

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair (Hastings)

Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)

Announcements from the Associate Deans (FitzGerald, Ramey)

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Berger)

CCGA's "Shopping List" for future UC budgets – UCD rankings requested 11.0

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)

ACTION ITEMS

Music – PRC Report. Guest: Prof. Jack Hicks, 1:00 p.m. 11.3

Political Science – PRC Report. Guest: Prof. John Labavitch, 1:30 p.m. 11.2

Applied Science – PRC Report (Prof. Levent Kavvas) 11.1

Textiles PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter (Hastings) 11.4

Native American Studies PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter (Hastings) 11.5

MAS in Clinical Research – Proposal to establish a new graduate group and program 11.6

(Waterhouse)

**Neuroscience M.S. – Proposal to establish an M.S. program to be offered by the
Graduate Group in Neuroscience, which offers the Ph.D.** (Waterhouse) 11.7

**Animal Biology Ph.D. – Proposal to establish a new graduate group and Ph.D.
program** (Waterhouse) 11.8

Division of Biological Sciences – Proposal to reconstitute the division as a college.
Guest: Prof. André Knoesen 11.9

CONSENT ITEMS

Sociology – Degree requirement changes. Guest: Prof. André Knoesen 11.10

Comparative Literature – Degree requirement changes. Guest: Prof. André Knoesen 11.11

**Designated Emphasis in Tourism Studies, proposal to establish a new DE –
EPC report** (Waterhouse) 11.12

Communication M.A., proposal to re-open admissions – EPC report (Waterhouse) 11.13

Philosophy degree requirement change – EPC report (Waterhouse) 11.14

German – Revised bylaws (Watkins) 11.15

Alan Hastings, Chair

PRESENT: *Members:* T. Berger, J. Gibeling, A. Hastings, L. Kavvas, E. Suttel, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins.

Representatives: J. Karpel, S. Tatsch.

Graduate Studies: E. Blaine, Paul FitzGerald, K. Garcia, L. Wilce.

ABSENT: *Members:* A. Conley, C. de la Peña, K. Erickson, J. Meeks, R. Scalettar, P. Singh.
Representatives: J. Galli-Banducci, J. Lane, E. Pyatt, C. Thornber, A. van Geelen.

GUESTS: Dr. Jack Hicks and Professors André Knoesen and John Labavitch.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

The announcements and subcommittee reports were postponed until after the action items.

ACTION ITEMS

The PRC Reports were presented in the order below.

Music – PRC Report

Dr. Jack Hicks, the PRC liaison for the review of the graduate program in Music, presented the PRC Report and its recommendations. Dr. Hicks described the Music program as the jewel in the crown of [the arts on campus]. He also said that the program is a work in progress and is in transition. Recently, four female assistant professors were hired, thus addressing a need for more gender balance in the program. However, their academic expertise now needs to be more fully incorporated into the graduate program and communication increased among the whole faculty. Dr. Hicks reported that three areas of weakness still needed to be addressed.

1. There is a continuing need for student advising, information and mentoring.
2. The lack of a formal TA training program, including regular observation by faculty and a TA handbook, is a serious issue.
3. Regular faculty meetings should be instituted to incorporate new faculty in the program and to consider devising an updated strategic plan.

Chair Alan Hastings indicated that the facilities and space issues were vital in this program's case. There is no other solution and this is not just the generic request. Dr. Hicks elaborated the legitimate need for a new site and space and reported that the campus is fast tracking the recital hall space. In addition, the program is willing and has requested permission to undertake a limited fund-raising initiative to supplement the shortfall for the recital hall. A Council member pointed out the need for an additional ethnomusicologist

Dean Jeffery Gibeling noted that the word "should" is used in the PRC Report recommendations and asked whether it ought to be changed to "must" or "shall". Dr. Hicks pointed out the astonishing lack of a TA training program and suggested Council could make that

apply to set up their own TA training and handbooks.

Dean Gibeling pointed out his concern that individual students and their GPAs could be identified from the information on page 2. Dr. Hicks agreed and thought it would be a good idea to revise that portion of the report. Council thought that the range of GPAs could be reported instead and that singleton categories could be merged with larger categories.

Chair Hastings summarized Council's discussion. Council wishes to emphasize the TA recommendations and the word "should" will be changed to "must" in Recommendations #3 (TA space and equipment), #6 (faculty communication, *including regular meetings*), #9 (improved student information, advising and mentoring) and #10 (TA training). In addition, the identifying information regarding individual students will be removed and replaced with ranges of GPAs/GREs. Prof. Berger made the motion to approve the PRC Report with the amendments described by Chair Hastings above. Dean Gibeling seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. PRC will make the changes to the report and Chair Hastings will draft the transmittal letter. The Chair thanked Dr. Hicks for his work on the review and for presenting the PRC Report to Council.

Political Science – PRC Report

Professor John Labavitch, the PRC liaison for the review of the graduate program in Political Science, presented the PRC Report and its recommendations. He said that the program is in transition, it has a new chair and leadership, and faculty-student interactions are improving. UCD's Political Science program has an international reputation.

Chair Hastings asked how Council could help the program to aim as high as possible. Prof. Labavitch responded that the PRC Report would help the program by pointing out issues to address. Some of these weaknesses, including student financial support and space, are continuing issues that the Social Sciences Dean might be able to address before the new space in Kerr Hall is expected to be available in 2006.

One of the program's primary issues is the relative balance or disciplinary importance of qualitative versus quantitative approaches to research in political science. Prof. Andrew Waterhouse asked whether the issue of content of instruction in the two approaches was contentious or evolving. He also asked about the students' career choices. Prof. Labavitch reported that the program is evolving from qualitative to quantitative approaches and the balance is shifting, which is evident in the new faculty hires. He reported that the external reviewer is a proponent of the quantitative approach and supported that trend in the program. Prof. Labavitch thought that the program should determine the balance while ensuring that students are not disadvantaged. Regarding the careers question, students are prepared for research institutions

Prof. Kavvas, the PRC Chair, pointed out that Recommendation #1 requires the program to define its core course series in terms of the subject matter that all students are required to know. He added that there needs to be a clear agreement among the faculty on the balance between the two approaches to research and that it needs to be communicated to incoming students.

Council discussed various aspects of the program's review, including the high response rate to the questionnaires, the review team's meetings with students and faculty, and whether the two approaches to research were discussed. The students and faculty enthusiastically support the chairs of the department and the graduate program. Council also discussed the 60% completion rate, which seemed particularly low. Apparently this is not a low rate for political science programs and most UCD students who do not complete the Ph.D. do complete the M.A.

Prof. Berger made the motion to approve the PRC Report as written. Prof. Waterhouse seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will draft the transmittal letter. He thanked Prof. Labavitch for his work on the review and for presenting the PRC Report to Council.

Chair Hastings thought that the external reviewers for the PRC Reports presented today were very thorough. Dean Gibeling wanted to add for the record to ask PRC to ensure that review committees are balanced by gender as well as discipline. He thought that it would have been especially appropriate in the case of Political Science. Prof. Kavvas said that the problem is not in identifying women nominees but in getting them to serve. Prof. Labavitch reported that PRC attempted to recruit women for the review team but were unable to do so in this case. Dean Gibeling suggested that Graduate Studies and PRC could work together to do this.

Applied Science – PRC Report

On behalf of Professor Brian Higgins, the PRC liaison for the review of the graduate program in Applied Science, PRC Chair Kavvas presented the PRC Report. He described the special set of circumstances that resulted in his writing and presenting the PRC Report. Prof. Kavvas pointed out that there is no comparable program in the country and therefore, no national ranking for Applied Science – Engineering. Chair Hastings asked how different this program is from an applied physics program. Prof. Kavvas responded that comparisons have not been made but the external reviewer was from two departments at Stanford, one in engineering and one in applied physics and had a relevant perspective on the program's curriculum. Prof. Kavvas added that one of the report's recommendations was to consider a name change because the current name is not appropriate as it is not recognizable. The report says engineering is applied science.

