

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
June 16, 2003
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon
3201 Hart Hall**

AGENDA ITEM

ATTACHMENT

ACTION ITEMS

Master of Advanced Study (MAS) in Maternal and Child Nutrition, proposal for a new part-time, self-supporting departmentally-based graduate program – Council’s initial review (Berger)	11.1
Graduate School of the Environment – Revised proposal (Meeks)	11.2
Community Development PRC Report transmittal letter – Draft (To be distributed.) (Hastings)	11.3
Transportation and Technology Policy PRC Report transmittal letter – Draft (To be distributed.) (Hastings)	11.4
Designated Emphasis Policy and Proposal Guidelines – Revised (To be distributed.) (FitzGerald)	11.5

CONSENT ITEMS

Minutes from May 14, 2003	11.6
Biomedical Engineering – Revised bylaws (Goldman)	11.7
Linguistics – Revised bylaws (Goldman)	11.8

DISCUSSION ITEM

Nonresident Tuition Remission Policy for Graduate Student Researchers (Hastings and Gibeling)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair (Hastings)
Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)
Announcements from the Associate Deans (FitzGerald, Minnis, Ramey)
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Berger)
Graduate Student Association (Collette/Friesner)
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Thornber/van Geelen)
Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Feliciano)

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development (Meeks)
Administrative (Hastings)
Courses and Bylaws (Goldman)
Educational Policy (Berger)
Program Review (Knoesen)
Support and Welfare (Sutter)

Alan Hastings, Chair

**MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Monday, June 16, 2003**

PRESENT: T. Berger, S. Crum, J. Friesner, J. Gibeling, A. Hastings, A. Knoesen, J. Meeks, R. Scalettar, E. Sutter, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins.

Graduate Studies: E. Blaine, P. FitzGerald, K. Garcia, D. Minnis, M. Ramey, L. Webb, L. Wilce.

ABSENT: A. Conley, N. Collette, K. Erickson, J. Feliciano E. Goldman, S. Joseph, A. Sokolow, C. Thornber, A. van Geelen, F. Zalom.

GUEST: Jonathan Karpel

ACTION ITEMS

Master of Advance Study (MAS) in Maternal and Child Nutrition, proposal for a new part-time, self-supporting departmentally-based graduate program – Council’s initial review.

EPC Chair Trish Berger presented the proposal for the new MAS degree program in Maternal and Child Nutrition. [It is the first UCD MAS degree program to be proposed.] EPC met on several occasions to discuss the proposal and requested a number of revisions from the proposers, which they made. After its last meeting on June 3, 2003, EPC had just one significant reservation that still needs to be resolved. It is related to the restriction on core course enrollment to “Graduate Standing, acceptance into MAS program” and the apparent enrollment of non-MAS students only by consent of instructor.

Council discussed various aspects of the proposal. Questions and concerns raised included the significant number of classes, the composition of the admissions committee in light of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs' (CCGA's) requirement that the members be Academic Senate faculty, the structure of a core course, enrollment restrictions for core courses, and clarification of the number of faculty on the student's guidance committee for the capstone event. Dean Gibeling emphasized that for graduate programs offered in conjunction with UC Davis Extension, it was critical to ensure that the faculty members are the ones making the academic program decisions. Council agreed to ask the proposers to make the following revisions and clarifications to the proposal.

- (1) Insert the bolded wording in the last sentence under **Section 1.6 Administration and evaluation**: “The entire program will be reviewed after the first 3 years **of admitting students** and every 7 years thereafter **by Graduate Council**.”
- (2) After the last sentence in **Section 2.1 Admissions**, add the sentence: “The others are non-Senate faculty members of the department.”
- (3) In **Section 2.2 Program of study (Master’s Degree Plan II)**, the last character in the third line should be “3” rather than “2”: “...(produced in consultation with a **3** member guidance committee)...”

- (4) Resolve the issues on Prerequisites (and in one case Entry Level) for the three Nutrition core courses NUT 260, 261, and 262, and for NUT 263 and NUT 230. Graduate Council will not allow limiting enrollment in these courses to the MAS degree students. The only legitimate enrollment restrictions are the size of the class and whether the students have the appropriate course prerequisite background.

To determine how widespread the course enrollment restriction problem might be, Ms. Friesner, the acting GSA Chair, suggested that next year GSA could conduct a survey of graduate students on whether they are being turned away from classes they want to take and the reasons for being denied access to classes.

Prof. Berger made the motion for Graduate Council to give its preliminary approval to the proposed program, contingent on the proposers making the additional changes to the proposal that Council requested. Dean Gibeling seconded the motion, and the vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write the proposers. When the revised proposal is received, it will be transmitted for review to the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review (CAPBR) and to the Library Committee. In addition, it will be transmitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies, who will forward it to the relevant deans for their review.

Graduate School of the Environment – Revised proposal

APD Chair Jack Meeks presented the APD report on the revised Mission Statement, proposed Organizational and Administrative Structure of the proposed UCD Graduate School of the Environment (GSE), its Academic Plan, and other supporting documentation, especially, the response of the GSE Planning Committee to the concerns previously expressed by the APD Committee and endorsed by Graduate Council in January 2002. Prof. Meeks summarized APD's response as still in favor of the concept of a GSE although its planning committee did not address any of Graduate Council's concerns in any detail and its response was superficial. An example is that the committee referred to two organizational models, the Kennedy School of Government and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, yet presented no outline of what a successful model program looks like. In addition, although Graduate Council was asked to consider the proposals independent of the limited resources currently available to the University, APD thought that much more specific detail needed to be provided to convince reviewers that there was a good chance for the GSE to succeed. APD also thought that leadership for the GSE would be crucial. APD thought that the GSE was probably the best approach, but that crucial supporting information regarding its structure and leadership was lacking in the documents. Of primary concern to APD was the planning committee's failure to provide evidence of the decisive leadership on campus to establish the basic organizational structure and compete for the funds essential to recruit a person to lead the GSE toward becoming the internationally recognized and respected school envisioned by the planners.

Council's discussion included why the GSE was being proposed, whether it was to provide off campus visibility to UCD's historical and present breadth in the environmental sciences or to provide on campus support for the faculty and graduate groups in the environmental sciences. Some campus faculty members feel that there is no campus environmental sciences leader to speak for them. Council wondered whether the GSE was the appropriate structure to provide what was needed for all the faculty in the environmental areas from different disciplines across campus. One member suggested that the GSE would be just another level of administration and

that if the ORU structure and the graduate group structure were functioning as they should be, the GSE would not be needed.

Council discussed whether the GSE would be a physical structure or administrative structure. Prof. Meeks thought that the GSE would just need space for its administrative structure.

Council agreed to forward the APD report to Academic Senate Chair Bruce Madewell with a cover letter from Council. Dean Gibeling summarized Council's discussion and Council agreed with the statement that most of the members and representatives "support some entity but the particular proposal is lacking sufficient detail and compelling arguments for Council to be able to evaluate whether this is the right structure or whether this structure is likely to be successful." Council suggested that the graduate groups that would fall under the umbrella of the GSE should look at the PRC Reports for their most recent program reviews and consider whether the GSE would address those problems that they cannot address themselves.

Profs. Berger, Meeks and Waterhouse made the motion to accept and transmit the APD Report to Prof. Madewell and to include Council's comments in the transmittal letter. Prof. Knoesen seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write to Prof. Madewell and transmit the APD report.

Regarding Program Reviews

Dean Gibeling said that a couple of times this year, the PRC Reports have pointed out that the graduate programs have not made progress since their last review (i.e., the same recommendations came forward). He expressed his pleasure that the Community Development program review was one where the program has had success in addressing the previous review's recommendations and in organizing itself.

Chair Hastings presented the draft transmittal letters listed below. He said that Prof. Knoesen had made some minor wording changes to the letters. He asked Council for any substantive changes to the letters. There were none.

Community Development PRC Report transmittal letter – Draft

Prof. Knoesen made the motion to approve the Community Development letter, Prof. Waterhouse seconded the motion, and the vote in favor was unanimous. The PRC Report and transmittal letter will be mailed to the addressees.

Transportation Technology and Policy PRC Report transmittal letter – Draft

Prof. Knoesen made the motion to approve the TTP letter, Prof. Waterhouse seconded the motion, and the vote in favor was unanimous. The PRC Report and transmittal letter will be mailed to the addressees.

Designated Emphasis policy and Proposal Guidelines – Revised

Associate Dean Paul FitzGerald presented the two revisions that Council requested at its meeting of June 10, 2003. (1) To address Council's concern regarding Ph.D. program faculty participation in the Designated Emphasis programs, he orally presented the following sentences to be added on page 1, to the end of the second paragraph under **I. Definition of a Designated Emphasis**.

“If no faculty from an affiliated program join the DE, then the affiliation of that Ph.D. program will end. The Chair of the DE will notify the Graduate Council Chair when an affiliation ends. If no Ph.D. programs are affiliated with the DE, the DE will suspend admissions, and notify the Chair of Graduate Council.”

In addition, on page 4, under **C. Affiliated Faculty**, at the end of the paragraph, he added the following sentence: “A lack of participation of affiliated faculty will be a major factor considered in DE reviews.”

Dean Gibeling asked what effect this portion of the policy has on the DE in Native American Studies (DENAS), which currently has no faculty participation outside of the Department of Native American Studies. The proposed wording means that the DENAS is out of compliance. However, he did not expect that this situation would ever be detected except during a DE program review.

(2) To address Graduate Council’s request for clarification of a student’s “not pass” for the Designated Emphasis, Associate Dean FitzGerald added a third paragraph on page 2, under **6. Qualifying Examination**. (See Attachment 11.6.) Dean Gibeling pointed out that in the revision, the nature of a re-take of the DE portion of the Qualifying Examination (QE) would be determined by the DE Executive Committee rather than by the QE Committee, which might be a concern. Council discussed this point. EPC was uncertain whether a DE student had ever received a “not pass” on the DE portion of the exam. EPC Chair Trish Berger thought that the re-wording was an improvement.

Chair Hastings pointed out one other revision. Approval of new DE programs include a 7-year **Sunset Clause**, which is in effect unless continuation is requested in the DE’s self-review document during the program review process. (See **Section 9. Program Evaluation** on page 3.)

Prof. Knoesen made the motion to accept Associate Dean FitzGerald’s additional changes to the revised Designated Emphasis Policy and Proposal Guidelines document. Prof. Meeks seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous.

CONSENT ITEMS

The second item was removed from the Consent List.

Biomedical Engineering – Revised bylaws

Prof. Knoesen suggested a revision of **Article VI. Student Representatives** of the Biomedical Engineering Bylaws. His suggestion was for the program to use the same wording for this article as is in the Linguistics bylaws. The Graduate Group Chair would consult with the program’s graduate student organization before appointing student representatives as Student Members of the Group. Chair Hastings asked for clarification of the wording to reflect that students will attend graduate group meetings except for the portion that includes confidential matters. Council agreed to vote to approve the bylaws, contingent on Biomedical Engineering making the requested changes to Article VI. Prof. Knoesen made the motion described above. Prof. Berger seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will notify the program chair of the bylaws approval, contingent on these changes to Article VI.

The two items below remained on the Consent List. They were approved as presented.

Minutes from May 14, 2003

Linguistics – Revised bylaws

Chair Hastings will notify the program chair.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Non-Resident Tuition Remission Policy for Graduate Student Researchers

Chair Hastings reported that the Academic Senate voted on the NRTR proposal. Following this vote, the Joint Academic/Administrative Committee met to discuss the proposal further. The Provost has drafted a directive informing the campus that the Joint Academic/Administrative Committee has recommended that the nonresident tuition remission (NRTR) policy should be based on the Cost by Residency Model and that she has accepted the recommendation. She has asked Dean Gibeling to work with the Academic Senate Committees, especially the Graduate Council, Committee on Research, and Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review to implement the policy. The policy will be distributed and Dean Gibeling will work on the details of its implementation.

Chair Hastings and Prof. Knoesen said that it will be important for Dean Gibeling to consult and obtain input from the faculty members of the graduate programs. Prof. Knoesen asked about the timeline for the policy's implementation. Dean Gibeling responded that the policy will be effective Fall Quarter 2004 and input from the campus will be due by the end of Fall Quarter 2003. Council discussed whether there would be many details to work out, especially during the transition period. Council also discussed the 25% GSR employment trigger point for the NRTR benefit. Dean Gibeling reported that there was strong sentiment that the trigger percentage should not be so high that students might be appointed below that percentage. He also pointed out that 25% is the minimum appointment level for the campus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair of Graduate Council

Chair Hastings thanked everyone for their hard work this year.

Dean--Graduate Studies

Dean Jeffery Gibeling said that not much had happened since last week except for the commencement ceremony. Chair Hastings thanked everyone for their work on commencement. Dean Gibeling also thanked everyone for their work on Graduate Council

Associate Dean for Programs

Associate Dean Paul FitzGerald FitzGerald had nothing further to report.

Associate Dean for Students

Associate Dean Melvin Ramey had nothing to report.

Associate Dean Emeritus

Associate Dean Douglas Minnis had nothing to report.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Prof. Berger said that she had nothing new to announce since last week's meeting.

Graduate Student Association

Ms. Joanna Friesner, Interim GSA Chair, reported that all the positions on the GSA Executive Council have been filled for next year. Mr. Jonathan Karpel, who is at today's meeting, will be the GSA Chair. Ms. Ellen Pyatt will be the Vice Chair.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

Dr. Carol Thornber and Dr. Albert van Geelen were absent.

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor

Mr. Joaquin Feliciano was absent.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development

Prof. Meeks had nothing further to report.

Administrative

Chair Hastings had nothing further to report.

Courses and Bylaws

Prof. Emily Goldman was absent. Chair Hastings said that the Academic Senate Courses of Instruction Committee reported that Graduate Council's courses committee (the Courses and Bylaws Committee) worked well this year but has not always done so in the past. It suggested taking over the review of the graduate courses, but Chair Hastings did not think that this was appropriate. The issue of the review of graduate courses could be re-examined next year.

Educational Policy

Prof. Berger had nothing further to report.

Program Review

Prof. Knoesen had nothing further to report.

Support and Welfare

Prof. Ellen Sutter had nothing further to report.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies