

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
Friday, March 19, 2004
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Room 203 Mrak Hall**

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
Closure of the reviews of four graduate programs (Kavvas)	
• Atmospheric Science	7.1
• Biological Systems Engineering	7.2
• Chemistry	7.3
• Plant Biology	7.4
Qualifying Examination Policies – Draft (Waterhouse)	
<u>CONSENT ITEMS</u>	
Minutes from February 23, 2004	7.6
Atmospheric Science – Degree requirement changes (Waterhouse)	7.7
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology – Degree requirement changes (Waterhouse)	7.8
<u>INFORMATIONAL ITEM</u>	
Graduate Council and its Subcommittees – Updated membership lists	7.9
<u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	
Announcements from the Chair (Hastings)	
Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)	
Announcements from the Associate Deans (FitzGerald, Ramey)	
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Berger)	
Graduate Student Association (Karpel)	
Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Tatsch)	
Survey on Faculty Perspectives on Graduate Student Mentoring	
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (van Geelen)	
<u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u>	
Academic Planning and Development (Meeks)	
Administrative (Hastings)	
Courses and Bylaws (Watkins)	
Educational Policy (Waterhouse)	
Program Review (Kavvas)	
Support and Welfare (Scalettar)	

Alan Hastings, Chair

Distribution:

Members:

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

**MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Friday, March 19, 2004**

PRESENT: *Members:* T. Berger, A. Conley, K. Erickson, J. Gibeling, A. Hastings, L. Kavvas, J. Meeks, P. Singh, A. Waterhouse
Representatives: J. Karpel, J. Lane, S. Tatsch, C. Thornber
Graduate Studies: P. Fitzgerald, K. Garcia, L. Wilce

ABSENT: *Members:* C. de la Peña, R. Scalettar, E. Sutter, E. Watkins
Representatives: J. Galli-Banducci, E. Pyatt, A. van Geelen.

CONSENT ITEMS

Closure of the reviews of four graduate programs

- **Atmospheric Science**
- **Biological Systems Engineering**
- **Chemistry**
- **Plant Biology**

Chair Alan Hastings informed Council that the recommendations for closure of reviews should have been placed on the agenda as consent items instead of action items. No one requested that they be considered as action items. Therefore, they were approved as presented. Chair Hastings will notify the program chairs in writing.

Minutes from February 23, 2004

The minutes remained on the consent list, were approved as presented and will be posted on the Web.

Atmospheric Science – Degree requirement changes

Dean Jeffery Gibeling requested that the Atmospheric Science degree requirement changes be moved from the consent list to the action list.

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology – Degree requirements

EPC Chair Prof. Andrew Waterhouse requested that the Biochemistry and Molecular Biology degree requirements be moved from the consent list to the action list.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Graduate Council Chair

Chair Hastings reported that there is an administrative committee examining year-round education. The Academic Senate has decided to form its own committee to consider the topic and has requested him or a designee to represent Graduate Council. Chair Hastings requested a volunteer from Graduate Council to serve on the committee. [Prof. Berger agreed to serve on the committee.]

Chair Hastings also reported on a recent *Sacramento Bee* article, which stated that UC's proposed higher graduate student fees are justified by the substantial income students will receive after earning their graduate degrees. Chair Hastings suggested that he and Dean Gibeling write a response to this editorial.

Dean–Graduate Studies

Graduate Studies Dean Jeffery Gibeling made several announcements. He distributed an article from the *San Francisco Chronicle*, opposing the Governor’s proposed 40% increase in graduate student fees and pointing out the importance of graduate education for California to be able “to compete in the global marketplace.” The Dean indicated that the Governor’s proposal would also increase nonresident tuition (NRT) by 20%. Although UC officials have proposed other options regarding the graduate student fees to the UC Board of Regents, there have been no proposals to reduce the increase to the NRT. Dean Gibeling indicated that there have been no further definite developments on the fee increases. Some portion (20%) of the increases would be returned to the campuses in the form of student financial aid.