Prof. Kavvas emphasized that the program has very serious issues with which to contend. He pointed out that six of the recommendations from the previous review in 1998 are still serious issues even though the program has made some advances since then. Prof. Kavvas summarized

Council discussed the national security issue. One of the current problems is that LLNL is used to recruit foreign students, who no longer can obtain clearance to be in the labs. Council also discussed the campus' difficulty in recruiting someone for the position of Chair of the Department of Applied Science and Edward Teller Chair. Prof. Berger thought that when a program cannot identify a chair, it suggests a lack of faculty involvement. She suggested suspending admissions until a permanent chair is identified. Prof. Kavvas agreed that the lack of a chairperson was a serious issue and referred Council to Recommendation #1, which suggests an internal chair be appointed for two years in order to have someone to address the PRC Report recommendations, and to Recommendation #16, which emphasizes the serious issues in this review and suggests initiating the program's next full review in four years, which is ahead of the usual seven-year cycle. Prof. Waterhouse emphasized the need for a graduate program chair. Dean Gibeling pointed out that Prof. Ann Orel is an active department and graduate program chair.

Council discussed the whole rationale for the Applied Science program and whether the past reasoning was still valid. Prof. Kavvas presented a historical perspective on the program since its last review. Since then, the balance of faculty has shifted from LLNL to campus. Currently there are just six 50% FTEs at LLNL. The result is a decrease of LLNL support for this program. Prof. Kavvas said it was really an applied physics program, located in the College of Engineering. However, the program does have areas of excellence such as plasma fusion and an outstanding faculty.

Chair Hastings thought that 14-17 faculty members were too few to offer 5 stems. Prof. Kavvas pointed out Recommendations #3 (to consider decreasing the number of stems from five to four) and #10 (to find basic/core courses taught by other departments, for example quantum mechanics, and to save specialty courses for Applied Science), which address this issue.

After further discussion, Dean Gibeling made the motion for Council to approve the PRC Report and for the transmittal letter to require the program to provide Council by September 2005 with a set of objectives, a clear and more focused description of the stems, and to identify the uniqueness of this program. The letter would also say that if Council was not satisfied that the program had addressed its statement of concerns. Council would recommend suspension of admissions for fall 2006. This sentence was reworded to say, "If there is not substantial progress, Council would consider suspension of admissions for fall 2006." Chair Hastings thought that the program should justify itself as though it were a new program. Prof. Waterhouse requested the addition of Council's concern with the department's leadership in order for the graduate program to move forward and be able to address the report's recommendations. The amended motion was seconded. The vote in favor of the motion was six, and one member opposed the motion. The motion was carried. Chair Hastings will draft the transmittal letter. He

Division of Biological Sciences – Proposal to reconstitute the division as a college.

Chair Hastings introduced Prof. André Knoesen, who attended the meeting on behalf of APD Chair Jack Meeks, to present the DBS item and two of the consent items. This was the third time that Graduate Council has reviewed a proposal to reconstitute the Division of Biological Sciences as a college. The latest revised proposal had nothing new except the inclusion of the paragraph requested by Council regarding an academic committee within the college to address graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues. The APD committee noted that the reporting lines are not appropriate in the administrative chart of the Dean's Office and has made a recommendation to revise the reporting lines and chart. The APD also pointed out the ambiguity of retaining the "sectional," rather than substituting a "departmental," structure for the disciplinary subunits of the college.

Chair Hastings suggested reporting that Council was pleased that the recommended committee on graduate education and postdoctoral scholars was taken into consideration and included by the proposers and suggested attaching the APD report to his letter. Dean Gibeling made the motion as described above. Prof. Berger seconded it and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write Academic Senate Chair Bruce Madewell and attach the APD committee's report as Council's report.

Air Quality Research Center Organized Research Unit – Proposal to establish a new ORU

Chair Hastings presented the proposed Air Quality Research Center ORU. Because Council received this proposal so late in the academic year, it was unable to follow its normal review procedures, which include a review and report to Council by APD. However, Council gave the proposal a thorough review.

Chair Hastings presented some concerns with the proposal: whether faculty members who apply for a training grant needed the ORU and how the ORU would benefit graduate education. There are few mentions of graduate education in the proposal. Another concern was what the real overlap would be with other ORUs, for example the Institute of Transportation Studies. Prof. Kavvas asked how the proposed center would benefit campus research over and beyond that of existing programs such as civil and environmental engineering, physics and others. Chair Hastings also was concerned about a proposal developed by a single individual. The proposal refers to a large amount of grant money but provides no details. Prof. Knoesen asked whether the proposers had a copy of the "Graduate Council Guidelines for Review of Proposed and Existing ORUs." Chair Hastings suggested attaching a copy of this document to Council's letter. Dean Gibeling thought it might be appropriate to write the Office of Research to remind them to include the Council Guidelines in the materials distributed to ORU proposers and reviewers. Prof. Kavvas made the motion for Chair Hastings to relay Council's response to the proposal to Academic Senate Chair Bruce Madewell. Prof. Evan Watkins seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will let Prof. Madewell know that Council was

CONSENT ITEMS

Chair Hastings asked Council whether anyone wished to move any of the remaining items off the consent list to the action list. There were no requests; therefore, the following items were approved as presented.

- **Sociology – Degree requirement changes**
- **Comparative Literature – Degree requirement changes**
- **Designated Emphasis in Tourism Studies, proposal to establish a new DE – EPC report.**
Council concurred with EPC's report that determined that supporting documentation for the proposal was lacking. The proposal was not approved.
- **Communication M.A., proposal to re-open admissions – EPC report.** Council concurred with EPC's determination that it was not appropriate to re-open the program as a terminal degree. A Ph.D./M.A. program was recommended instead.
- **Philosophy degree requirement change – EPC report.** Council was informed that Philosophy has not yet responded to EPC's comments. The request for amendments will be re-submitted.
- **German – Revised bylaws**
- **Applied Mathematics – Revised bylaws**
- **Ecology – Revised bylaws**
- **Electrical and Computer Engineering – Revised bylaws**

Chair Hastings will notify the relevant graduate program chairs of Council's approval of their revised degree requirements and bylaws. The EPC reports for the items that it did not forward to Council for approval will be filed in the appropriate Graduate Studies files.

ACTION ITEMS (continued)

Textiles PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter

Native American Studies PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter

Chair Hastings asked Council for any changes to the two PRC Report transmittal letters. Prof. Kavvas reported that he reviewed the letters and had no revisions. He made the motion for their approval as presented. Prof. Watkins seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous for each of the two letters. Chair Hastings will transmit the letters and PRC Reports to the addressees.

MAS in Clinical Research – Proposal to establish a new graduate group and program

EPC Chair Prof. Waterhouse presented the proposal for the Master of Advanced Study in Clinical Research. He reported that the program is very well developed. Associate Dean FitzGerald pointed out that they have a full-time professional staff person who has been working on the MAS program. Prof. Waterhouse presented some observations: it is a very rigorous program that has tremendous support from the School of Medicine (SOM). It looks like a much larger program than

proposed MAS program. Prof. Waterhouse reported that the proposers assured EPC that the School of Medicine would still proceed with the MAS even if the K-30 were not funded. Dean Gibeling asked whether students would pay regular graduate student fees. Associate Dean FitzGerald explained the buy out of time for the students, who would be Medical School faculty. Dean Gibeling reported that the programs at UCSF and UCSD offer the MAS degree. The Graduate Council Analyst said that the program claims to not be “self-supporting” by our definition, whereby the students pay higher fees that cover the cost of the program.

Chair Hastings informed Council that the next step in the review process would be to transmit the proposal to the Academic Senate’s Library Committee and Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review (CAPBR) for their review and comments. CAPBR would review the proposal’s financial aspects and budget. Council had additional comments and questions about the MAS students’ fees, who would be responsible for receiving the fees, and who the program’s students would be. The students are not typical students because they would be Medical School faculty. Prof. Waterhouse reported that EPC did not feel that it could evaluate the program’s budget. After further discussion of the program’s responses to EPC’s comments and a question regarding “marginal cost of instruction,” Dean Gibeling suggested asking CAPBR to determine whether the program is self-supporting.

Chair Hastings raised a question under Preparation for Admission on page 8, regarding whether the program was excluding international students. The program will be asked to clarify the first bullet under 2.1.

Ms. Kathy Garcia raised a question on page 7, regarding whether it would be a conflict of interest for the assistant dean, who is a SOM faculty member, to be the graduate group chair of the program.

Dean Gibeling raised some academic questions. Have the 400-level courses been referred to the Courses and Bylaws Committee for approval for graduate degree credit? There was some discussion of 400-level courses. Dean Gibeling indicated that Council has to approve any 400-level course for a degree credit for graduate programs. Dean Gibeling also pointed out that Academic Senate Regulation 600.B states that once appointed, faculty cannot receive a higher degree from their division/unit. UCSD and UCSF do not mention this on their Web sites.

Prof. Berger made the suggestion to raise two issues in the letters: the program’s budget and student populations. Chair Hastings will communicate these back to the program. Associate Dean FitzGerald thought that the proposed MAS in Clinical Research was a good program. The problem of admitting Academic Senate faculty to the program still needs to be resolved. Also, there is the problem of admitting students into the program before it is approved.

program that has not been approved. Prof. Berger added that the program needed to clarify its limitation on international students. Prof. Watkins seconded the amended motion. The vote to support the concept of the proposed graduate group and MAS in Clinical Research program, subject to the noted contingencies, was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write the letters to the proposers and Academic Senate committees.

Neuroscience M.S. – Proposal to establish an M.S. program to be offered by the Graduate Group in Neuroscience, which offers the Ph.D.

Prof. Waterhouse reported that in its prior review, the Neuroscience Graduate Group was prompted to offer the M.S. as well as the Ph.D. The Neuroscience M.S. proposers have taken the Ph.D. program and replaced the dissertation with the thesis. The MS program is very rigorous and includes both the Plan I and Plan II options. The same number of units is required for both plans. Prof. Sutter pointed out that there is a job market for graduates with the M.S. degree. Prof. Waterhouse reported that the proposers emphasized that research skills were important at the Master's level too. Council discussed financial support for the Master's students and whether it should be included in the proposal. Council also discussed the rigor of the program.

Dean Gibeling pointed out that on page 7, the proposal should say that students pick a "Proposed Thesis Committee Chair or Major Professor" instead of a "Thesis Advisor" which is incorrect terminology. Council discussed the bylaws and having one set for both the M.S. and Ph.D. programs. Prof. Watkins reported that he has been in touch with the program. Prof. Berger made the motion for Council's preliminary approval to the proposed Neuroscience M.S. program subject to Dean Gibeling's suggested rewording above. Professors Kavvas and Watkins seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write the letters to the proposers and Academic Senate committees.

Animal Biology Ph.D. – Proposal to establish a new graduate group and Ph.D. program

Prof. Waterhouse reported that this new program proposal generated the most comments in his committee. The main issue was the flexibility of the curriculum. However, when EPC examined other programs around the country, it found that they had a similar design, with no restrictions on courses for the committee to select from and how they are administered. The proposed program is a good example of such programs. The EPC convinced the proposers to add a second core course. There are other academic content courses that the students are required to take. This program's flexible curriculum would be one way for UCD to broaden its graduate programs. In the future Council might discuss a model that would result in fewer programs. If there were fewer but larger programs, they would have to be more flexible.

Prof. Waterhouse reported that EPC supported the proposed program, the faculty supports it, and Animal Science has the track record of a successful Master's program. Many of the Animal Science students go on to Ph.D. programs elsewhere. The EPC considered the proposed

request for a name change to Animal Biology. Prof. Berger, a member of the Animal Science Department and one of the new program's proposers, reported that Animal Biology would be an interdepartmental graduate group and that it would be broader than Animal Science.

Dean Gibeling said that he wholly supported this program. He also read the description from Zoology, which was disbanded 10 years ago. The description is a close match with that of the proposed program. Prof. Waterhouse asked Prof. Berger whether the proposers considered the Zoology name. She responded that no one suggested Zoology.

Dean Gibeling thought that there should be a letter of support from the Chair of Animal Behavior, as a closely related program. Chair Hastings requested a letter from the Chair of Epidemiology as another closely related graduate program. Dean Gibeling also said that the 200A and B and 201 courses must be approved before the proposal is finally approved. He thought that the program should develop a sample mentoring or advising form that listed the individual student's required courses; he thought the form would be very helpful. Prof. Berger reported that there was one for the Animal Biology M.S. Dean Gibeling said there appears to be a real need for the program but the proposal needed more substantive evidence on page 23 of job market needs and opportunities for placement of graduates, for example, job listings, employer surveys, or assessments of future job growth. Dean Gibeling asked Prof. Berger about faculty participation from the School of Veterinary Medicine and DBS. Prof. Berger thought that there were three Vet Med and possibly one DBS faculty member who would join the graduate group. Chair Hastings asked whether the program would be restricted to vertebrates; Prof. Berger responded that it was not.

Dean Gibeling made one more request. In the program's operating procedures, he pointed out an asymmetry in the description of the Ph.D. compared with the M.S. for which the thesis and comprehensive exam committees were described but the Ph.D. committees were not described. Prof. Watkins made the motion for Council's preliminary approval of the proposal, contingent on the amendments described above. Prof. Sutter seconded the motion. The vote in favor was 6 and there were no votes opposed. Prof. Berger abstained from voting, as she is one of the proposers. The motion was carried. Chair Hastings will write the letters, to the proposers requesting revisions to the proposal and to the Academic Senate committees.

Division of Biological Sciences – Proposal to reconstitute the division as a college.

This item was reviewed earlier in the meeting, in the second hour, after Prof. Knoesen arrived.

CONSENT ITEMS

The consent items were presented right after the meeting's break.

Howitt and Gail Goodman are the program's proposers here on this campus. This is Graduate Council's second review of the proposal. The CAPBR has not yet responded to his letter.

A significant remaining concern about the program is its relationship with the self-supporting M.S. in Forensic Science, specifically whether students might start in the State funded Ph.D. program and then switch to the self-supporting M.S. program. Dean Gibeling said that UC Davis Extension will have to decide whether and how to accept such transfers into their program. The expectation is that at any one time half the Ph.D. students will be here at UCD and half at CSU Fresno. Associate Dean FitzGerald thought that 96 students is a large number. Dean Gibeling agreed but added that there is a need for real science to underpin what people in forensics and related areas do.

Dean Gibeling pointed out that that he was the one who wrote the letter to Chair Hasting and CAPBR Chair Angela Cheer, pulling together the most current budget information and updates on the proposal's review. The budget model is similar to that used for the DEL:CRA proposal. In response to a question by Chair Hastings regarding Dean Sheffrin's letter, Dean Gibeling said that it needed to be updated. Dean Sheffrin is responsive to his faculty and they support the proposed program.

Associate Dean FitzGerald raised the question of housing the program's students. He thought that the two lead deans needed to address where the 48 students would be housed. Dean Gibeling reminded Council that UCD is on the path to increase its number of graduate students by 1000. Here at UCD, the Criminal Justice Sciences students would be housed in the labs of faculty. Prof. Sutter pointed out that some students are not laboratory based but field based.

Chair Hastings thought it would be helpful to have letters of commitment for space from the lead deans. Chair Hastings pointed out that Council has not held up this program's review. The Office of Resource Management and Planning (ORMP) had the proposal for a year and then this year the Office of Graduate Studies and the proposers revised the proposal. He reported that the proposers dealt with the issues raised by the previous Graduate Council. Dean Gibeling said that he would like to see this program's review facilitated and suggested Council's conditional approval contingent on a favorable response from CAPBR and the two lead deans' commitments for space. The responses would be judged by Chair Hastings on behalf of Council. Prof. Berger made the motion described by Dean Gibeling and Prof. Sutter seconded it. The vote in favor of the motion was 6 and there were no votes opposing it. Dean Gibeling abstained from voting as he presented the proposal on behalf of the proposers. The motion was carried. Dean Gibeling will write the two lead deans requesting their commitments of space. He will forward their responses, as well as CAPBR's, to Chair Hastings to review for final approval.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Jeffery Gibeling reported that the **search for the two Graduate Studies Associate Deans** is underway. The **nonresident tuition remission (NRTR) policy** will be effective fall quarter 2004. The Graduate Student Researchers (GSRs) will have their fees and nonresident tuition paid from faculty grants. The campus is waiting for final approval of the policy by UCOP. A Web site with Questions & Answers will be set up, including information about the emergency fund. Dean Gibeling thanked those who attended the **Graduate Studies Commencement Ceremony** on June 17, 2004 and reported that many faculty members were in attendance.

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs

Associate Dean for Programs Paul FitzGerald had no announcements.

Associate Dean for Students

Associate Dean for Students Melvin Ramey was absent. Today is his last day in the Office of Graduate Studies before his retirement.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Vice Chair Trish Berger, Graduate Council's representative to CCGA, presented the **(1) CCGA's "Shopping List" for future UC budgets**. The list of priorities related to graduate education is for the new base funding which was agreed to in the budget compact with the Governor. Prof. Berger asked Council for a ranking of the list and any additional suggestions. Prof. Watkins selected #6 and Chair Hastings selected #8 as high priorities. The Graduate Council assistant will e-mail the document to Council and ask the members to rank the items on the list and send them back to Prof. Berger.

(2) Prof. Berger reported that UC Irvine has such bad housing problems that the campus now gives graduate students four years to advance to candidacy. Then students are disqualified if they do not meet the time limits (Lee check with Prof. Berger on details)

(3) UC Santa Cruz has a pilot program to submit theses/dissertations electronically.

Graduate Student Association

GSA Chair Jonathan Karpel had no announcements.

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor

Ms. Sheri Tatsch said that it has been an educational process to be on Graduate Council. Dean Gibeling announced that Ms. Heather Wylie will be next year's GSADC and will be starting July 1, 2004.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

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

Courses and Bylaws

C&B Chair Evan Watkins reported that this summer his committee will make the bylaws guidelines more user friendly.

Educational Policy

EPC Chair Andrew Waterhouse reported that he has tried to “clear the decks” for next year’s committee.

Program Review

PRC Chair Levent Kavvas reported that PRC conducted 10 program reviews and presented 10 PRC Reports to Council this year. The last three reports were presented today. For the 2004-2005 academic year, 12 graduate programs will be reviewed. A handbook for the Committee members was developed this year and Ms. Garcia is developing a Web site that will be up by the beginning of fall quarter. The Program Review Closure Committee will meet over the summer to continue their work in closing out past graduate program reviews.

Support and Welfare

S&W Chair Richard Scalettar was out of the country.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies