

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 26, 2004
12:00 noon – 3:00 p.m.
Room 3001 Plant and Environmental Sciences**

AGENDA ITEM

ATTACHMENT

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair (Hastings)
 Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)
 Announcements from the Associate Deans (FitzGerald, Ramey)
 Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Berger)
 UCD year-round operation: “making summer normal,” update
 Ph.D. dissertations on line
 Graduate Student Association (Karpel)
 Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Tatsch)
 Postdoctoral Scholars Association (van Geelen)

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development (Meeks)
 Administrative (Hastings)
 Courses and Bylaws (Watkins)
 Educational Policy (Waterhouse)
 Program Review (Kavvas)
 Support and Welfare (Scalettar)
 Summary of the internal fellowship review process

ACTION ITEMS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Animal Science – Graduate program name change request (Hastings) | 8.1 |
| School of Medicine, Division of Emergency Medicine – Request to establish the Department (Hastings) | 8.2 |
| “Guidelines for Evaluating and Prioritizing Graduate Programs” – Reference FYI | Reference |
| The Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA), a Joint Ed.D. Academic Program with CSU Sacramento and Sonoma State University – Proposal to establish a new Ed.D. program (Waterhouse) | 8.3 |
| Designated Emphasis in Biophotonics – Proposal to establish a new Designated Emphasis program (Waterhouse) | 8.4 |
| International Agricultural Development M.S. – PRC Report. Guest: Professor Julian Alston, 1:10 p.m. | 8.5 |
| Art History M.A. – PRC Report. Guest: Professor Colin Carter, 1:35 p.m. | 8.6 |
| Medical Informatics M.S. – PRC Report. Guest: Professor Niels Jensen, 2:15 p.m. | 8.7 |

CONSENT ITEM

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Minutes from March 19, 2004 | 8.8 |
|------------------------------------|-----|

Alan Hastings, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Monday, April 26, 2004

PRESENT: *Members:* T. Berger, A. Conley, C. de la Peña, K. Erickson, J. Gibeling, A. Hastings, L. Kavvas, J. Meeks, R. Scalettar, P. Singh, E. Sutter, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins

Representatives: J. Karpel, J. Lane, S. Tatsch, C. Thornber, A. van Geelen

Graduate Studies: E. Blaine, C. Duffy, K. Garcia, M. Ramey, L. Webb, L. Wilce

ABSENT: *Representatives:* J. Galli-Banducci, E. Pyatt

GUESTS: Professors Julian Alston, Colin Carter and Niels Jensen

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Graduate Council Chair

Chair Alan Hastings had no announcements.

Dean–Graduate Studies

Dean Jeffery Gibeling made several announcements. He noted that the primary University budget issue is the proposed increase in fees and nonresident tuition. There is widespread agreement – even to the level of the Regents – that the proposed 40% fee increase for graduate students is unworkable. Current expectations are for a fee increase of about 20% and a nonresident tuition increase of 20%, with a 20% return-to-aid for both. The Regents may not vote on fee levels at their May meeting, which means decisions would not be made until July. Dean Gibeling also commented briefly on two meetings on postdoctoral issues that he recently attended in Washington, D.C. He also reminded Council that the call for nominations for the two Associate Dean positions is out, with a nomination deadline of May 14. Dean Gibeling also described personnel changes in Graduate Studies that will result from the resignation of Assistant Dean Lisa Webb and the retirement of Assistant Dean Charles Duffy.

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs Paul FitzGerald was absent.

Associate Dean for Students

Associate Dean for Students Melvin Ramey announced that implementation of the new non-registered graduate status -- Thesis/Dissertation Preparation status, is anticipated to take place at the beginning of Fall 2004. Programs will be informed of the details shortly.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Vice Chair Trish Berger, Graduate Council's representative to CCGA, made two announcements.

1. Ph.D. dissertations on line -- filing thesis

CCGA has talked about students filing theses and dissertations on line. Dean Gibeling reported that he has been talking with the campus library administration about on line filing. Assistant Dean Charles Duffy said there has been some discussion, not just on campus, but with the California digital library as well and that University Microfilms may provide some input.

2. UCD year-round operation: “making summer normal,” update

Prof. Berger represents the Graduate Council and CA&ES on the new Academic Senate ad hoc committee, which is developing policy to make summer a normal quarter. Prof. Berger reported that the committee’s next meeting is on April 28, 2004 and requested Council to e-mail her any new ideas and input on year-round operation.

CCGA Chair Kent Erickson reported that UC Vice President Larry Hershman discussed the university budget with the UC Academic Council on March 31, 2004. Prof. Erickson also introduced the UC Planning and Budget Committee’s resolution on Graduate Student Support.

Graduate Student Association

GSA Chair Jonathan Karpel made several announcements.

1. The 2004 GSA Award for Excellence in Service to Graduate Students was given to Celia Davis, the Program Coordinator in the Mathematics department. Because of the excellent pool of nominees, it was a very close vote by the GSA Assembly this year.
2. The annual GSA picnic will be held on Saturday, May 8, 2004 at the Recreation Pool Lodge starting at 4:00 p.m. Council is invited.
3. Mr. Karpel reported that he was re-elected as the GSA Chair for next year and he is looking forward to returning to the Graduate Council.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

PSA Chair Albert van Geelen reported on the two recent postdoctoral scholar (postdoc) meetings in Washington D.C. A UC Davis delegation, consisting of Dean Jeffery Gibeling, Prof. Jerry Hedrick, Dr. Shawn Hayes (a postdoc) and Dr. van Geelen attended both meetings. The first one was sponsored by the NAS Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy (COSEPUP), as a follow-up of their initial report on postdocs at US Universities. The meeting dealt mainly with institutional and national approaches and policy issues. Prof. Hedrick was one of a few PIs who attended. The second meeting was organized by the National Postdoctoral Association (NPA). This meeting had considerably more postdocs in attendance, but also a fair number of university administrators and people from national organizations and granting agencies, such as the NIH. It was a good opportunity for postdocs and administrators from different institutions to compare notes and learn from each other. The NPA organization is trying to mature and develop into a voice for postdocs that can help influence postdoc policy at a national level. One important project that will yield much valuable information is the Sigma Xi survey. UC Davis is one of up to 50 US universities participating in the survey, where postdocs will be polled about their situation. Assistant Dean Charles Duffy is the local lead investigator and will be pulling data from this survey, once the results are in, this fall.

Graduate Studies is hosting the spring postdoctoral scholar reception this evening (April 26, 2004) from 5 to 7 p.m. in the University Club Lounge. Everyone is invited to attend.

Dean Gibeling added that, at the second postdoc meeting in Washington D.C., some important issues were discussed, such as the definition of what a postdoc is. Here at UC Davis there is an expectation that postdocs will be mentored, but more clarification and policy are needed regarding the mentored apprentice experience that separates the postdoc training from the staff researchers working in those same laboratories.

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor

Ms. Sheri Tatsch had nothing to report.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development

APD Chair Jack Meeks had nothing to report.

Administrative

Chair Hastings reported that the Administrative Committee has not met recently.

Courses and Bylaws

C&B Chair Evan Watkins reported that his committee is working on the 2-year backlog of bylaws and expects eight sets of bylaws to be ready for the next Council meeting.

Educational Policy

EPC Chair Andrew Waterhouse informed Council that program requests for changes to degree requirements have been shifted to another committee to allow EPC to complete the review of several proposals for new programs before the end of the academic year. He suggested that Council might want to have a policy regarding how long it takes to conduct reviews. Some proposers expect proposals to be reviewed within one quarter.

Program Review

PRC Chair Levent Kavvas reported that the PRC is continuing its reviews. Three PRC reports will be presented today and more will be presented at the next meeting.

Support and Welfare

Summary of the internal fellowship review process

S&W Chair Richard Scalettar said that the summary that he requested was not ready.

ACTION ITEMS

Animal Science – Graduate program name change request

Chair Hastings presented Animal Science's request for a simple name change to "Animal Biology." He reported that he has received letters of support from the CA&ES Dean and Executive Committee. Dean Gibeling pointed out that the program remains a departmentally-based graduate program. The name of the graduate program (Animal Biology) would be different from that of the department (Animal Science). CCGA Chair Erickson said that there would be no systemwide issue regarding the name change. Prof. Watkins made the motion to approve the name change, Prof. Meeks seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write Dean Gibeling and request that he notify the Chancellor via the Vice Provost--Undergraduate Studies. When the name change is approved on campus, Chair Hastings will notify the CCGA Chair in writing.

School of Medicine, Division of Emergency Medicine – Request to establish the Department

Chair Hastings presented the request to establish the Department of Emergency Medicine. No implications for graduate education were discussed in the proposal. Dean Gibeling said no implications for the School of Medicine were mentioned either. Prof. Berger suggested and made the motion to respond, "there are no apparent implications for graduate education." Dean Gibeling seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write Academic Senate Chair Bruce Madewell.

The Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA), a Joint Ed.D. Academic Program with CSU Sacramento and Sonoma State University – Proposal to establish a new Ed.D. program

Chair Hastings asked Prof. Waterhouse to begin his presentation of the proposed joint Ed.D. program by describing the difference between Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees. Prof. Waterhouse responded that a person with an Ed.D. is not destined to be a researcher. The Ed.D. degree program includes additional coursework and a project on a current problem. The Ed.D. research project does not need to be new or contribute to the literature.

Council discussed whether Ed.D. programs and this joint degree program in particular should require a second language. Although it was recognized that it would be good for school administrators not to be monolingual, the Academic Senate regulations for the Ed.D. currently do not require a second language.

Prof. Waterhouse said the DEL:CRA joint program is based on an agreement between UC and CSU and focuses on working professionals within one day's driving distance of Sacramento. The program's four overarching and inter-related themes include "building community in a diverse society." Prof. Waterhouse briefly described how the program would function. It would admit a cohort that would enroll in a prescriptive set of courses, scheduled on weekends/evenings. Then students will focus on one of two tracks, education in the pre-school to grade 12 setting or in the community college area. After completing the core courses, the students take the Qualifying Examination (QE), which is a written exam administered to everyone on the same day. During the third year, students will work on their dissertations, which are major research-based projects that address real problem issues. The students will come back to defend the dissertation and can present an oral seminar. The Ed.D. research is not open-ended and is expected to provide potential solutions that can be readily applied to the problem or question examined.

Council discussed the QE, the approval of the dissertation proposal, and the advancement to candidacy process. Because once students have passed the QE, nothing more can be required of them except the dissertation, Council thought the mechanisms for approving the dissertation proposal needed to be clarified on page 23. Questions included: When is the proposal reviewed for approval, who approves it, and can it *not* be approved?

Prof. Waterhouse reported that some other issues were raised and discussed in the EPC meetings. EPC wanted to know about the relationship between the proposed DEL:CRA program and the existing Joint Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (JDPEL) with CSU Fresno. Prof. Erickson said that from a CCGA perspective, the proposal needed to include more data about the current joint Ed.D. program with Fresno.

The new program has tight restrictions on continuing faculty membership. Membership was so restrictive that one EPC member felt that there was little opportunity for faculty outside the School of Education who wanted to participate. EPC wanted other campus faculty members to be allowed to be members of the program if they were involved in one of the overarching themes, especially in the area of building a diverse community.

Dean Gibeling explained that the DEL:CRA Joint Ed.D. is a departmentally-based graduate program offered by the School of Education. Chair Hastings pointed out that there are only four UCD faculty members associated with it. Dean Gibeling emphasized the need to ensure that there is enough UC-ness in the joint program. Prof. Erickson added that of the four faculty, two

are administrators. Prof. Waterhouse reported that a faculty hire is underway for a person to run the program; a second hire is for an additional faculty to teach. Prof. Watkins raised a concern about the number of faculty available to chair dissertation committees. Prof. Waterhouse pointed out that these are not Ph.D. dissertations.

Council raised several other points. Regarding the QE, the committee members' vote does not have to be unanimous; only a majority vote is needed. Prof. Waterhouse said that EPC requested that the QE and dissertation committees have five members instead of just four; the proposers agreed to the change. He said that one issue for the faculty is parity between UCD and CSU membership. The question of whether the same faculty member could chair both the QE and dissertation committees was raised; this is not allowed for Ph.D. degrees.

The discussion of the Joint Ed.D. was interrupted and Prof. Julian Alston presented the PRC Report for the IAD program (see below). Then the discussion was continued.

Prof. Waterhouse summarized Council's requests for the proposers: to provide more specific comparisons with the Fresno program, to address the small number of UCD faculty, and to clarify the wording regarding the advancement to candidacy by specifying when and by whom the dissertation proposal is approved.

Prof. Meeks asked whether the School of Education could keep two joint Ed.D. programs going. Prof. Carolyn de la Peña pointed out that the program does have a protocol for adding faculty. Prof. Erickson said the program's distance based learning needs to be better explained; when students are working full time, it is important. Regarding the program's two tracks, he thought that there is expertise in P-12, but asked about expertise in community college track. How many faculty are in each of these tracks, especially in community college leadership? What is the quality of the faculty CVs?

Prof. Waterhouse responded that there is a good core of faculty from each institution. Prof. Erickson requested additional information regarding the statement that the proposed program does not compete with UC Berkeley's joint Ed.D. program. He asked whether the UCD and UCB programs are in different areas.

Prof. Berger made the motion to give preliminary approval to the proposed DEL:CRA joint Ed.D. program with the contingencies raised by Council. Prof. de la Peña seconded the motion. Dean Gibeling asked that the proposers explain the number of UCD faculty who do not have administrative responsibilities and specify any additional teaching faculty who will be involved, and describe any faculty hires that have been made or are underway. Eleven votes were in favor of the motion; two were opposed to the motion. The motion was carried. Chair Hastings will write Associate Dean Sharon Dugdale, notifying her of Council's preliminary approval with contingencies. Council is waiting for comments from the Academic Senate Library Committee and Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review.

Designated Emphasis in Biophotonics – Proposal to establish a new Designated Emphasis program

Prof. Waterhouse left the meeting due to another commitment. Prof. de la Peña presented this item at the end of the meeting. (See below.)

International Agricultural Development M.S. – PRC Report

Professor Julian Alston, the PRC Liaison for the review of the Graduate Group in

International Agricultural Development (IAD), presented the PRC Report and its recommendations as well as background on the program since its last review. The same issues from the 1994-1995 review are still relevant; some of the same problems have recurred. Two strengths are that IAD's subject matter is relevant to the UCD campus and the students are extraordinary. Many graduates go on to obtain Ph.D.s and many become leaders around the world. Program weaknesses include the lack of involvement by a small number of faculty members, a lack of institutional support for the program, and the core teaching is highly dependent upon lecturers appointed on an annual basis. The program is inexpensive to run and the returns to the campus are large in terms of the graduates' leadership and ambassador roles around the world.

Council discussed the recommendations for increasing institutional support for the program, including finding a campus champion, developing endowment funding, and supporting the teaching of IAD courses. Council also discussed the recommendations to strengthen faculty participation in the group and the student advising procedures. It was Council's view that the primary points were in recommendations # 4 and 5. Council thought that the faculty needs to take the lead in revitalizing and strengthening the group. Faculty involvement in and commitment to the program must increase. There are many ways this need can and should be met. For example, it is not reasonable that most of the core courses are taught by lecturers. Faculty should determine ways to participate in the core teaching in the program. Council also thought that the leadership needs to first come from within the program, and then the program can look for an outside champion.

Dean Gibeling made the motion to approve the PRC Report. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings thanked Prof. Alston for his work as the PRC liaison for the review of IAD and for presenting the PRC Report to Council. Chair Hastings will draft the transmittal letter for Council to review at its next meeting.

Art History M.A. – PRC Report

Professor Colin Carter, the PRC Liaison for the review of the graduate program in Art History, presented the PRC Report and its recommendations. Prof. Carter reported that two recommendations from the 1995 review are still at issue: a lack of collaboration with other programs and a long time to degree of 3-4 years. Council discussed and supported the recommendations of the current report.

Council also raised a number of serious issues in its discussion of the program. It was concerned about the high (30-40%) attrition rate for students, as it suggests something is wrong with the program. Although Art History is advertised as a two-year program, the time to degree is actually 3-4 years. The program includes remedial work, 45 units and a thesis. Council members had a number of suggestions to shorten the time to degree, including offering more Plan II options instead of the thesis and decreasing the coursework which is too heavy for a Master's degree. Dean Gibeling pointed out that in recommendation #2 the PRC Report says the program "should" decrease time to degree. Council agreed that the program "must" shorten time to degree and this would be stated in the transmittal letter.

Council is also concerned about the overall nature of the program. There needs to be a much better match between how the program is advertised and what is in fact offered. Many of the students are interested in museum work, which is advertised on the program's Web site, but currently the program has no faculty member who teaches museum studies. Dean Gibeling asked whether the PRC had taken account of the program's memo regarding correction of facts.

Professor Carter responded that the information presented in the program's correction of fact did not correspond with information the Ad Hoc Committee received from the faculty and students of the program. Therefore, no corrections were made.

Chair Hastings suggested appending the Master's-only document to the PRC Report when it is transmitted to the program. It is Graduate Council policy that Master's-only degree programs should be offered in those fields where the Master's is a terminal degree or there is some other unique aspect to the Davis program. Specifically, Master's programs should not be viewed as preparation for Ph.D. programs. Taking this into account, the Art History program should either re-define its vision and direction and make structural changes to offer the graduate curriculum as advertised, emphasizing museum work rather than providing a general degree, or it should revise its Web site and publications to match the program being offered. Prof. Kavvas thought that the UCD program was fundamentally an art history program, not a museum studies program.

Because Council thought that these were substantive and important issues, it decided to conduct the next full review of the Art History program early, beginning in the fall of 2006.

Additionally, Council wished to emphasize the importance of communications in recommendation #3. Graduate Studies can help graduate programs with some aspects of Web site development and with printed publications. Graduate Studies program recruiters thought that the Art History brochure could benefit from a major revision.

Finally, Council asked that recommendation #5 concerning improving active collaboration with faculty and programs outside of Art History also be directed to the program, and not just to the Dean of the Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies.

Prof. Berger made the motion to approve the PRC report and to include Council's additional comments, recommendations, and decisions in the transmittal letter. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings thanked Prof. Carter for his work as the PRC liaison for the Art History program review and for presenting the PRC report to Council. Chair Hastings will draft the transmittal letter for Council to review at its next meeting.

Medical Informatics M.S. – PRC Report.

Chair Hastings thanked Professor Niels Jensen for attending this meeting for Prof. Ken Joy, the PRC Liaison for the review of the Graduate Group in Medical Informatics. Prof. Jensen, who was a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, informed Council that this was the graduate group's first review and he presented the PRC Report and its recommendations. He reported that the group has serious problems. The program does not have a research orientation, there is a very limited number of active faculty, the curriculum needs substantial re-design, and the group's administrative home has changed several times. Recommendation #1 is addressed to the Dean of Graduate Studies and is to suspend admissions to the program. Because there are just a few continuing students and no applicants for the fall have been accepted, the impact on students would be minimal. Continuing students must be allowed to complete the degree program and the faculty must provide the courses and any other academic support needed.

Graduate Council agreed with the assessment that there are substantial problems, related specifically to a lack of faculty involvement. Although there are 36 faculty members, only a handful are actively participating in the program and they are mostly emeriti or adjunct faculty. There appears to be a lack of vision and agreement among the graduate group faculty regarding the definition and role of medical informatics and the relationship of this program to other areas,

such as bioinformatics and statistics, and the relative role of basic science and more applied database issues.

Given the substantial problems with the program, Graduate Council agreed to recommend to the Dean of Graduate Studies to *suspend admissions to the Medical Informatics graduate group* in concurrence with recommendation #1 in the PRC report.

Council discussed recommendation #2 regarding a proposed ad hoc committee to create a new graduate group and re-opening admissions to the current or new Graduate Group in Medical Informatics. Dean Gibeling pointed out that the fundamental problem with the recommendation was that graduate groups are faculty driven. To have administrators appoint a committee without faculty is counter to what a graduate group is. Council did not discuss the proposed ad hoc committee since it agreed that a new program must be faculty initiated. Council was not convinced that the current graduate group's faculty resources are sufficient to offer a graduate program. Chair Hastings suggested that Graduate Council would *consider* a request to re-open admissions after the faculty in this area developed a vision and a clear and well thought out graduate program with sufficient faculty resources, involvement and support. He thought that Council should emphasize that the steps required are not trivial and that substantive changes from the program's current state would be needed. Council agreed that recommendation #1 (and not recommendation #2) was the key part of the PRC report, as any revitalization of the program must be faculty driven and graduate groups are always initiated and run by interested and involved faculty.

Dean Gibeling made the motion to accept the PRC report, re-emphasizing recommendation #1 and suggesting that Council will consider re-opening the program if the graduate group wishes to continue and if it develops a vision and a clear program. Prof. Watkins seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous.

Chair Hastings thanked Prof. Jensen for his work on the review of the Medical Informatics Graduate Group and for presenting the PRC Report to Council. Chair Hastings will recommend to Dean Gibeling the suspension of admissions to Medical Informatics, with the caveat regarding continuing students and notifying applicants for fall 2004. Chair Hastings will draft the PRC Report transmittal letter for Council to review at its next meeting.

Designated Emphasis in Biophotonics – Proposal to establish a new Designated Emphasis program

On behalf of Prof. Waterhouse, EPC member Prof. de la Peña presented the proposal for the DE in Biophotonics. The area of biophotonics on campus has recently received NSF funding of its research program as a Science and Technology Center, which it has named the Center for Biophotonics Science and Technology. One of the center's goals is to train and mentor Ph.D. students in the interdisciplinary areas of the research program. In reviewing the DE proposal, EPC was concerned with the required course in Biology because it originally included the option of three BIS 100 level courses. The proposers agreed to delete these, leaving just the two 200 level courses from which to choose. Besides one required course in Biology and one in Optical Science and Technology, specialty courses in both segments, the DE offers a seminar and a colloquium series each year for the students and the Center's researchers.

Chair Hastings thought that this DE had an ideal structure to meet the needs of students. Prof. Watkins reported that his committee will review the DE's bylaws and when they are approved, they will be substituted for the draft bylaws in the approved program proposal.

Prof. Berger made the motion to approve the DE in Biophotonics, with the caveat that the bylaws be approved. Prof. Kavvas seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write the proposers.

Prof. Watkins added that the Joint Ed.D. program's bylaws are under review too. His committee will review the bylaws and when they are approved by Council, they will be substituted for the draft bylaws in the program proposal before it leaves campus.

CONSENT ITEM

Minutes from March 19, 2004

The minutes were approved as presented with an addition at the end of the paragraph on the Davis Division Bylaw 80 B. under Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award agenda item on page 4 of the draft. The addition states, "Subsequently, the Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction (CERJ) suggested revising the proposed amendment to say, **"B. 19. To establish, review, and revise as necessary the criteria for the Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award, and annually to nominate its recipient."** Chair Hastings approved this revision on behalf of Council. The Representative Assembly of the Academic Senate will consider the amendment for approval at its meeting of May 4, 2004."

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies