

GRADUATE COUNCIL AGENDA
Monday, February 28, 2005
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
2154 Meyer Hall

AGENDA ITEM**ATTACHMENT****SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Academic Planning and Development (Knoesen)
 Administrative (Berger)
 Courses and Bylaws (Waterhouse/Watkins)
 Educational Policy (Upadhyaya)
 Program Review (Kavvas)
 Support and Welfare (Scalettar)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair (Berger)
 Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)
 Announcements from the Associate Dean (Caswell-Chen)
 Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Wu)
 Graduate Student Association (Karpel)
Graduate student survey of graduate program name changes
 Postdoctoral Scholars Association (van Geelen)
First Annual Award for Excellence in Postdoctoral Research
 Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Wylie)

ACTION ITEMS

Communication M.A. – Proposal to re-open admissions. Guest Lynette Hunter 6.2A
Rhetoric and Communication M.A. – Name change request. Guest Lynette Hunter 6.2B
Criminal Justice Sciences Joint Doctorate with CSU Fresno, proposal to establish a graduate group and Ph.D. Program – Council’s final review (Gibeling) 6.3
<http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/programproposal/CriminalJustice.htm>
Animal Biology – Bylaws (Watkins) 6.4
Animal Biology M.S. – Request to transfer administration from Department of Animal Science to Graduate Group in Animal Biology (Gibeling) 6.5
Doctoral Qualifying Examinations – Draft policy (Berger) 6.6
Item deleted. 6.7
Mending the Wall: Report of the Special Committee on Shared Governance and Senate Operations, UC Academic Senate Davis Division, December 13, 2004, Chapter 10 (Berger) 6.8
http://www.mrak.ucdavis.edu/senate/shared_governance_report.pdf

CONSENT ITEMS

Designated Emphasis in Feminist Theory and Research – Geography affiliation request (Berger) 6.9
Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA) – Name change request (Berger) 6.10
Designated Emphasis in Social Theory and Comparative History – Degree requirement changes (EPC) 6.11
Psychology – Degree requirement changes (EPC) 6.12

Trish Berger, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Monday, February 28, 2005

PRESENT: *Members:* T. Berger, P. Chesson, A. Conley, J. Gibeling, A. Knoesen, R. Scalettar,

J. Turgeon, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins

Representatives: D. Johns, J. Karpel, A. van Geelen, H. Wylie

Graduate Studies attendees: E. Caswell-Chen, K. Garcia, C. Jurado, S. O'Neill, L. Wilce

ABSENT: *Members:* J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, L. Kawas, S. Upadhyaya, R. Wu

Representatives: S. Blank, A. Cole, A. Kelleher, E. Pyatt

GUEST: Lynette Hunter

ACTION ITEMS

Communication M.A. – Proposal to re-open admissions

Chair Berger introduced Professor Lynette Hunter, EPC's primary reviewer for the two Communication M.A. items on the agenda, who was invited to today's meeting to present them. Following its last review, the Rhetoric and Communication M.A. program's admissions were suspended in January 1997, primarily because there were too few faculty members remaining to maintain an academically viable program. The faculty has requested to re-open the M.A. program now that they have more members.

Professor Hunter presented a brief history of EPC's review of the proposal and the proposal's revisions this year. The number of faculty members is now sufficient to teach the core courses every year and the electives every other year. The M.A. is a viable degree. It is not a terminal degree since the faculty will be proposing a Ph.D. program. The graduate program has strong support from its lead dean and very strong commitment from the department.

Another issue EPC considered was whether the proposal was for a new M.A. program or a continuation of the old program. Professor Hunter reported that as someone who works extensively in the history of rhetoric, she considered which courses or general areas were retained from the earlier degree program. On paper, the program appeared to have deleted all the original rhetoric courses and substituted communication courses, resulting in 50% identical courses and 50% new courses. She examined their new courses and determined that they cover the rhetorical areas that were in the original M.A. program. Therefore, the proposal was for re-opening and continuing the original M.A. program rather than opening a new M.A. program.

