

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, February 23, 2004
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Room 203 Mrak Hall**

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
Spring Quarter 2004 calendar grid (Please return.)	6.0
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
Minimum Viable Size for a Graduate Program – APD report (Meeks)	6.1
Policies Related to Programmatic Changes on Campus – Revised drafts (Meeks) (The APD report will be distributed before or at the meeting.)	6.2
Reconstitution of the Division of Biological Sciences to the College of Biological Sciences – APD report. The full proposal is available on the Web at the following URL http://www.dbs.ucdavis.edu/undergrad/div_to_college/index.html (The APD report will be distributed before or at the meeting.)	6.3
<u>CONSENT ITEM</u>	
Minutes from January 29, 2004	6.4
<u>INFORMATIONAL ITEM</u>	
Graduate Council and its Subcommittees – Updated membership lists	6.5
<u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	
Announcements from the Chair (Hastings)	
Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)	
Announcements from the Associate Deans (FitzGerald, Ramey)	
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Berger)	
Graduate Student Association (Karpel)	
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (van Geelen)	
<u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u>	
Academic Planning and Development (Meeks)	
Administrative (Hastings)	
Courses and Bylaws (Watkins)	
Educational Policy (Waterhouse)	
Program Review (Kavvas)	
Support and Welfare (Scalettar)	

Alan Hastings, Chair

Distribution:

Members:
T. Berger
J. Gibeling
E. Sutter

A. Conley
L. Kavvas
A. Waterhouse

S. Crum
J. Meeks
E. Watkins

C. de la Peña
R. Scalettar

K. Erickson
P. Singh

**MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Monday, February 23, 2004**

PRESENT: *Members:* A. Conley, S. Crum, C. de la Peña, J. Gibeling, A. Hastings, L. Kavvas, J. Meeks, R. Scalettar, P. Singh, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins.
Representatives: J. Karpel, J. Lane, E. Pyatt, S. Tatsch, A. van Geelen.
Graduate Studies: T. Dillinger, C. Duffy, K. Garcia, M. Ramey, L. Webb, L. Wilce.

ABSENT: *Members:* T. Berger, K. Erickson, E. Sutter.
Representatives: J. Galli-Banducci, C. Thornber.

Chair Alan Hastings introduced Assistant Professor Carolyn de la Peña, who has been appointed to Graduate Council, replacing Professor Jeannette Money.

CONSENT ITEM

Minutes from January 29, 2004

Chair Hastings pointed out a correction to the minutes on page 3 under the Postdoctoral Scholars discussion item in line 2. Dr. Albert van Geelen's "project" was corrected to say "Professors for the Future (PFTF) project." There were no other changes to the minutes, which were approved as amended.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Graduate Council Chair

Chair Hastings announced that the Chancellor has forwarded the proposal for a UCD Graduate School of the Environment off campus for a second systemwide review.

Dean-Graduate Studies

Graduate Studies Dean Jeffery Gibeling made several announcements. He referred to the **Governor's January budget proposal**. Dean Gibeling said that the 40% increase in graduate student fees was untenable and that the 20% increase in nonresident tuition (NRT) was too high. With these two increases, it would cost nonresident graduate students \$25,000/year in fees and tuition to attend UC. If California's voters do not pass Proposition 57, the \$15B bond to refinance the State's debt, a \$10B bond proposal that was not taken to the voters last year might be resurrected.

Dean Gibeling is distributing student support money for 2004-2005 while guessing what next year's actual fees and tuition might be. There is some additional money going back out to the programs, on top of the block grant money that has already been allocated. The Dean said that he hoped that everyone has seen the Provost's letter regarding student support, in which she encouraged graduate programs to not be overly cautious in admitting students. The applicant pool appears to be excellent for most programs, and this may be a year to make significant advances in the size and quality of our programs.

Prof. Jack Meeks mentioned a *Sacramento Bee* article regarding patent activity and suggested that the connection between research and income from patents to UC might be better publicized. Prof. Andrew Waterhouse suggested using patent income to recruit and support graduate students.

Dean Gibeling reported that the Chancellor has an upcoming talk in Sacramento in which he will report the very significant economic impact of UCD on the state and region. Dean Gibeling pointed out some of the benefits of graduate education to the State. Students are not just obtaining a higher education to gain a higher salary for themselves. Chair Hastings thought that the Graduate Education Objectives that Council is developing would be helpful.

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs Paul FitzGerald was absent because he was teaching.

Associate Dean for Students

Associate Dean for Students Melvin Ramey had no announcements.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Vice Chair Trish Berger, Graduate Council's representative to CCGA, was absent because she was teaching.

Graduate Student Association

GSA Chair Jonathan Karpel announced that GSA is looking at nominations for next year's Executive Council. GSA would like to continue building on its flowering relationship with the campus administration.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

PSA Chair Dr. van Geelen reported that UC Davis would participate in a Sigma Chi postdoc survey of about 50 institutions. In February 2004, *The Scientist* reported on its survey of the best places to be a postdoc. This year UCD, which was listed as the eighth in the top ten last year, dropped out of the top 15. This February's report listed a number of different sorts of organizations where postdocs were working. These included government laboratories and specific research institutes. In response to members' questions, Dr. van Geelen reported there was a total of 3,500 responses to the survey and Assistant Dean Charles Duffy reported there are 649 postdocs at UCD.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development

APD Chair Prof. Meeks has three APD reports on today's agenda.

Administrative

Chair Hastings reported that the Administrative Committee has not met recently. He thanked Associate Dean Melvin Ramey for resolving graduate student issues that might otherwise be transmitted to the committee.

Courses and Bylaws

C&B Chair Prof. Evan Watkins reported that reviews of graduate courses are up to date and that he expected that his committee might have some bylaws on Council's next meeting agenda.

Educational Policy

EPC Chair Prof. Waterhouse reported that the review of the Joint Ed.D. program proposal was taking several meetings to complete.

Program Review

PRC Chair Prof. Levent Kavvas had nothing to report at the moment. Eight PRC reports will be presented to Graduate Council before the end of the academic year.

Support and Welfare

S&W Chair Prof. Richard Scalettar reported that the committee is currently in the middle of its review of the graduate student fellowship applications. In response to a question, Assistant Dean Lisa Webb reported that more than 2,400 fellowship applications were keyed into the Graduate Studies database. [Approximately half of those were eligible for review.] Dean Gibeling added that many of the students in the system wanted to be nominated for several fellowships, but some programs decided not to nominate an individual student for more than one fellowship.

ACTION ITEMS

Minimum Viable Size for a Graduate Program – APD Report

APD Chair Prof. Meeks reported that APD thought that PRC was the most appropriate group to look at the minimum viable size for a particular graduate program. Prof. Kavvas suggested that the Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC), a subcommittee of PRC, might be the best committee to consider this issue. Prof. Meeks reported that APD benefited from the insight of Prof. André Knoesen, the former PRC Chair, who is an APD member this year. In its evaluation, the APD chose Avian Sciences and German, two of the ten highlighted small programs, as examples of successful programs based on their recent reviews.

Dean Gibeling brought the 1995 National Research Council's (NRC's) report on its last survey, entitled *Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States, Continuity and Change*, and distributed two figures from the report showing the (1) average number of program faculty and (2) average number of students enrolled, by broad field and quality grouping. Dean Gibeling pointed out that size was important. In each of the five broad fields, the top ranked programs have the largest number of faculty and the largest number of enrolled students. This is one piece of evidence that size is important. Dean Gibeling added the caveat that the NRC sometimes lumps several programs together in its survey because its program fields do not always match those at any particular institution. There is also the question of whether ranking relates to quality. The perception is that reputation is important. Larger programs tend to be more successful. In contrast to the two examples cited by APD, Dean Gibeling mentioned a small graduate program that appears to be on its way down. It has reported that it does not have enough faculty to prepare its self-review document for its upcoming program review. If that is the case, it may not have enough faculty to offer the graduate program.

Prof. Meeks said that APD could not suggest an arbitrary number of enrolled students as the minimum viable size for a graduate program. However, there are some guidelines at the bottom of the APD report. One suggestion, from an intellectual perspective, was that PRC could review some programs at the same time. Another suggestion, from an administrative perspective, was that programs could be clustered together. These could be small and large programs that are co-located. Prof. Meeks conceded that each program might lose some direct services related to no longer having its own graduate program staff person.

Prof. Alan Conley, the PRC liaison for the review of Avian Sciences, reported that all of the members of the ad hoc committee (AHC) that conducted the review initially had a negative view of the program's small size. However, they all changed their minds because the program was effective in relation to the quality of its graduates. Prof. Conley suggested that if the concern with program size was related to financial pressures, then that should be stated directly and that

faculty could accept that. Dean Gibeling responded that there is a finite amount of money and that every program receives at least the minimum amount regardless of size. He added that Chair Hastings and he also were concerned about cohort size for core courses. If a program is too small, graduate courses sometimes are dropped or not taught. The Dean agreed with Prof. Conley that reviewing academic quality was Graduate Council's role but pointed out that Council is disconnected from resources. Weighing academic quality against resources is difficult when decisions must be made. Prof. Conley reiterated that if the issue is money, it needs to be stated. Chair Hastings suggested that currently there is a national push in biological sciences for broader, less narrow, programs and that programs might be combined.

Prof. Conley reported that Avian Sciences is essentially departmentally based and has an *esprit de corps*. He added that large graduate groups sometimes do not have that because they have small numbers of students spread across campus. Ms. Ellen Pyatt mentioned her program, Hydrologic Sciences, as an example.

Prof. Kavvas reminded Council that its recommendations will affect how reviews are conducted. At the moment, PRC is looking at the nominations for the ad hoc committees that will conduct next year's reviews. Ms. Kathy Garcia, the committee analyst, reported that in next couple of weeks the Program Review Closure Committee will re-arrange the timeline for some reviews so that the 20 programs due for review in 2008-2009 would not all be reviewed during that academic year. Therefore, there is this opportunity to select which programs might be reviewed at the same time. Prof. Kavvas pointed out that next year, a number of humanities programs will be reviewed; they will have separate review committees but the reviews would be conducted concurrently. Dean Gibeling said that in the past PRC has reviewed programs in affinity groups but that these reviews tend to get off schedule over time.

Dean Gibeling requested Council's consideration of this topic because he wanted its guidance regarding whether or not to support some programs. He said Council reviews programs and tends to assume that they all can improve. Chair Hastings pointed out that it also was easier to create new programs than to close existing programs. Prof. Kavvas thought that PRCC might be able to provide the best perspective on this issue.

Chair Hastings emphasized that size *per se* is not the single criterion. Prof. Meeks suggested that since the administrative level of support does not drop to zero but to some minimum level for any given program, perhaps Council could try to affect the administrative costs of programs. For example, Council could recommend combining programs or the administration of programs.

Chair Hastings also raised the cohort size and program quality issue. Prof. Conley reminded Council that the AHC that reviews a program cannot make the administrative decision to financially support or not support a program. Dean Gibeling suggested that there may be a bigger benefit to get stellar students in bigger programs than good students in smaller programs although there are some programs that comprehensive universities must offer. He added that costs are becoming a bigger reality that must be considered. Prof. Watkins suggested that Graduate Council might look at significant decreases in a program's enrollment over time as that might be an indicator of a problem with a program. Prof. Steven Crum thought that one indicator is enrollments, whether they increase, decrease, or remain consistent over time.

Chair Hastings concluded the discussion by saying that Council was not going to reach a consensus beyond the recommendation that PRC take program size into account in its reviews.

Policies Related to Programmatic Changes on Campus – Revised drafts

Prof. Meeks presented his committee's report. He pointed out that the revised drafts of the policies do not define the unit called a "section."

Chair Hastings said that Council's approach to the draft policies could be to go through them line by line or to point out certain circumstances in the policies where Graduate Studies and Graduate Council need to be included more specifically. Dean Gibeling pointed out that if you ever need to make a change to a program, it is important to have these documents that describe the procedures and processes involved in proposing, reviewing, and approving the specific types of changes.

Prof. Meeks reported that the most egregious problem is in section 200-25, procedure 2 for the transfer, consolidation, or discontinuance of graduate academic program. The "Dean" that is initiating the action should be identified as the Dean of Graduate Studies. The Graduate Council Assistant added that section 200-50, procedure 1, for name change for graduate academic program, also needed rewording to route the initial request to Graduate Studies/Graduate Council for action. Dean Gibeling suggested that Graduate Studies examine and edit the policies and submit them back to Chair Hastings, Analyst Lee Wilce and himself. Chair Hastings will then send Council's comments and the suggested edits to Prof. Bruce Madewell, Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Council agreed.

Associate Dean Ramey presented some background regarding the use of the term "sections" for the units in the Division of Biological Sciences; it was a way to proceed without having to go to the Regents for approval. Prof. Meeks pointed out that the term "division" is not well defined either and has at least two meanings on campus.

Reconstitution of the Division of Biological Sciences to the College of Biological Sciences – APD report

Prof. Meeks presented the APD committee's report on the reconstitution of the Division of Biological Sciences as a college. He indicated that in its revised proposal, DBS has responded to Graduate Council's request from last year at this time, to create a committee specifically to address graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues. Prof. Meeks pointed out the importance of the new committee and its administrative linkages. Chair Hastings suggested that Council send the APD report to Prof. Madewell. Council agreed to respond that it supported the reconstitution of Biological Sciences from a division to a college and appreciated the addition of the recommended committee in its revised proposal. Prof. Waterhouse made the motion as stated, Prof. Kavvas seconded it, and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write Prof. Madewell.

At the end of the meeting, Chair Hastings reminded Council to return the **Spring Quarter 2004 calendar grids**.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies