

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, November 17, 2003
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Room 3201 Hart Hall**

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
Master of Advanced Study (MAS) in Maternal and Child Nutrition – Bylaws (Watkins)	3.1
MAS in Maternal and Child Nutrition, proposal for a new part-time, self-supporting departmentally-based graduate program – Review for formal approval (Hastings)	3.2
Selection of graduate programs to be reviewed in the 2004-2005 academic year (Kavvas)	3.3
Human Development Graduate Group – Bylaws (Watkins)	3.4
Administrative merger of Human Development and Child Development (Hastings)	
School of Medicine Department of Medical Pathology – Name change proposal (Hastings)	3.5
Implementation of Non-resident Tuition Remission Policy (Gibeling)	3.6
Sponsored Research Manual (SRM) Intramural Funding Sources Section 525 “Graduate Student Travel Awards” – Additional revisions (FitzGerald)	3.7
<u>CONSENT ITEM</u>	
Minutes from October 17, 2003 (To be distributed.)	3.8
Graduate Group Chair Appointments – Current process (FitzGerald)	3.9
Closure of Program Reviews – Recommendation to close 16 reviews (Kavvas)	3.10
Revision to the Designated Emphases Policy and Process for Reviews (Kavvas)	3.11
Human Development Ph.D. – Degree requirement changes (Waterhouse)	3.12
German – Degree requirement changes (Waterhouse)	3.13
<u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>	
Applied Mathematics – Revised bylaws issue (Watkins)	Handout
Qualifying Examination Committees (Hastings)	
Minimum viable size for a graduate program (Hastings)	
<u>INFORMATIONAL ITEM</u>	
Graduate Council and Subcommittee Membership Lists, updated	3.14
<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)	
Term of CCGA Representative	
Graduate Student Association (Karpel)	
Policy prohibiting graduate students from teaching upper division courses	
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (van Geelen)	
<u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u>	

Alan Hastings, Chair

**MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Monday, November 17, 2003**

PRESENT: Members: T. Berger, S. Crum, J. Gibeling, A. Hastings, L. Kavvas, J. Meeks, J. Money, R. Scalettar, P. Singh, E. Sutter, E. Watkins
Representatives: J. Galli-Banducci, J. Karpel, J. Lane, E. Pyatt, S. Tatsch, A. van Geelen
Graduate Studies: T. Dillinger, C. Duffy, P. Fitzgerald, K. Garcia, L. Webb, L. Wilce

ABSENT: Members: A. Conley, K. Erickson, A. Waterhouse

Chair Alan Hastings introduced those members and representatives who were new or absent at the first two meetings.

CONSENT ITEMS

Minutes from October 17, 2003

Chair Hastings removed the minutes from the consent list because they are not ready to distribute.

The rest of the items remained on the consent list and are approved as presented. Chair Hastings will write the chairs of the 16 programs whose reviews have been closed. He also will notify the chairs of Human Development and German that their degree requirement changes were approved.

Graduate Group Chair Appointments – Current process

Closure of Program Reviews – Recommendation to close 16 reviews

Revision to the Designated Emphases Policy and Process for Reviews

Human Development Ph.D. – Degree requirement changes

German – Degree requirement changes

ACTION ITEMS

Master of Advanced Study (MAS) in Maternal and Child Nutrition – Bylaws

Prof. Evan Watkins, Chair of the Courses and Bylaws Committee, presented the bylaws and his committee's recommendation that they be approved and that they be included in the program's proposal. Prof. Trish Berger made the motion to approve the bylaws and to include them in the proposal. Prof. Jack Meeks seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will notify the proposers in writing.

MAS in Maternal and Child Nutrition, proposal for a new part-time, self-supporting departmentally-based graduate program – Review for formal approval

Chair Hastings distributed the proposers' responses to the concerns raised by the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review (CAPBR) and by Dean Joseph Silva. In lieu of CAPBR's approval, Council's review for formal approval will consider whether the proposers' response has satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised by CAPBR. Chair Hastings reported that the proposers responded to issues raised in Council's preliminary review. The major issue was the restriction on enrollment in the program's courses. The other revisions requested by Council were minor.

Although he thought that the proposal was well put together, Prof. Meeks also said that he thought that the proposers did not address CAPBR's first question regarding what would happen if the program did not enroll a sufficient number of students to support it. Chair Hastings

referred Council to the proposers' response. Dean Jeffery Gibeling said that UC Davis Extension would be responsible for any financial shortfall. Council agreed that the proposers had satisfactorily addressed CAPBR's concerns.

Prof. Meeks made the motion for Council to give its formal and unconditional approval to the proposed program. Prof. Evan Watkins seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will notify Dean Gibeling in writing and request that he transmit the proposal to the Vice Chancellor--Undergraduate Studies for consideration by the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors.

Selection of graduate programs to be reviewed in the 2004-2005 academic year

Prof. Levent Kavvas presented the Program Review Committee's selection of 10 programs to be reviewed next year and three program reviews to be delayed one year. His committee thought that 10 reviews would be a good workload for next year's committee. Prof. Kavvas explained that reviews are usually conducted every 7 years. New Master's programs are first reviewed 3 years after admitting students and new Ph.D. programs are first reviewed 3-5 years after admitting students. He added that historical factors have affected the 7-year review period. Now that procedures and resources are in place to ensure reviews are completed in a timely manner some adjustments will be made to the review schedule to bring the number of reviews per year close to 10.

Prof. Berger moved to approve the PRC's selections of programs to be reviewed next year and of reviews to be delayed one year. Prof. Ellen Sutter seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. In a joint letter to the graduate programs, Chair Hastings and Prof. Kavvas will initiate the reviews selected for next year.

Human Development Graduate Group – Bylaws

Administrative merger of Human Development and Child Development

Chair Hastings referred Council to the last memo in the Human Development Bylaws attachment. It refers to the proposed administrative merger of the Graduate Groups in Human Development and in Child Development and Council's requirement for a single set of bylaws. The bylaws address the merger of the administrative structure of the two graduate groups. The two graduate degree programs would remain separate.

Prof. Watkins reported that the review of the bylaws has a longer history because of the merger. In 2001 the bylaws for the administrative merger were submitted, last year Prof. Emily Goldman's committee requested revisions, and this year his committee requested a couple of minor changes. Chair Hastings pointed out that the two degree programs would remain unchanged.

Council discussed the proposed administrative consolidation and its relationship to the two graduate groups and their separate degree programs. Council discussed what the review process for a consolidation of graduate programs might entail. The discussion of whether the administrative merger was like moving a program's administrative home or more like moving one degree program to another graduate group. Chair Hastings suggested voting on a new entity. Prof. Watkins made the motion to approve the consolidation of the Graduate Groups in Human Development and in Child Development into one Graduate Group in Human Development. Prof. Berger seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write Dean Gibeling and request that Graduate Council's approval of the consolidation be forwarded to the Vice Provost--Undergraduate Studies, to be transmitted to the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors as an informational item. The Graduate Group Chair will be copied on the letter.

Dean Gibeling raised a question regarding Human Development's bylaws. On page 2, under the article regarding membership, 2.d) (which specifies members' contributions) refers to the "M.S. qualifying examination." This is unusual terminology and it was unclear to Council whether this meant the M.S. Plan II comprehensive examination or a different examination. Prof. Watkins asked whether it is a qualifying exam for the M.S., a preliminary exam, or a final exam. If it is the final exam, then it is the comprehensive exam for the M.S. Plan II option. Council agreed to vote on approving the bylaws, contingent on the program's revising the wording of the M.S. qualifying examination. Prof. Meeks moved to approve the bylaws, contingent on changing the wording "M.S. qualifying examination" to "M.S. comprehensive examination" in the document. Prof. Berger seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Prof. Watkins and Chair Hastings will notify the program chair.

