but it may be something we can work off of to develop a vision on how we can eventually get to a medical school. We can provide criticism as well as propose alternative models. One model that was proposed concentrated on public health and related research.
- The committee discussed types of research, types of faculty, and how it relates to the medical school.
- The report discusses the pre-baccalaureate biomedical education track for undergraduates. It is not clear what careers that would lead to. Some individuals

at UCM have a more interdisciplinary vision, e.g., work with the Psychological Sciences program on issues related to health sciences other than biology and physiology. Others on campus have also been discussing a Bachelor's program in public health that can be related to environmental issues.

Action: Chair Leppert asked the committee to send her their comments on the WAG report before the February 2nd DivCo meeting

VII. Graduate Student Support/NRT Allocation

GRC requested the NRT policies from all the graduate groups to determine if it needs to establish a campus-wide policy, e.g., restrict NRT allocation to Ph.D. students only.

- The graduate groups' policies seem to be: allocate according to faculty need, allocate according to student quality, and a hybrid of the two. None of the graduate groups explicitly prohibited NRTs for M.A. students, but many of them stated that Ph.D. students have a high priority.
- By this date next year, we should have closer to 20 NRT slots. OP does not give out money for NRT. This year, UCM gets $56,000 that OP gave out for graduate training. That will be used for NRT this year as it was last year.
- A committee member suggested that GRC establish a monitoring mechanism to track how the money is being spent, specifically, it could determine whether the receiving students are mostly Ph.D. students or M.A. It was suggested that Maria Tinoco would have that information.
- A committee member suggested that instead of specifying to the graduate groups what their allocation policies should be, GRC could offer some criteria for them such as a ranking system.

Action: Committee agreed to let graduate groups have their own policies.

VIII. Chancellor's Discretionary Funds

- At the last GRC meeting, the committee discussed whether the grant writer's time should be increased to 100% to help with large grant initiatives. GRC's other main concern was the lack of staff available to support shared research infrastructure.
- A committee member inquired whether GRC should state that it is willing to help the Chancellor identify some priorities.
- DivCo already voiced to the Chancellor that it would like faculty review on how the money is spent.

Action: Chair Leppert will draft a memo to DivCo regarding GRC's two main priorities: increase the grant writer's time to 100% and that the additional increment of funding should be used to hire technical staff to support shared research infrastructure.

IX. QSB Proposal – Indirect Cost Return

- The QSB graduate group sent GRC a memo (posted on crops) requesting that each fiscal year, a certain percentage of indirect cost return funds be returned to the Schools to facilitate research activities and programs.
- A committee member stated that while it is not GRC's policy to set, the committee should develop a position in the next month.
- This issue was discussed in last academic year's GRC. The faculty was presented with a list of priorities by the EVC/Provost as to what they wanted to spend the opportunity funds on. S&E II has a very small square footage and the idea was to take out a $10 million loan. The debt service on the loan will come completely out of the opportunity funds. A committee member was told that it will take 20-25 years to pay off the loan.
- About 30% of overhead goes to opportunity funds.
- A committee member suggested two things: Obtain the distribution models that exist on other UC campuses (for example, UC Berkeley did an intensive two year study of the campus and what it costs to do research. They have a model for the distribution of that money) and invite Budget Director Kathy Jefferds to a GRC meeting, as she is committed to developing a distribution model.
- A committee member brought up the QSB proposal to EVC/Provost Alley as well as some other issues on indirect cost return. Alley will look at the rate at which UCM is building up funds versus the projected rate.
- GRC should explore a distribution model with a phase-in period.
- A committee member stated that GRC should demonstrate that these funds will bring more funding to the campus. We can gather data and examples of grants that have been denied because of the campus's lack of research infrastructure.

Action: VCR Traina will try to obtain the distribution models from the other UC campuses.

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

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, February 11, 2009 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm
Room 324 – Kolligian Library
1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION	TIME	ITEM
Information		I. **Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert* February 3rd CCGA Meeting
Information		II. **UCORP Report** – *Patti LiWang* February 9th UCORP Meeting
Action		III. **Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from January 14 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 28)* • Approval of Minutes from January 28 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/February 11)*
Discussion/Action		IV. **CRF – QSB 207** CRF subcommittee: Professors Dunham, Guo, and Ghosh *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/February 11/CRF-QSB 207)*
Discussion		V. **Senate Awards** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/ Senate Awards)*
Discussion/Action		VI. **NRT Allocation to Graduate Groups** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/ Graduate Groups Bylaws, Policies and Procedures/NRT Policies - submitted Spring 2009)*
Discussion/Action		VII. **WAG Report** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Medical Education/ Washington Advisory Group Final Report.pdf)*
Discussion/Action		VIII. **WASC/GRC Policy Review** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/WASC Accreditation)*
Discussion/Action		IX. **Research Infrastructure/US Congress Stimulus Package (NSF MRI)**
Discussion/Action		X. **CRU Policy** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/CRU/CRU_Policy_Proposal and Process for Establishing CRU)*
Discussion/Action		XI. **QSB Proposal – Indirect Cost Return** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Indirect Cost Return/Request from QSB_ICR and CampusResearchSupportPolicyReport3-1-05)*

Continued on page 2

Discussion/Action — **XII. Senate IT Committee**

(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Request from ITAC/UCCC campus comparison grid.pdf)

Discussion — **XIII. GRC Travel and Research Grants**

(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/ Research & Travel Grants 2008-2009)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
February 11, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 2:00 pm on Wednesday, February 11, 2009, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Leppert reported on the February 3 CCGA meeting:

- They are concerned about the reduction in support for graduate students. A couple of years ago, the UC committed to additional support for graduate students. They also committed the campuses to matching that support. Currently, there is no tracking mechanism ensure that the money going to campuses is actually going to graduate student support or that the campuses are actually matching the support.
- CCGA was considering approval of the nursing program at UC Davis as was Academic Council. UC Davis had a $100 million grant. There was concern about the resources available to deliver that program and there was controversy about passing it in this budget climate. It passed by one vote out of Academic Council. That could have ramifications for the proposed medical school at UC Merced.

III. February 9 UCORP Report – Professor Patti LiWang

- There is now a system for UC teleconferencing for all seminars. A subscription is required. The equipment needed is a camera, FireWire, and two computers in the room. Anyone in the UC system can log on and watch the seminar. There is also a chat room where participants can type questions. Professor LiWang is interested in obtaining that same capability at UC Merced's Castle facility. The committee members also discussed the merits of having this technology on the main campus.
    - GRC will write a memo to the campus IT office to request that this new teleconferencing technology be made available and urge them to adopt it for UC Merced as soon as possible. Professor LiWang will send an email to Chair Leppert with the specifics of the technology.
- The UCORP chair announced that he wants the committee to be more proactive in helping the UC campuses make their research better. He wants to know about any issues that campuses are having with its administrations and grants offices.

GRC Committee members had the following discussion in response:

- Some committee members felt that research is a low priority for UC Merced's administration. For example, a CRU policy was drafted four years ago but was never implemented because it got held up at various stages.
- The committee discussed indirect cost return being used to pay for a bond to expand S&E II.
- A committee member heard that the economic stimulus package in Congress contains an MRI line item for NSF. Our chances of being funded for these kinds of opportunities are diminished due to the lack of research infrastructure on this campus.
- Committee members discussed rates of overhead on grants and how they are not applied consistently on this campus. Chair Leppert asked that this issue be placed on the next GRC meeting's agenda to discuss with VCR Traina.

IV. CRF – QSB 207 (Physical Biochemistry)

- The committee requested that the instructor make the following changes: amend the enrollment limit (instructor will first check with the Graduate Group on the possibility of getting a grader), amend the course description to state the difference between the undergraduate course and the graduate course, remove the prerequisite listed for the graduate course, amend the grading information in the course description, and edit the course description to make it under 50 words.

Action: Instructor will make suggested changes, email revised CRF to Committee Assistant Takhar, and Takhar will distribute to GRC for an electronic vote.

V. Senate Awards

The committee was asked to review last year's GRC criteria for the three Senate Awards: the Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award, the Award for Distinguished Early Career Research (untenured faculty), and the Award for Distinction in Research (tenured faculty).

- Committee members suggested a change to the Distinction in Research Award and Distinguished Early Career Research Award in regards to the additional materials that GRC will ask from the finalists: delete "(e.g., course syllabi, teaching evaluations, published textbooks, articles on pedagogy, additional letters of support, and other evidence of exceptional instructional activities)." These materials are applicable to the Teaching Award, not the Research awards.

VI. NRT Allocation

There are nine NRT slots to allocate this year and the campus will receive 20 next year.

- Committee members discussed various models: allocate one slot to each of the nine graduate groups; allocate slots proportional to the number of each group's international applicants (groups that have more international applicants will get more slots); and make NRT slots into competitive fellowships. Committee agreed that a policy needs to be put into place for the future. It was decided that a competitive fellowship model might not be feasible for either Graduate Groups or GRC due to time constraints.

Action: The item will be placed on the next meeting's agenda for further discussion.

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

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

Cmte. to approve

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE · Merced Division

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, February 18, 2009 3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
Room 324 – Kolligian Library
1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION	TIME	ITEM
Information		I. **Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert*
Action		II. **Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from January 14 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/January 28)* • Approval of Minutes from January 28 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/February 11)* • Approval of Minutes from February 11 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/February 18/ Draft Feb 11 minutes_rev.doc)*
Discussion/Action		III. **NRT Allocation to Graduate Groups** **VCR Sam Traina** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/ Graduate Groups Bylaws, Policies and Procedures/NRT Policies - submitted Spring 2009)*
Discussion/Action		IV. **TA Policy** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/February 18/Grad TA Semester Limit GRC memo.pdf)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		V. **WAG Report** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Medical Education/ Washington Advisory Group Final Report.pdf)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		VI. **WASC/GRC Policy Review** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/WASC Accreditation)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		VII. **Research Infrastructure/US Congress Stimulus Package (NSF MRI)** **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		VIII. **CRU Policy** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/CRU/CRU_Policy_Proposal and Process for Establishing CRU)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		IX. **QSB Proposal – Indirect Cost Return** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Indirect Cost Return/Request from QSB_ICR and CampusResearchSupportPolicyReport3-1-05)*

VCR Sam Traina

Discussion/Action	**X. Uniform Policy on Overhead Rate Exceptions** **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action	**XI. Senate IT Committee** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Request from ITAC/UCCC campus comparison grid.pdf)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion	**XII. GRC Travel and Research Grants** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/ Research & Travel Grants 2008-2009)* **VCR Sam Traina**

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
February 18, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 3:00 pm on Wednesday, February 18, 2009, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Nothing to report.

III. Consent Calendar

- Minutes from the January 14, January 28, and February 11 meetings.

Action: Minutes were approved by committee.

IV. WAG Report

A memo to DivCo was drafted based on GRC members' comments on the WAG report.

- Committee members discussed the financial implications of a medical school.
- Committee discussed the Biomedical undergraduate major. Some members were concerned that this major is being developed as a biology-focused effort that would draw resources away from other programs. It would be more preferable to develop a major that is distributed around the campus, e.g., environmental health impacts or the influence on culture.

Action: Committee approved the draft memo.

V. NRT Allocation to Graduate Groups

Committee members had previously asked for data on who would be getting continued support next year. There are nine NRT slots to be allocated this year.

- Block grant money (comes from OP) and Graduate Division fellowships (discretionary money set aside to cover NRT) are the two sources of funding UC Merced has been using for NRT. Last year, the Budget Office found some discretionary money that faculty could swap their start up funds for to allow them to pay NRT.
- There is $150,000 available that can be used to swap out with faculty start up funds. If faculty want to commit their start up funds, there would be enough for

an additional ten international students. GRC would then have to develop guidelines on who will be allowed to swap and how to prioritize the allocation.

- Graduate Group Chairs in SSHA were polled as to whether they'd be willing to see a reduction in the number of NRT students in exchange for allowing their NRT to be three years rather than the current two years.
- A committee member mentioned that the Graduate Councils on other UC campuses make the NRT allocation to the graduate groups and let the groups decide how they are going to use them.
- A committee member suggested that UC Merced's position that it is illegal to pay NRT for TAs out of the instructional budget is debatable.
- There was some discussion about NRT support for students on grants – most UC campuses do not allow it; UC Merced does. UC Davis's policy for international students on a grant is that they buy out 25% of NRT and faculty pays for the remaining 75%. A committee member pointed out that other campuses are trying to drive faculty to include NRT on their grant budgets. That might be something GRC could examine in the future to encourage our faculty to incorporate NRT in their grant proposals.

Action: Committee voted to allocate one NRT slot to each graduate group this year and to develop a model in later discussions for the allocation of future NRT slots. In regards to the swapping of faculty start up funds, GRC can ask the faculty if it is willing to do this, and if we get more than ten NRT slots, GRC can develop a swap policy.

VI. TA Policy (Request from School of Natural Sciences)

Request posted on crops.

- The policy is in the Graduate Advisor's Handbook. Students can TA for a total of twelve semesters and only four semesters after advancing to candidacy.
- Committee discussed the graduate groups's bylaws and the policy at other UC campuses.

Action: Committee voted to remove the four semesters requirement from the policy.

VII. Research Infrastructure/US Congress Stimulus Package (NSF MRI)

- NSF funding has gone up by $3 billion, NIH $10 billion, and DOE Office of Science $2.8 billion. They are being told to look for and fund proposals that have already been reviewed and have just fallen below the ranking.
- There is also facilities money in NSF and NIH which there has not been since 1996. This means that faculty can apply for renovation of buildings.
- NSF has decided to waive the cost sharing requirement on MRIs.

DRAFT

- According to the Director of NSF, there will be no special calls for NSF, NIH, and DOE Office of Science. While the stimulus bill is loosely written, it appears that existing programs will be funded at a greater percentage.
- A portion of the stimulus money that is going to California could be used for research initiatives such as the California Institute for Climate Solutions.
- Training grant programs will also get an increase in funding with NSF.
- As VCR Traina receives data and confirmation of the details of the stimulus bill, he will disseminate funding opportunities to faculty.

VIII. <u>Uniform Policy on Overhead Rate Exceptions</u>

Issue was discussed at the last GRC meeting and the committee wanted further clarification.

- UC Merced follows OP's policy. Junior faculty are told that we will generally not waive indirect costs.
- A mixed rate policy is allowed at every UC campus but nobody does it because it is not affordable. Our average return on indirect cost for all sponsored projects at UC Merced is only 22%.
- A committee member brought up that he is paying full indirect costs on some grants but he is receiving none of it back. He wants to generate a policy where the indirect costs would come back. He suggested encouraging the faculty to use mixed rates or off campus rates when possible. For example, the NSF has a $350,000 program and faculty can turn a percentage of that into research rather than paying interest for a building. Another committee member pointed out that if a faculty member's grant has direct charges on the facilities side, then it qualifies for off campus rates.
- It was pointed out that GRC can make recommendations but it is ultimately the Provost that decides the distribution of indirect cost funds.
- It was suggested that faculty should also look at expenses associated with personnel. If more than 25% of a student or faculty member's salary is attributed to an off campus activity, they qualify for the reduced rate.

IX. <u>GRC Travel and Research Grants</u>

- Chair Leppert will send an email to committee members to check if there are any more conflicts of interest other than committee members having proposals under review. She will assign two reviewers per proposal, one in the PI's School and one outside. If there is a PI in the room when his/her proposal is being discussed, the PI will recuse him/herself.

X. WASC/GRC Policy Review

- Committee Assistant Takhar has been collecting the current bylaws and polices and procedures of each graduate group in preparation for the WASC review.
- UC Davis's graduate program review policy is being adapted for UC Merced. GRC will review it and suggest changes. It was suggested that GRC form a policy statement that specifies under whose purview program review lies. A committee member mentioned that the statement should be placed in GRC's bylaws. We could also have non-UC Merced faculty involved in program review, similar to CAP.
- GRC should also review the Graduate Advisors Handbook parallel to the graduate groups's bylaws to make sure there are no conflicts. GRC should also look at the Graduate Student Bill of Rights & Responsibilities.
- At the next meeting, the committee will discuss the restructuring of GRC. In light of the discussion on forming a Senate IT committee, it might be more efficient to enlarge GRC's membership to have an executive committee and various subcommittees to handle specific issues. It can also put placed in the GRC bylaws that GRC has the authority to appoint an ad hoc committee to run program reviews.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

DRAFT

Cmte. to approve

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE MERCED DIVISION

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)

Wednesday, February 25, 2009 3:00 – 4:30 pm
Room 324 – Kolligian Library
1-866-740-1260 Access Code 2287930#

All documents available on UCMCROPS at:
GRC 2008-2009/Resources

AGENDA

ACTION	TIME	ITEM
Information		**I. Chair's Report** – *Valerie Leppert*
Action		**II. Consent Calendar** • Approval of Minutes from February 18 meeting *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/2009/February 25)*
Discussion/Action		**III. Distribution Model for NRT/Faculty Start Up Funds Swap** **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		**IV. Senate IT Committee** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Request from ITAC/UCCC campus comparison grid.pdf)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		**V. GRC Travel and Research Grants** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/ Research & Travel Grants 2008-2009)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion		**VI. WASC/GRC Policy Review** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/WASC Accreditation)* **VCR Sam Traina**
Discussion/Action		**VII. CRF Review** **QSB 299 Directed Independent Study** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Meetings/February 25/ CRF - QSB 299 (Revised))*
Discussion		**VIII. Graduate Fellowships** *(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Fellowships 2009-2010/ Cota Robles_Guidelines_200910.doc and Faculty Mentor Program_Guidelines_200910.doc)*

Discussion/Action

IX. CRU Policy
(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/CRU/CRU_Policy_Proposal and Process for Establishing CRU)
VCR Sam Traina

Discussion/Action

X. QSB Proposal – Indirect Cost Return
(posted on crops: GRC 2008-2009/Resources/Indirect Cost Return/Request from QSB_ICR and CampusResearchSupportPolicyReport3-1-05)
VCR Sam Traina

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE • Merced Division**

Graduate & Research Council (GRC)
Minutes of Meeting
February 25, 2009

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Graduate & Research Council met at 3:00 pm on Wednesday, February 25, 2009, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Valerie Leppert presiding.

II. Chair's Report

- Nothing to report.

III. Consent Calendar

- Minutes from February 18, 2009 meeting.

Action: Item was tabled until the next meeting.

IV. Distribution Model of NRT/Faculty Start-Up Funds Swap

Item was discussed in the last meeting and committee members wanted further clarification on swap models.

- We have six swaps to assign.
- Different swap models were presented and deliberated on.
- Committee members agreed that they should formulate a model before the end of the year for next year's GRC.

Action: Committee decided to postpone formulating a model until it knows the total amount of requests from the graduate groups. Committee will then assign slots proportional to the number of requests.

V. GRC Research & Travel Grants

- It was re-stated that two reviewers will be assigned per proposal – one in the PI's School and one outside.

Action: Chair Leppert will assign reviewers from the committee.

VI. Graduate Fellowships Guidelines

The Graduate Division previously sent the guidelines for the Cota-Robles Fellowship and the Faculty Mentor Program Fellowship to GRC for review.

Action: Committee approved the Cota-Robles Fellowship as presented. Committee approved the Faculty Mentor Program Fellowship with two changes: a grammatical correction and a change of nomination deadline to April 10, 2009. The deadlines was pushed back because this fellowship requires the applicant and his/her mentor to prepare specific materials.

VII. WASC/GRC Policy Review

- UC Merced's established graduate program review policy has been drafted based on UC Davis's policy. It is posted on crops in addition to other WASC-related program review documents.
- Three members of GRC volunteered to be reviewers of the UC Merced draft policy. Their review should take two weeks.
- A committee member suggested that when GRC submits this policy to WASC, it should point out to WASC the need for more staff support for gathering data.
- It was mentioned that the on-campus WASC committee is also looking at UC Merced's draft program review policy to see what might be missing.

VIII. Review of EECS Bylaws and Policies & Procedures

EECS previously submitted its Bylaws and Policies & Procedures to GRC.

- Two reviewers from GRC were assigned to review the documents. Chair Leppert will assign a third reviewer. The reviewing time will be two weeks.

IX. CRF Review

QSB 299 Directed Independent Study

Committee had the following comments:

- There needs to be an explanation for the change in grading option.
- The abbreviated syllabus that was provided by the instructor is a template and does not contain QSB-specific information on the course.

Action: GRC Committee Assistant will email the QSB Graduate Group Chair with GRC's comments. The revised CRF will then be re-submitted to GRC for a vote.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest:

Valerie Leppert, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant

DRAFT