Dean Gibeling also distributed a memo on **strategic investment in graduate education for 2004-2005** signed by the Provost and himself. The block grant allocations for next year were based on a 10% increase in tuition and registration fees and a 4% increase for nonresident tuition (NRT). The Provost and Dean will provide funds to cover increases that exceed these two percentage levels for GSRs and students who receive block grant support. There will also be an emergency fund to which faculty with GSRs can apply for NRT during the three years of transition to full implementation of the nonresident tuition remission policy for GSRs. The Dean hopes that the faculty appreciates the Provost’s investment in and commitment to graduate education.

Prof. Kent Erickson reported that Jerry Kissler, UCOP Assistant Vice President, Budgetary Planning and Fiscal Analysis, pointed out that the Governor has not brought up the NRT policy. When the legislative analyst examines the proposed budget, it will be recognized that UC would be charging more for NRT than it costs to educate the students. The extra money will be used to offset state support for UC.

Council members raised questions regarding the effective date for the new postdoctoral scholar title, whether the PGR title could still be used for another year and whether Graduate Studies would have a notification and a formal application procedure for the emergency money to cover NRTs. Prof. Meeks thought that an end-of-the-year report on international student applications would be interesting. Dean Gibeling indicated that international student applications were down at UCD, systemwide, and in the nation.

Dean Gibeling announced that he planned to distribute the **call for the two Graduate Studies Associate Dean positions** next week and that he was actively interested in receiving Council’s nominees.

Dean Gibeling said that the **Graduate Studies commencement speaker** was still open to nominations. None have been received thus far. He asked Council for nominations.

Prof. Erickson reminded Council that UCLA and UCB had sent letters to the UC President regarding the Governor’s proposed increased fees for graduate education and asked whether UCD has taken a similar course of action. Dean Gibeling responded that he has had conversations with the Chancellor, who supports graduate education and reducing the increases to graduate student fees. He also expected that the Provost would comment on the impact of the proposed cuts in her email updates to the campus. Chair Hastings suggested that he write the Provost, thanking her for her memo and expressing Council’s concern with the proposed 40% and 20% increases in fees and tuition. He would copy the Chancellor on the letter. Prof.

Erickson made the motion for Chair Hastings to write the Provost. Prof. Trish Berger seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Hastings will write the Provost.

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs

Associate Dean for Graduate Programs Paul FitzGerald had no announcements.

Associate Dean for Students

Associate Dean for Students Melvin Ramey was out of town.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Vice Chair Trish Berger, Graduate Council's representative to CCGA, reported that CCGA has discussed the proposed increases in graduate student fees and tuition. Prof. Erickson reported that CCGA is working on language regarding private fund raising for graduate students. He indicated that campuses are not active enough in this area. Dean Gibeling said that Graduate Studies has no development officer and it is his aim to have one to work in partnership with campus deans. Prof. Erickson will take Council's input back to CCGA. Dean Gibeling pointed out that having a development officer was especially important at UCD because of graduate groups, which comprise more than half of the graduate programs. Graduate Studies plays a special role with their support.

Graduate Student Association

GSA Chair Jonathan Karpel had no announcements.

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor

Survey on Faculty Perspectives on Graduate Student Mentoring

Ms. Sheri Tatsch announced that a survey on mentoring graduate students would be distributed to faculty via email on March 30, 2004. The survey is short and responses will go directly to her. She will present a report on the survey's results to Dean Gibeling and the Chancellor. She encouraged Council members to respond to the survey and to encourage other faculty members to do so too.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

PSA Chair Dr. Albert van Geelen was absent. Dr. Carol Thornber had no announcements.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development

APD Chair Prof. Jack Meeks had no announcements.

Administrative

Chair Hastings reported that the Administrative Committee had met recently and a recurring issue was raised. When new faculty members are hired and bring an advanced student with them, the student often has difficulty meeting the UC residency requirement and the UCD graduate program's other requirements. Chair Hastings thought that this topic should be carefully examined.

Courses and Bylaws

C&B Chair Prof. Evan Watkins was absent. Ms. Kathy Garcia, Committee Analyst, reported that bylaws would not come forward to Council until May.

Educational Policy

Prof. Waterhouse said that EPC has three items on today's agenda.

Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award

Chair Hastings reported that Prof. Madewell contacted him regarding the Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching (OGST) Award. The Academic Senate committee that used to be charged with this award no longer exists. For the past two years, the Undergraduate Council has taken on the responsibility of sending out the call and making the award. Chair Hastings suggested that the OGST award go to Council's Support and Welfare Committee next year.

[In response to a request from the Academic Senate Chair for an amendment to **Davis Division Bylaw 80. B.**, Prof. Berger proposed, "B. 19. To recommend the award of the Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award, according to the terms of the Academic Senate." On April 16, 2004, the Graduate Council Assistant distributed the following materials via email to the Graduate Council members: the proposed amendment, the draft paragraph above, and a copy of Bylaw 80. Members were requested to vote on the amendment via email by April 19, 2004. A majority of the members voted in favor of the proposed amendment. Prof. Berger notified Prof. Bruce Madewell. 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.]

Program Review

PRC Chair Prof. Levent Kavvas reported that there would be quite a few PRC items on the April 26th meeting agenda.

Support and Welfare

On behalf of Prof. Richard Scalettar, the Chair of S&W, who was absent, Dean Gibeling reported that all the fellowship applications were reviewed, fellowships have been awarded and the offer letters have been mailed. Associate Dean FitzGerald reported that this year the process went more smoothly and more of the faculty reviewers who volunteered followed through on their commitment. Prof. Berger expressed her appreciation for the timely notification of the awards.

ACTION ITEMS

Qualifying Examination Policies – Draft

Prof. Waterhouse presented the EPC's draft policies and suggested the following review process: (1) Graduate Council would provide its input today, (2) EPC would then distribute a revised draft to graduate program chairs for comments on how their programs conduct QEs, and (3) a final draft of the policies would then be submitted to Graduate Council for its review and approval. Chair Hastings and Prof. Berger expressed strong agreement that the graduate program chairs should be provided with the opportunity to give their input.

Prof. Waterhouse reported that his committee was asked to address a number of issues regarding the Qualifying Examination, including the number of faculty on the QE committee, written and oral portions of the exam, whether the major professor should be permitted to be a member of the committee, and the content of the exam. He presented EPC's thoughts on these topics.

Membership

EPC thought that there should be 5 members on the QE committee. No fewer than 5 should be in attendance at the QE unless one member is ill or has an emergency. In that case, it would still be acceptable to conduct the examination with 4 faculty members present since the committee's decision on the student's performance need not be unanimous.

Prof. Waterhouse distributed Council's approved "Guidelines for Service on Advanced Degree Committees." Dean Gibeling noted that the current guidelines stipulate that if a QE took place with only four faculty members present, then the fifth member would meet separately with the student at another time. Prof. Waterhouse reported that EPC felt that the QE decision needed to be made by the members actually in attendance at the exam and EPC wanted all the committee members present to participate in the decision making process. Chair Hastings presented examples of programs where one or two QE committee members transmit results of separate written exams to the rest of the committee but do not attend the QE itself. Council discussed the rationale for allowing four versus five members being in attendance at the QE. Prof. Meeks pointed out that the chair of the committee cannot be absent and asked whether the external (out of the graduate program) member could be absent. Prof. Meeks thought that the attendance of two committee members, the chair and the outside member, was essential; they both must be present at the QE. Prof. Waterhouse explained that the purpose of having an outside person on the committee was partially for quality control of graduate programs. He thought that goal would not be compromised by the absence of one external member at one exam for any individual graduate program.

Prof. Berger raised the question of whether graduate programs had any difficulty in recruiting an external faculty member, someone from outside their graduate program, for QE committees and how willing people were to sit on committees outside their own graduate program. Dean Gibeling thought that the draft policy should not differentiate between graduate groups and departmentally-based graduate programs with regard to external members. Chair Hastings thought the QE committee should be allowed to have at least two external members. Council discussed the composition of QE committees in their various disciplines. Prof. Waterhouse added that EPC recommended a limit on special members on QE committees; there should not be more than one non-UCD Academic Senate member.

Prof. Meeks was not opposed to allowing an outside member but thought that Council should not require one because of the difficulty of recruiting QE members. Prof. Waterhouse thought that the net number of QEs on which individual faculty members would serve would not change. Council raised other issues regarding external committee members. Prof. Alan Conley suggested that they often are unfamiliar with the graduate program's standards and culture. Council agreed that QEs differ within, as well as across, programs and having an external member may not guarantee quality control. In addition, it was unclear how to choose an external examiner who was really external and independent of a particular program

Prof. Erickson suggested that Council recommend having an external reviewer as a member of the QE committee but allow individual programs to decide whether to allow or require external members. Council could state that a majority of the committee must be members of the student's graduate program and the program could decide whether to have one, two or no external members.

Topic of content of exam

Council discussed the content of the QE and whether it should evaluate the breadth as well as the depth of a student's knowledge in the field. Another topic was whether the student's major professor should be allowed to be a member of the QE committee and if so, how to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Some members thought that conflict of interest might be less of an issue in the humanities than other disciplines because the student's research is often totally separated from the major professor's research. Also, in small graduate programs, there may be just one person with expertise in a student's dissertation area and it may be appropriate to have the major professor on the exam committee. Council pointed out various sources of potential conflicts of interest, including the major professor financially supporting the student's research, other committee members' critiques of the student's research being construed or perceived as attacks on the major professor's research, and junior faculty members feeling intimidated or awkward about criticizing senior faculty. Two people reported that the major professor had been the most rigorous member on their QE committees. Chair Hastings reminded Council that the goal was to have a set of QE guidelines. One member recommended requiring individual programs to justify having the major professor on the QE committee. Chair Hastings suggested that Council could point out the dangers of having the student's major professor on the QE committee and could require programs to outline the benefits and rationale for having the major professor on the committee. Prof. Waterhouse suggested that the guidelines strongly discourage having major professors on the QE committees and that if they are allowed, then requiring the program to explain how it would avoid conflicts of interest. Chair Hastings suggested that if the major professor is on the QE committee, then the guidelines should strongly urge including an external member as well.

Timing

The EPC draft guidelines state that the graduate programs shall define an appropriate time period for when the QE is taken. Prof. Waterhouse indicated that when programs are reviewed, this time period could be examined. EPC thought it was better to specify the time period than not to do so. EPC could not come up with a specific time that it thought was too early and the ninth quarter was the latest. Chair Hastings thought that taking the QE before the fourth quarter was too early. Prof. Erickson thought that the time should be left to the program to determine and presented examples of when earlier exams were appropriate. Prof. Berger thought that any wording regarding the ninth quarter was confusing and she did not want programs to say, "before the ninth quarter." Prof. Erickson disagreed with the last sentence under Timing: "Faculty shall evaluate a student's performance in view of their preparation time." Prof. Waterhouse agreed to delete it from the draft.

Content

EPC drafted a very short general statement regarding the QE's content. Prof. Erickson thought that it was totally appropriate for the Ph.D. and that the guidelines should not address the specifics, which are different across programs.

Process

Prof. Waterhouse reported that EPC examined QE procedures that are currently in practice on other campuses. His committee felt that the QE had to include an oral component. EPC recommended that other attendees at the QE besides the committee members and the student might be invited only with the unanimous consent of the committee and student. EPC thought that a written exam should not be part of the QE unless the person who graded it was present at the QE. However, a written exam could be part of the material reviewed during the QE. Council

members presented examples of programs where the member who prepares and grades the written portion of the QE exam does not sit on the oral portion of the QE. Prof. Waterhouse's response was that if members write the exam, they have to be present at the oral QE and participate in the decision making process. Chair Hastings requested that Prof. Waterhouse take the draft guidelines and Graduate Council's comments back to EPC. Prof. Berger and Dean Gibeling requested that Council review the revised version before it is distributed to the graduate program chairs.

Prof. Waterhouse asked for clarification regarding who appoints graduate student committees: (1) the Dean of Graduate Studies, (2) the Chair of Graduate Council, or (3) the Chair of Graduate Council and the Dean of Graduate Studies or Dean's designee. Dean Gibeling reported that the Academic Senate regulations and current practice are confusing. [After the meeting, it was agreed to use a generic statement, e.g., that student committee nominees are submitted to Graduate Studies and appointed in accordance with Academic Senate regulations.]

Dean Gibeling raised another regulation issue. The QE is supposed to be taken at the end of all coursework. However, a student might take the exam in the same quarter he/she is taking the last couple of courses. The student would then postpone advancing to candidacy until the end of the quarter. Prof. Waterhouse reported that someone had raised the issue of programs not submitting the results of the QE to Graduate Studies in a timely manner. He also asked where statements regarding the QE guidelines would be included, for example in Academic Senate regulations, Graduate Council policies and Graduate Studies handbooks.

Atmospheric Science – Degree requirement changes

Dean Gibeling referred to page 2 where the wording of the degree requirements made it sound as though students could obtain a Master's or Ph.D. degree by completing a minimum of six graded graduate units with the balance being undergraduate course units. He thought that this was a light number of units for a Ph. D. Dean Gibeling reported that the UC Davis General Catalog lists more Atmospheric Science graduate courses that the students might take. Chair Hastings suggested that the degree requirements be returned to the program for further revision. Prof. Berger made the motion to request Atmospheric Science to increase its required number of graded graduate level course units and to justify the number for the Ph.D. and to modify the number required for the Master's to meet the Academic Senate regulation minimums. Council members discussed whether or not the Ph.D. degree course requirements should meet the minimum number required for the Master's degree. Prof. Erickson thought that it did not make sense to require a set number of units for all Ph.D. programs. Prof. Conley asked if Council was losing sight of the purpose of the Ph.D., which is to prepare students to conduct independent research. He said that courses are available to students to prepare them for the QE and dissertation. He thought students should be encouraged to get involved in research early. Chair Hastings thought students needed to take courses to obtain core knowledge.

Prof. Meeks seconded Prof. Berger's motion (above). The vote was 8 in favor and 1 opposed. The motion was carried. Prof. Waterhouse will notify the program chair of Graduate Council's request for the additional revisions

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology – Degree requirement changes

Prof. Waterhouse reported that EPC felt that BMB's requirement that the QE be taken at the end of the fifth, or prior to the sixth, quarter was acceptable. Prof. Waterhouse suggested that Council approve the degree requirements with some minor wording changes and return them to

the program. If the program agrees to the wording corrections, then the degree requirements would be considered approved. Because the meeting ran late and two members left, Council lost its quorum of members. Dean Gibeling suggested deleting the word “original” in “original contribution” on page 2 regarding the Master’s thesis. The Graduate Council Assistant will highlight all the minor wording corrections in the BMB degree requirement documents and distribute them electronically to the Council members. Members will be asked to review the degree requirements and the minor wording changes and to vote within 10 days on whether to approve them. If BMB’s requirements are approved, the Chair of Graduate Council will notify the graduate program chair of the approval with the caveat that the program accepts the additional minor wording changes. [Graduate Council approved the revised BMB degree requirement changes via an email ballot due on April 7, 2004. The vote in favor was 9 and there was one abstention. The graduate program accepted the minor wording changes in an email message dated April 12, 2004. A formal letter of approval will be mailed to the program chair.]

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Graduate Council and its Subcommittees – Updated membership lists

The meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies