1. Development of leave policies for GAs, fellows, trainees, and postdocs. A. Massaro distributed revised drafts for discussion of policies for parental leave, extended medical leave, and short-term absences. B. Pletz, S. Huntington, and L. Lewellen raised numerous issues:

- How will the benefits compare with those received by faculty and staff? It is important that these benefits not exceed those for faculty and staff – or be perceived to exceed those benefits. The fact that graduate students generally have shorter tenure than faculty and staff may create perception issues.

- How will the academic aspect of leaves be handled? It is important that GAs, fellows, and trainees maintain their student status during an appointment leave. In some cases, a reduced credit load may be approved. This area will need to be defined within the Graduate School.

- How will the cost be managed? This is a key question. In addition to the stipend, the student-based appointments include payment of tuition and fees. Units that appoint additional GAs (those not already on appointment) would incur additional costs. Some leaves could cross quarters, which could complicate matters further. Some GAs will have been appointed in multiple units; which unit(s) will bear financial responsibility for the leave?

- How will abuse of the policies be prevented and addressed? There could be problems with appointing-unit practices as well as with students.

- Should there be different leave policies for different appointment types (GTA, GRA, GAA)?

- What assurance will students have that privacy issues will be handled properly? Units may need to be trained in how to handle medical and other personal information appropriately.

- If more than one policy is proposed, should they move through the approval process simultaneously or separately? This should be considered as the policies are refined.

The general sense of the discussion was that one leave policy could probably cover both long-term (parental, extended medical, extended emergency) and short-term (medical, emergency, bereavement) absences. The policy should provide stipend protection and appointment protection, and will probably in essence memorialize existing best practices on
campus. There was interest in having as much flexibility as possible in handling individual situations, perhaps without stating a specific maximum leave period.

2. **Status and timetable for implementation of improved GA appointment process.** In response to some of the feedback from campus constituencies, we had previously agreed to adjust the timetable for campus-wide implementation. We remain committed to a campus-wide implementation by Autumn 2005. We continued discussion about a pilot project or limited implementation starting in the winter quarter. Through such an approach, we could get feedback on specific problems, work those problems out, and provide updated documents that would be better suited to the campus needs. In order to ensure a smooth implementation for all Autumn 2005 GA appointments, we need to finalize the documents and process early enough so that they can be used by appointing units for Autumn 2005 appointments.

A number of issues were raised during discussion:

- Should we use a process similar to that used for the implementation of electronic theses and dissertations, where use of the GA appointment document would be optional for Winter 2005, Spring 2005, and Summer 2005 and then would be mandatory for Fall 2005?

- What is the most effective way to engage the colleges and regional campuses in this process, since they all indicated that they wanted to be involved in the pilot activity? Two basic options were mentioned: (a) have all of them (except Law) participate; or (b) have one college from each cluster take the lead, with the others providing input to the lead college. Whatever approach is used, having input from graduate programs will be very important. We also need feedback about the utility of the standard document for all appointment types. MAPS has already volunteered to participate.

We need to agree on a pilot or feedback process. The target date for finalizing the document and process also needs to be identified. The campus needs to be updated about the process. L. Murphy will take the lead in putting together a possible approach and timeline for review and revision.

3. **Next meeting.** The next meeting will be Monday, December 20 from 9:00 until 10:30 a.m. The major topic will be GA leaves, including verification of eligible groups.

4. **G-QUE scorecard.** J. Evans is taking the lead in creating a draft G-QUE scorecard.

5. **Status of GCBC in Senate.** B. Pletz will circulate the current version of the GCBC proposal to determine whether anyone has further changes to recommend. S. Huntington stressed the need to clarify GCBC’s relationship to the GA and Fellowship Committee of the Council on Research and Graduate Studies.

6. The meeting ended 12:00 noon.
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