School of Medicine Department of Medical Pathology – Name change proposal

Council discussed the rationale for the proposed name change to the Department of Medical Pathology and Laboratory Medicine. Prof. Paul Singh asked about the size of the department. Associate Dean FitzGerald responded that there were 20 or fewer faculty members. Council agreed that there were no issues regarding graduate education. Prof. Meeks suggested including the word "neutral" in the response. Prof. Berger made the motion to respond that Graduate Council thought the proposed name change was neutral with regard to graduate education issues. Prof. Meeks seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will notify Prof. Bruce Madewell, the Academic Senate Chair.

Implementation of Non-resident Tuition Remission Policy

This item was discussed later in the meeting.

Sponsored Research Manual (SRM) Intramural Funding Sources Section 525 "Graduate Student Travel Awards" – Additional revisions

Associate Dean FitzGerald presented the additional revisions to SRM 525. At its meeting of September 18, 2003, Council considered some revisions and suggested some others. Council members suggested revising the October 15th application deadline because students sometimes do not find out about meetings or conferences that they might attend until after the deadline to apply for travel awards. Associate Dean FitzGerald pointed out the new wording on pages 3 and 4 which would allow students to apply to be reimbursed for travel which occurred in the previous travel period, in cases where the meetings or the student's acceptance to the meeting were announced after the application deadline for that travel period. The drawback of students applying for an award after paying for their own travel is that they would not know whether they would be reimbursed.

Council discussed the policy on student travel. Associate Dean FitzGerald clarified that there is no guarantee that every student will receive a travel award and there is a limit of one travel award per student during his/her graduate education. Prof. Richard Scalettar, the Chair of the Support and Welfare Committee, reported that two-thirds of those who apply do not receive awards. There is just \$20,000 to distribute per each 6-month cycle. Profs. Meeks and Money thought that this information should be on the Web so that students know their chances of receiving an award and that it is a risk to travel and then apply for an award. Council discussed whether the travel award reviewers might be more or less inclined to fund travel already taken.

Dr. Albert van Geelen, Chair of the Postdoctoral Scholars Association, asked whether these travel awards could be opened up to postdoctoral scholars. The PSA has \$3000 and spends \$2000 on travel awards. Chair Hastings thought that mentors should send their postdocs to conferences and assist them in finding positions. Prof. Steven Crum said that many postdoc awards earmark money for travel.

Prof. Meeks thought that the proposed change to SRM 525 was a good addition because it leaves some flexibility for those cases where meeting announcements or acceptance to meetings are received after the application deadlines. Prof. Berger agreed that the change would improve the existing policy. Prof. Sutter made the motion to accept all the SRM 525 revisions noted on the document. Prof. Singh seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Assistant Dean Charles Duffy will forward the revised policy for campus review.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Applied Mathematics – Revised bylaws issue

Since he is a member of the Executive Committee of the Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics (GGAM), Chair Hastings recused himself as chair and asked Vice Chair Berger to chair the meeting for this item. Prof. Watkins reported that the GGAM bylaws have a long history. He described the handout, which includes part of Article VII from the bylaws, Prof. Emily Goldman's request to the program to make a revision to the article, Prof. Bruno Nachtergaele's response, and additional sections from the bylaws on membership and the Executive Committee. Of particular concern to Prof. Goldman, who chaired the Courses and Bylaws Committee last year, was the program's statement, "The amendment passes if it is approved by a majority of the [Mathematics] Department members in the [Applied Mathematics Graduate] Group and by a majority of the non-Department members of the Group." This statement suggests different classes of faculty within the group, based on department affiliation. Prof. Nachtergaele's response says that the GGAM believes itself to be atypical in this respect and that the Department of Mathematics plays a special role in the group's resources and functionality. The GGAM Executive Committee did not approve Prof. Goldman's suggested revision and decided not to submit it to the group's membership for a vote. Prof. Watkins reported that his committee is inclined to support Prof. Goldman's position but wanted to ask Council for what the next step should be. In response to a question posed by Prof. Berger before the meeting, Prof. Watkins reported that the group has 66 faculty members, 19 who are in the department of mathematics and 47 who are non-mathematics department faculty.

Prof. Berger pointed out the composition of the executive committee: the graduate group chair and four elected members, two from mathematics and two from outside mathematics. In addition, non-voting attendees at meetings include a student representative, the graduate coordinator of the department of Mathematics who is also the coordinator for the graduate group, and the chair of the graduate program committee of the department of mathematics. Chair Hastings reported that the graduate group chair has always been from mathematics although that is not stipulated in the bylaws and that mathematics and applied mathematics share the same staff coordinator.

Council discussed graduate groups and agreed with Associate Dean FitzGerald that such a two-tiered faculty was inconsistent with Graduate Council policy for graduate programs. Prof. Berger asked Council whether it wished to discuss the bylaws or invite Prof. Bruno Nachtergaele to attend Council's next meeting. Council agreed to invite Prof. Nachtergaele to the next meeting. Prof. Watkins will extend the invitation on behalf of Graduate Council.

Chair Hastings asked Council to discuss the next two items before assigning them to a subcommittee.

Qualifying Examination Committees

Chair Hastings presented several concerns that have been raised recently regarding the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination (QE) and its committee. Some of these include:

- **Number of faculty on the QE committee.** Historically, there have been and continue to be 5 members. In 1969 Graduate Council approved a policy allowing a minimum of 4 members in specific cases. One graduate program currently has approved degree requirements that state there will be 3 members. Chair Hastings has surveyed other institutions and has found that many have just 3 faculty members on the QE committee.
- **Written and oral portions of the QE.** For example, one graduate group has two areas that have a written exam that students can choose to take as part of the QE. The faculty associated with those areas are on the QE committee but they do not attend the oral portion of the QE.
- **Issue of whether the major professor is or is not permitted to be a member of the QE committee.**
- **Content of the QE.** The QE used to be a general exam and now it typically is the student's presentation and defense of the dissertation research proposal.

Chair Hastings thought that it would be good to have a comprehensive overview of the QE by the end of the year.

Council discussed the issue of the number of committee members. Prof. Berger thought that there should be an odd number of faculty to avoid voting ties and that 3 was a sufficient number of faculty. Prof. Scalettar reported that in Physics one member has to be external and that makes three too small a number for the QE committee. Chair Hastings suggested recommending a range of three to five members. He added that when students are enrolled in a Designated Emphasis program, the committee must include a DE member. Prof. Kavvas thought that departmentally-based programs that have two faculty from outside the department on the committee to act as outside reviewers should have five faculty on the QE committee. Prof. Singh said that the graduate program in Biological Systems Engineering used to allow the major professor to join the committee; this is no longer allowed. Prof. Sutter said that in some programs, the academic adviser could be on the QE committee. Prof. Meeks suggested that Council develop a set of guidelines.

Associate Dean FitzGerald thought that the number of members was not as important as whether the major professor was on the QE committee. He thought that there was a potential intimidation factor on junior faculty who were also on the committee. The major professor's research grant may fund the student and it may be difficult for junior faculty to express any strong disagreements to the student's approach. Prof. Berger added her perception from EPC last year. Typically, in the sciences major professors are not on QE committees but in the humanities and arts they are. Prof. Crum suggested the number of committee members could be 3 or 5 depending on the discipline.

Prof. Watkins reported that in the humanities, the QE tends to be a broader general exam and that the committee membership tends to be well distributed and larger. Chair Hastings asked Council

how general the exam should be. In support of a broad general exam, Prof. Watkins reported that students in English have a wide range of teaching responsibilities after they graduate. Chair Hastings thought that graduate programs do a disservice to students by not requiring breadth of knowledge for students heading for research careers too.

Chair Hastings will charge EPC with the comprehensive review of the QE and request that the committee draft a report for Council's consideration.

[An additional charge to the committee will be to establish a time limit for the QE committee to report the results of the exam to the Office of Graduate Studies. There have been two recent cases, one in the "ag and bio sciences" and another in engineering where the QE committees have not reported the results several weeks after the QE.]

Minimum viable size for a graduate program

Chair Hastings asked Council to discuss the minimum viable size for a graduate program. Some graduate programs have very small numbers of enrolled students, admitting just one to three students per year. Council needs to be aware and careful of differences between disciplines, where the appropriate minimum cohort size for student interactions may vary. Chair Hastings said that financial savings was not the primary rationale for raising the topic. There also are issues in terms of the time required for program review. He asked Council to have a brief discussion of the topic.

Dean Gibeling said that economic factors have to be considered since there are finite resources for graduate education. All graduate programs, even small ones, require financial support for the graduate program staff person, the program's block grant, and the cost and workload to conduct the graduate program's review. Associate Dean FitzGerald emphasized that cohort size is important to the quality of the student's education.

Chair Hastings pointed out that we subdivide the graduate pie particularly fine at UCD. Council discussed some solutions to small size. Some graduate programs could be broader and include others. Smaller programs could combine or share administrative support. Also, the actual number of students in a program may vary and be flexible depending on the discipline. Chair Hastings will charge APD with the examination of this topic and with developing a draft statement or policy for Council's consideration. The Office of Graduate Studies can provide the committee with the numbers of new and enrolled students for each of the programs.

Implementation of Non-resident Tuition Remission Policy

Chair Hastings presented some background on the Nonresident Tuition Remission Policy for Graduate Student Researchers (GSRs). The Provost announced the policy in June 2003 and it will be implemented beginning Fall Quarter 2004. However, there are still a number of unanswered questions. Dean Gibeling is consulting with three of the Academic Senate committees on how to implement the policy. The attachment includes his memo to the committees and the Provost's directive to the campus. Dean Gibeling selected some key questions from the directive to be addressed.

Last year discussion was focused on two models under which the policy might be adopted. The model selected was the Cost by Residency Model, whereby the nonresident tuition for GSRs would be charged to the fund source that also pays the stipend to that individual. Dean Gibeling

would like to begin his consultation with Graduate Council today and asked Council to participate in a discussion of questions from his memo or the directive.

Chair Hastings suggested discussing the NRTR in terms of the full indirect cost rate, exceptions to the policy, the trigger percentage, and funding sources that do not provide money for the NRT. He reiterated that the policy would be implemented, that the NRTR has always been paid, and the question now is how it will be paid. He asked Council for its questions.

One Council member suggested discussing question #4 and whether the Provost's \$600,000 investment in the NRTR policy could be used for work-study GSRs. Dean Gibeling said that the Senate committees were being asked for advice on how to use the \$600,000 and because some funding is hard to use to cover NRTR charges, the programs' block grant money might also be used for this purpose. A Council member asked about the total amount of the block grant as a comparison.

Council discussed avoiding large-scale exceptions to the policy. Other topics were TAs, GSRs, and first year students; whether NRTRs would be subject to indirect costs and fees; and funding caps by granting agencies. Dean Gibeling reported that when he met with the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review, it was especially interested in the transition period. He reported that programs could use their block grant for NRTR for GSRs during the transition but they should avoid using it all for this purpose, as that would limit their flexibility. Council members reported that during the admissions process, their programs determine how many nonresident students that they can support. One Council member thought that not many of his colleagues would admit international students if they cost as much as postdoctoral scholars.

Council also discussed the trigger percentage for the NRTR and students having split appointments. For example, a program might appoint a student at the equivalent of 50% time with 25% paid from a grant as a GSR which pays the NRTR and a 25% fellowship stipend from the program's block grant. Different programs may have different solutions. Some programs admit students directly into individual laboratories while others may use the lab rotation model during the first year. Some programs' faculty may be able to predict whether they will have international students working on their grant-funded research while others may not know ahead of time. Dean Gibeling said that some split appointments (e.g., TA and GSR) pay split fees. The NRTR will not be a benefit for TAs. However, a 25% TA/25% GSR appointment will provide NRTR as a benefit of the GSR appointment.

A Council member asked about possible exceptions to the policy in cases where the students' family members are willing to pay the students' fees and tuition. Two members said their programs offer admissions with partial fees and students have to decide whether they can provide the rest. Council also discussed whether programs could provide the additional percentage of employment for students hired as TAs below 50%. Chair Hastings said that if the percentage appointment is above the 25% trigger, the grant should pay all of the tuition, while if the appointment is below 25% the charge could be pro rated. Graduate Council will continue this discussion and Chair Hastings will charge APD with drafting a response on behalf of Graduate Council.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Graduate Council and Subcommittee Membership Lists, updated

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Graduate Council Chair

Chair Hastings said he had no further announcements.

Dean–Graduate Studies

Graduate Studies Dean Jeffery Gibeling made two announcements. He reported that the UC Berkeley Graduate Council sponsors a lecture. He passed around a poster describing two lectures in evolutionary genetics. He presented this item as an interesting observation, as an example of something academic that Graduate Council could do. An endowment funds the lectures at Berkeley; UC Davis could seek similar funding.

Dean Gibeling reported that this year's admissions numbers have increased over last year's. There are more than 4100 graduate students enrolled in graduate programs. This number is 400 more students than were enrolled last year. The applications increased across the campus. There were more international applications, more domestic applications, and more applications from under-represented minorities. We are on the path to grow to 5000 students in the next 5-7 years. How this will converge with the State budget and potential decrease in enrollment is challenging.

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs

Associate Dean Paul FitzGerald had no announcements.

Associate Dean for Students

Associate Dean Melvin Ramey was absent.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Vice Chair Prof. Berger, Graduate Council's representative to CCGA, reported that UCOP currently plans to keep the ratio of undergraduate:graduate enrollment increases the same. UCLA was hoping to have a development officer appointed to its graduate division (or its equivalent), but it is against policy at UCLA to have such a position. Prof. Berger asked Dean Gibeling whether he was interested in the Office of Graduate Studies having such a position. He responded that he is working on it. Chair Hastings said Graduate Council could voice support for an OGS development officer to the Provost or other appropriate administrator.

Term of CCGA Representative

This item was not discussed due to lack of time.

Graduate Student Association

Policy prohibiting graduate students from teaching upper division courses

GSA Chair Jonathan Karpel reported that a graduate student had told him that the policy prohibiting graduate students from teaching upper division courses is being enforced. Mr. Karpel researched the AI policy and learned that it can be used in emergencies. He asked Council whether this is a policy, whether it is in place, whether it is being enforced, and whether it is being enforced equally across departments. Dean Gibeling responded that the short answer is: yes, there is a policy, in place, being enforced.

Chair Hastings responded that in order for graduate students to teach upper division courses, they need to obtain an exception to the policy. The exception is difficult to obtain during the academic year, but in the past it was easier to obtain for the summer. Now that summer is being treated as a normal quarter, the Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction is denying requests for exception. Prof. Berger added that an AI has to obtain special permission for each

course. Prof. Watkins added that exceptions are for each student individually rather than blanket exceptions during the summer. Chair Hastings suggested that Graduate Council could “weigh in” on the basis of the educational value of the upper division teaching experience to graduate students.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

PSA Chair Dr. Albert van Geelen had no announcements

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor

Ms. Sheri Tatsch had no announcements

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no subcommittee reports. The committee chairs had nothing further to report.

Academic Planning and Development

Administrative

Courses and Bylaws

Educational Policy

Program Review

Support and Welfare

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies