

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
April 30, 2020  
307 Kerr Hall, 2:00-4:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Don Smith (Chair), Banu Bargu, John Bowin, Sharon Daniel, Andrew Fisher, Daniel Friedman, Nobuhiko Kobayashi, Longzhi Lin, Alex Pang, Patricia Pinho, Edward Shanken, Quentin Williams (ex officio), Katharin Peter (Library Rep), Elizabeth Goldman (Grad Rep), Daniel Rodriguez Ramirez (Grad Rep), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

**Absent:** None.

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

**Member Items**

Council again discussed the issue of missing grades for graduate courses. GC previously decided a blanket policy on how to deal with/resolve issues of missing grades in graduate courses was not feasible, but Chair Smith did bring back some data for Council on the small number of courses that did have missing grades. It appeared that the vast majority were from individual studies/thesis research courses (with faculty instructor of record). Chair Smith will follow up with the Registrar about cc'ing department managers on notices to faculty about missing grades.

**COVID-19 Impacts on Graduate Education**

Council continued its discussion of COVID-19 impacts on graduate students and graduate education. Among topics discussed included graduate student funding, the systemwide 18 quarter limitation on serving as an ASE, and non-resident tuition.

**2020-21 FTE Review**

Council continued its review of the 2020-21 faculty FTE requests.

**Revised Forward Funding Model for Faculty Partner Hires**

Graduate Council reviewed VPAA Lee's revised Forward Funding Model for Faculty Partner Hires (April 7, 2020). Council found that revised proposal (and VPAA Lee's cover letter) addressed several of GC's minor comments on the original proposal. However, several of Council's more substantive comments were not adequately addressed. Council agreed that the core of the draft policy centered on "preemptive" action, and an expansion of what constitutes a faculty "retention" case to include a faculty's partner in cases where neither the faculty or the partner have received an offer for employment elsewhere. While the spirit of acting preemptively to retain a faculty member may be desirable, GC remained concerned about two issues that were not adequately addressed in the revised proposal or in VPAA Lee's letter. Council's first concern centered on potential issues of inequities in how retention case requests are identified and supported (or not) within the academic division. Council raised a concern that the policy seemed to give academic deans sole discretion about whether to act on and develop a preemptive partner retention case, while not addressing process to ensure fairness of review and equity. Council's second concern was that the proposal will create two kinds of retention cases that differ significantly in requirements, in that faculty retention cases involving a partner hire will not require an outside employment offer, while faculty retention cases that do not involve a partner hire will continue to require an outside written offer, as is current practice. While there may be advantages and disadvantages to requiring versus not requiring an outside offer in a retention case, having two separate retention case categories with different requirements is unsound.