

**Ad Hoc Top Tier Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes for GA Subgroup Meeting: November 5, 2015**

- I. **Attendance:** Kate Korgan, Janet Dufek, Anjala Krishen, Hasan Deniz, Peter Gray, David Damore, Merrill Landers, Surbhi Sharma, and Katelyn DiBenedetto  
**Excused:** Alfredo Fernando Gonzalez
- II. **Focus on GA Planning Document (R2PC Plan Worksheet):**
- a. Any questions/ clarification on responsibilities?
    - i. We are in first year of 5 year plan.
    - ii. Timeline for state funding
      - 1. Post-Bachelor's: 5 years (possibility of one-year extension)
      - 2. Post-Master's: 3 years (possibility of one-year extension)
      - 3. If external funding: number of years does not count—pick up where left off for State-funding
      - 4. Purpose of the set number of years for state-funded GAs: incentivize faculty/ departments to get other funding sources
    - iii. Plans due to Deans by November 30<sup>th</sup>, unless otherwise told
- III. **Top Tier Policy: Research and Assessment (Update from GA sub-sub group and R2PC sub-sub group; handout and on drive)**
- a. Extend Recruitment support to departments
  - b. Quality of Student Life and Climate Survey
  - c. About to send out Fall 2015 Admissions Survey
  - d. GA piece:
    - i. Data from Oklahoma State
      - 1. We will all have access to a spread sheet with all programs and what the Oklahoma data says. This will allow us to more easily compare the results that come in.
      - 2. **To Do: on the first page of the excel workbook, define terms and explain variables**
    - ii. Top Tier Realignment Plan
      - 1. Continues to go over well with rest of groups Kate is speaking with
      - 2. Disperse stipend increases on a discipline-specific, market competitive GAs: this is best practice
      - 3. Departments in plans tell us what they think minimum stipends should be.
      - 4. What happens with these plans in December/ January:
        - a. This committee helps determine where the money is allocated too. Most likely the Graduate College will not be able to get all of the students up to the minimum GA amount requested by the department, but they will be able to get all of the students up to a certain amount. The department can agree to this. If they do not like this option, they can supplement the rest of the amount that the

Graduate College cannot cover or they can decide to redo the GA positions so that at least some of the students would have the minimum amount they believe is appropriate (based on data).

5. We need new funding sources because the State GAs are not going to get us to where we need to be.
6. Should there be a step difference between doctoral students who have and have not advanced to candidacy? This is a question we will need to discuss. It is a question that is in the GA part of the R2PC plan. Departments will need to tell us their opinions on this (again—based on data and best practice for their field!)
7. We are not adding new GA positions at the moment. Rather, this is about bumping up pay for current students (percentage increase towards the department's minimum stipend goal)
8. What happens to the stipend of individuals on external grants? Their stipend will need to increase to match whatever the other stipends in their department.

IV. **Time Sensitive Items:**

- a. GA sub-committee group supportive of:
  - i. Discipline-specific, competitive market based GAs
  - ii. Increase for Doctoral stipend only
    1. Rational for this: doctoral stipends are a metric for Top Tier

V. **Ideas that we need to have further discussions on in December (particularly once we have plans):** *[Note: Janet will be assigning teams to address each point]*

- a. 80% of state funded GAs teach 6 credits a semester. Should this continue or should there be more flexibility?
- b. What incentivizes faculty to write grants and what is the reward for taking doctoral students?
- c. How do we give out the state-funded GAs?
  - i. Part of this is why are we giving out state-funded GAs in the first place because we do want faculty to write grants (but opposing argument: need state-funded GAs because help the faculty to get external grants)
  - ii. Department-level: faculty should decide
  - iii. College-level: give allocations to Deans and they break up and give to departments
  - iv. We need to know rational for why giving out GAs!
- d. Active faculty vs less active faculty in grad programs
  - i. How many faculty are fit to be mentors?
  - ii. Tiers of faculty
- e. PTI funds vs funding doctoral students to teach
  - i. Approximately same price as PTI so maybe we should turn some of the PTI funds to support more GAs
- f. Quality of students is something we need to remember!
- g. Reframe how we discuss stipend and benefits

- i. One of by-products of group should be write up recruitment talking points, which include information on the GA packages as a whole at UNLV
  - h. DGRAs
    - i. Should we take these positions and repurpose them? Should we grow them? Should we make them more competitive? Should we change the length of time for them?
  - i. Need to think about positions on campus that aren't state funded (professional development GRAs)
    - i. If we get rid of these positions, we would lose a lot of funding for our students.
    - ii. How do we determine their stipend?
      - 1. Is it based on the campus minimum or their department minimum?  
Do we leave the decision up to the unit they work under?

VI. **Dates:**

- a. Next subcommittee meeting: 10am-11:30am on Thursday, December 3<sup>rd</sup> at BEH 104
- b. Workshop to assess department GA proposals: Wednesday, December 16<sup>th</sup> at 9:15 am (location TBD)