

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
January 18, 2018  
307 Kerr Hall, 2:00-4:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Gina Dent (Chair), Lissa Caldwell, Gerald Casel, Weixin Cheng, Ben Crow, Carolyn Dean, Judith Habicht-Mauche, Athanasios Kottas, Paul Roth, Alexander Sher, Tyrus Miller (ex officio), Katharin Peter (Library Rep), Amani Liggett (Grad Rep), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

**Absent:** Joseph Lehnert (Grad Rep)

**Guest:** Jim Moore, Assistant Dean, Graduate Division

**Members Items**

Chair Dent provided an update on the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) meeting of January 3, 2018. She reported that topics of discussion included implications of the proposed tax bill and DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) program. She also reported on the status of the campus graduate degree proposals under review at CCGA.

Chair Dent provided an update on the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting of January 16, 2018. She reported there was consultation with the CP/EVC and discussion of the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP).

**Dual Degree Guidelines**

Chair Dent provided an update on follow up communication with VPAA Herbie Lee on development of a campus process for dual degree proposals. With this information, the committee finalized its set of recommendations and guidelines for review. On campus process, GC decided that graduate dual degree proposals, as non-degree pathways linking two institutions, will be submitted to the VPAA's office, and after VPAA review, will be forwarded for Graduate Council review for curricular approval. The VPAA will ensure that proposals conform to WASC guidelines, and advise proposers on any need for WASC review (i.e. substantive change form) as part of VPAA review of the proposal.

Graduate Council noted it will review the proposal that is forwarded by the VPAA, along with the detailed MOU outlining the agreement with the partnering institution (per WASC guidelines). GC noted it will focus especially closely on four aspects of the WASC requirement dual degrees: 1) at least half of the credit towards the degree must be earned in UCSC courses and taught by UCSC faculty; 2) no more than 25% of the credits being offered at the graduate level may be double counted or overlapping; 3) dual degrees will not be awarded for substantially the same body of work; 4) the dual degree should exceed the amount of academic work typically required for a single degree.

Graduate Council recognized that the WASC requirement to not approve dual degrees for "substantially the same body of work" and detailing that dual degrees "should exceed the amount of work typically required for a single degree" can be met in several ways, and will vary by discipline and program. The Council noted it expects that each proposal will include justification in unique ways, but every program will be expected to provide a detailed description of the form of the additional work required, the means of evaluating that work, and the guarantees for program faculty autonomy and student protection in the event of negative circumstances at the other degree-granting institution.

Graduate Council additionally identified a set of criteria for dual degree pathway review, including in the following areas: justification/rationale for the degree, detailed responsibilities and rights of each faculty

committee, distinction between programs for students earning the UCSC degree and students earning the dual degrees—including outline of additional work required for the second degree, discussion of the dual degree and how it will not affect time to degree as well as any impacts on funding, provisions in the event of negative circumstances (closing of the partnering program, failure of students in the partnering program), and indication of the agreement of program faculty to the establishment of the pathway. Graduate Council will formally provide its detailed guidelines to the VPAA. Members also noted they welcome the opportunity for formal consultation with the VPAA once he has a clearer sense of the requirements for the “substantive change form” potentially required by WASC, and its impacts on the campus review process.

### **Computer Science Impaction Request**

Graduate Council reviewed the Computer Science (CS) request for impacted status. A proposal from CS for impacted status was first reviewed by GC in 2016-17. The Council was supportive of this request, and supported CPB’s recommendation that if approved, CS impaction status should be re-evaluated yearly to assess progress.

Graduate Council reviewed the proposal with a focus on the interaction between undergraduate and graduate programs, and specifically for any effects that impacted status might have for graduate students. The timeline for review was very short and so limited the time the Council could devote to review of the request. Council also notes that more information would be needed from Planning & Budget to make stronger recommendations. However, the Council agreed that the CS department has made a compelling case for impaction, and that impaction at the undergraduate level is negatively impacting potential graduate growth, especially in the masters program. Given the very low number of master’s students the CS department admits relative to applications (as reported by Graduate Division), granting impaction status could yield the growth in master’s enrollments the department suggests it wishes.

Less clearly outlined in the proposal were the potential impacts of a reduction in undergraduate students on graduate funding, and members noted that CEP has tried to address at least the more narrow issue of TAships further. Council discussed the need for a less static means of managing curricular capacity and TA allocations, as well as adjusting formulas in general to include both undergraduate and graduate offerings (where TAs might be necessary). In the absence of an updated means of creating curricular flexibility, Council advocated for the continued augmentation of TAships from central administration.

### **Guide for Managing Curricular Capacity and Program Enrollment**

Graduate Council reviewed VPAA Lee’s revised “Guide for Managing Curricular Capacity and Program Enrollment,” intended to offer guidance for improving curricular capacity and a pathway for applying for and receiving designation as an “impacted status” department. The Council reviewed an earlier version of the guide in 2016-17. The Council noted that this revised version of the guide requests that departments/programs proposing impaction address how limiting undergraduate enrollment will impact graduate enrollment and funding. Members expressed that this approach more clearly helps departments/programs frame undergraduate impaction within the broader ecology of program enrollment and the desire to support graduate growth.

### **Revised: Mathematics BA/MA Proposal**

Graduate Council reviewed the Mathematics Department’s revised proposal for a contiguous five-year Bachelor’s/Master’s pathway that coordinates the MA program in Mathematics with appropriate Bachelor’s programs, the most natural candidate being the Mathematics BA program. Council noted its support of the motivation and objectives of the proposed pathway. The Council also expressed continuing concerns around coursework requirements and decided to request that the Math department address these concerns before further considering the proposed pathway.

### **Consultation: VPDGS**

The Council formally consulted with Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Miller on the block allocation formula and the Master's Incentive Program (MIP).

VPDGS Miller began with an overview of the block allocation. He noted that the block allocation is based on two factors 1) enrollments and 2) degrees granted. An average of three years (two years of actuals, one year of projection) is used for the formula. A weighted percentage of total enrollment and degrees granted is used to draw a particular amount from the block allocation for the year. He also noted the formula allows for an over-offer rate. While most of the block allocation is formula driven, VPDGS Miller noted minor adjustments are made to account for things like rapid growth or difficult years.

Members asked if the block allocation provides more flexibility than undergraduate over-enrollment funding. VPDGS Miller noted that the Graduate Division has gotten more strategic and proactive about conversations with programs about their aims, in order to help deliver resources to meet those goals. Flexibility has allowed strategic allocation above the block-allocation-formula-driven aspect of the process. There was brief discussion of Rebenching funding, and thinking about the next phase of graduate growth through different initiatives, including one focused on making it cost efficient for departments and divisions to utilize a variety of soft funds (TAS, MIP, summer) to create teaching opportunities. Members raised the historical lack of focused development on graduate education on the campus. VPDGS Miller responded with updates on some of the work currently underway, including a recent hire of a development director in the Graduate Division, efforts by University Relations to involve research and graduate education more centrally than in the previous campaign, and proposed initiatives like the Centers of Excellence.

VPDGS Miller provided an overview of the Master's Incentive Program (MIP). He noted that most programs are using MIP funds to enhance doctoral support. Members asked for a breakdown of how MIP funds are used, and VPDGS Miller noted that 50% off the top goes to the Graduate Division for fellowships and TA remissions, a portion goes to the academic division (\$800), and \$2600 for domestic (with additional amount for non-resident) goes to the program. VPDGS Miller noted the growth in master's programs since inception of the MIP. Members asked if there was any way of judging the increased workload for those that have started master's programs. While VPDGS Miller acknowledged that there is no sense of that generally, there have been advantages, including ability to enrich curriculum.

The Council also requested, in its pre-consultation memo, that VPDGS provide the annual report on graduate academic integrity cases for the previous year, to review as an informational item. VPDGS Miller provided a brief oral report. There was no update on delegations and re-delegations of authority.