

Graduate Council
MINUTES
October 18, 2012, 2:00-4:00 p.m., Kerr Hall 307

Present: Bruce Schumm, *Chair*, Bettina Aptheker, Scott Brandt, Tyrus Miller (DGS), Juan Poblete, Seth Rubin, Megan Thomas, Jim Moore (DGS), Christy Caldwell (Library Rep.), Michael Tassio (ASO)

Absent with notice: Raphael Kudela

Consent Agenda

The meeting minutes of October 4, 2012, were approved without corrections. Members elected to discuss the FTE Transfer proposal at the next meeting on November 1, 2012.

Chair Announcements

Chair Schumm updated the Council members on the October 9 Senate Executive Committee meeting where Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Miller gave a presentation on aspirational graduate growth. The Graduate Council will delve into issues around graduate growth at their next meeting. The Comprehensive Campaign is underway, and graduate education has been included in conversations about specific funding goals for University Relations to target. Members voiced interest in consulting with leadership from UR.

Chair Schumm updated the Council members on the recent Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) meeting where California Senate Bill 259 was discussed. The bill expands the definition of employees under the Higher Education-Employer Relations Act (HEERA) to include student employees whose employment is pursuant to the degree they are seeking, permitting these student employees to pursue representation. In August the bill passed in the Assembly but was later vetoed by the Governor. It is likely that a new formation of the bill will surface. Chair Schumm invited the GSA representatives on the Council to apprise the Council of GSA's opinion of RA unionization, and of the rationale behind the opinion, should the issue be under discussion by the GSA.

Non-resident tuition continues to be a topic of consideration at CCGA, but any action at the systemwide level is unlikely. Initiatives will have to be taken up, if there is interest, at the campus level; UCSC has an initiative led by Dean Miller.

The report from the Joint Administrative/Senate Workgroup on Academic Graduate Student Issues will be discussed at the Regents meeting in November.

Chair Schumm updated the Council members on the recent SEC/Campus Leadership meeting where the issue of the burden of graduate student tuition on departments that support was raised. This topic is likely to be discussed more this year within the context of funding for aspirational graduate growth.

Dean of Graduate Studies (DGS) Announcements

Dean Miller informed the Council of informational and consultation processes that are currently underway regarding aspirational graduate growth. He has met with the Senate Executive Committee and the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, and has several other scheduled meetings.

Campus administration leadership, including Dean Miller, recently met with UCSC Foundation Trustee Board. Dean Miller discussed aspirational graduate growth with the board, and recent graduates gave presentations. Each administrator in campus leadership has goals for the comprehensive campaign.

Dean Miller recently met with members of the Achievement Rewards for College Scientists (ARCS). The ARCS gives direct funding to graduate students and has been a major supporter over the past 30 years.

Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Herbert Lee, and Dean Miller recently attended a conference at UC Irvine. The former Graduate Dean at UC Berkeley and other faculty are working on a forthcoming website that, as they call it, are ‘workshops in a box.’ The workshops are on contemporary topics such as “Do babies matter in science?,” “Some things are legal,” etc., and UCSC will be able to provide links to relevant videos.

Graduate Student Association (GSA) Announcements

The Graduate Student Association is currently finalizing their member representation on Academic Senate committees. Additionally, their membership is heavily involved in the voter registration efforts on campus.

The GSA still views issues at Family Student Housing as a priority, though their leadership has changed and their momentum on the issue may wane. Chair Schumm insured the GSA that Council will continue to pursue the issue, although it may broaden in scope to a broader conversation about housing costs on campus, and how educational goals are prioritized in setting costs.

Library Announcements

The UC libraries have developed a systemwide data management program called DataUp to assist UC researchers to document, manage and archive their tabular data, protecting against data loss and fulfilling data management plans of grants. The program’s software is mostly open-source and it is likely that others will develop useful tools such as the capability for analytics.

TIM External Review Deferral Request

Graduate Council reviewed the request of the Technology and Information Management (TIM) department to defer its 2013-2014 external review by two years, to 2015-2016. Given the long and difficult path this program has encountered over the past few years, the Council cannot support this request. The Council was unanimous in its position that it is important that somebody external to the department review the status, prospects, and plans of the TIM department and program, and provide feedback to the department and administration during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Sensitive to the effort demanded by undertaking an external review, and recognizing that the most pressing issues faced by the TIM program may not require specific expertise in the field to assess, the Council is however also supportive of instead conducting a review internal to the UC system, or even the UCSC campus, that would fall outside the nominal review process. This review might focus on a more targeted set of questions devised by your office as well as that of the Dean of the BSOE, in consultation with Chair Haddad, CPB, and GC. A full external review would follow after an appropriate interval, to be determined based on the results of the internal review, but quite probably in 2015-2016 as originally proposed.

Continued Discussion of the Systemwide Review of the Rebenching Report

Graduate Council completed its consideration of the report from the University of California Rebenching Budget Committee. The Council viewed the report and its recommendations quite favorably, and saw the effort as a long-overdue step to rebalance the allocation of State resources across the campuses of the University. The Council endorsed the principles that arose from the Rebenching Committee's deliberations, as well as the specific points of implementation devised by the Committee. While the Council urges the University to move forward with the proposal, it does so with the following attendant notes of caution:

- Without the contemporaneous development of a fair and considered policy of enrollment management, the incentives introduced by the rebenching policy threaten to undermine the goal of achieving a fair distribution of funds throughout the system, and yet again institutionalize disparities that place certain campuses in positions of demonstrable fiscal disadvantage to other campuses. Since it is more cost-effective to favor non-resident undergraduate enrollment over that of State residents, a system of compensation needs to be introduced that penalizes campuses that do not do their fair share of educating the State's population while rewarding those that pick up the slack. The "fair-share" targets need to be equitably derived, with opportunities for campuses to make their case about enrollment targets and associated policy.
- Following through on the rebenching proposal cannot be done in isolation. Rebenching is integrally connected with and sequenced within the full series of UC's reforms of state funding: funding streams, rebenching, aspirational graduate growth, and long-range enrollment planning. For rebenching to be meaningful and successful, the integrity of all elements of the funding reform must be maintained throughout the full process.
- The multi-year commitments made under the rebenching policy must be carried out faithfully, since decisions with long-term impact are already being made on campuses based on rebenching principles.

On a final, more technical note, the Council is somewhat concerned about the use of the term "per-student funding" – a term that on its face seems transparent – to represent the result of the somewhat intricate weighted formulation that accounts for students with different degree objectives at different levels, incorporates enrollment targets, and treats non-resident enrollments differently for undergraduate and graduate students. While the Council sees the formulation as both well thought-out and strategic, it is concerned that those with less patience in parsing the meaning of the formulation (e.g., the Press and Legislature) might misinterpret the meaning of

the result to the University's disfavor, or perhaps even wonder if the complexity of the formulation is intended to throw up a smoke screen that obfuscates the University's finances and weighs against the current administration's claimed interest in transparency. Alternatively, a term that does not include the word "student," such as "per weighted-student funding," might be more advisable.

Electrical Engineering MS Capstone Change Proposal

Graduate Council reviewed the request of the Electrical Engineering (EE) Department for the approval of a second Master's track with a project-based capstone. Council members voiced a number of concerns about the proposal that it would like to see addressed before approving the proposal.

The department requests the new track fall under the 'Plan II' option of section VI.C of appendix D of the UC Santa Cruz Academic Senate Manual. For this option, "A comprehensive final examination or project in the major subject, of such nature and conducted in such manner as may be determined by the department or group concerned, is required of each candidate." The Council was concerned that, as currently worded, it would appear possible for the capstone requirement to be satisfied entirely within the bounds of a course for which a student is receiving class-hour credit towards the degree; it is not clear how such an experience would qualify as a "comprehensive project" warranting capstone status. In addition, it appears that the determination of whether a proposed capstone project is sufficiently comprehensive, and is done at a level commensurate with the awarding of the Master's degree, would fall to a sole member of the department – the sponsoring faculty – who is likely to have a vested interest in the success of the candidate. It seems more appropriate to the Council that, instead, a committee (ad hoc, or the standing Graduate Committee) be charged with evaluating the scope and quality of the capstone project, and recommending for or against approval of the project towards the satisfaction of degree requirements.

Finally, the Council noted that the sentence "In the course of completing a Master's project, the student finds a faculty member (sponsoring faculty) who will guide the student throughout the completion of the Master's project" is probably not precise in its formulation. We believe the intent of the sentence might be more along the lines of "In order to undertake an approved Master's project, the student identifies a faculty member (sponsoring faculty) who will guide the student throughout the completion of the Master's project." Since this language is proposed for the Catalog (the document of record for degree requirements), precision in language can be important.

External Review: Stage One Comments on Charge

Due to time constraints and the importance of other items on the agenda, the Council will discuss this item at their next meeting.

Program Proposal: Games and Playable Media MS

The Graduate Council reviewed the revised draft of the Games and Playable Media M.S. proposal and, based on its academic merit, unanimously approved the proposal. However, by a vote of four in favor, one opposed, one abstain, with member Scott Brandt recused, the Council reconfirmed support for the Committee on Planning and Budget's recommendation that "a

mechanism [be] put in place for the centrally funded start-up funds of \$500,000 to be at least partially repaid if the program produces revenues beyond its immediate needs.” Given the deep sacrifices that all departments and divisions are being asked to endure in this period of rapidly-shrinking budgets, it seems reasonable to reconsider whether a program that has used one-time University support to initiate a revenue-generating program might be expected to return at least some portion of those funds if its revenue exceeds its anticipated need, and if it can do so without hampering its prospects for success.

Aspirational Graduate Growth

Due to time constraints, the Council will discuss this item at their next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.