Regarding the name change, she reported that in the last 10-15 years, rhetoric has changed its significance in the job world and the academic world. Most people who are in the field of rhetoric now teach and conduct research in either rhetoric and composition or the history of rhetoric. The name change of the M.A. program from "Rhetoric and Communication" to "Communication" would be appropriate since the program does not have faculty qualified to teach the history of rhetoric. If the program's admissions had been open over the past eight years, it probably would have evolved into the program described in its current proposal to re-open admissions.

Professor Andrew Waterhouse made the motion to re-open admissions to the M.A. program and Professor Peter Chesson seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The vote in favor was 7, no one opposed it, and there was one abstention. The motion carried. Chair Berger will notify the Dean of Graduate Studies of Council's recommendation to re-open admissions, effective fall 2006, as requested by the faculty.

Rhetoric and Communication M.A. – Name change request to "Communication"

[Graduate Council's discussion of the name change request is reported in the agenda item above.] Professor Evan Watkins made the motion to approve the name change for the M.A. program from "Rhetoric and Communication" to "Communication." Dean Jeffery Gibeling seconded the motion. The vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Berger will notify the Dean of Graduate Studies and copy the department chair.

CONSENT ITEMS

Chair Berger asked Council if it wished to move any of the items off the Consent List. She had some questions regarding the Psychology and Comparative Literature items and would like to carry them over to the next meeting when EPC Chair Shrini Upadhyaya would be present. The rest of the items remained on the consent list. The items below were approved as presented. Chair Berger will notify the appropriate faculty or administrators for the first three items and the minutes will be posted on the Web.

- **Designated Emphasis in Feminist Theory and Research – Geography affiliation request**
- **Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA) – Name change request**
- **Designated Emphasis in Social Theory and Comparative History – Degree requirement changes**
- **Minutes from December 13, 2004**

Chair Berger will notify Professor Upadhyaya that the items below were carried over to the next meeting.

- **Psychology – Degree requirement changes**
- **Comparative Literature – Degree requirement changes**

Chair Berger thanked Professor Hunter for presenting the Communication M.A. items to Council.

ACTION ITEMS (continued)

Criminal Justice Sciences Joint Doctorate with CSU Fresno, proposal to establish a graduate group and Ph.D. Program – Council’s final review

[The proposal was available at the URL:

<http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/programproposal/CriminalJustice.htm>]

Chair Berger presented the Criminal Justice Sciences (CJS) attachment and reported that the proposal has had a fairly long history. In June 2004, Council gave its final approval to the revised proposal, contingent upon a positive review from the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review (CAPBR). In November 2004 CAPBR responded and raised both academic and budgetary concerns. The proposers have responded to all of CAPBR’s concerns. Chair Berger briefly reviewed the academic concerns and thought they were in Council’s purview. To address the budget and enrollment concerns, the proposers made some slight changes in their budget estimates and reduced the total number of students from 96 to 80. They expect one-half of the students to be on the Davis campus instead of one-third at Davis and two-thirds at CSU Fresno. Although CJS is a joint doctorate, it offers a Ph.D., not a professional degree, and is not expected to be self-supporting. Graduate student enrollments at UC Davis are expected to increase and to be able to accommodate this program’s students.

Dean Gibeling presented the program proposal’s review history. He described the budget and reported that the cost would be two faculty members who would be devoted to this program, which would be implemented over time. The Provost thinks that two FTE is an appropriate investment and is supportive of the program. Dean Gibeling pointed out that there are not many doctorate programs in criminal justice science that are as broad as this program that has forensic science, forensic behavioral science, and victimology. The victimology area is mostly at Fresno, forensic science is mostly at Davis, and forensic behavioral science is at both campuses, which is how the students end up being equally divided between the two campuses, by the expertise of the faculty. Typically, first year students will be at Fresno, and second year students at Davis, and years three and four will be at the campus of the faculty member with whom they want to conduct research.

Dean Gibeling said that CAPBR’s role in the review was to be advisory to Graduate Council on budget issues. He discussed the indirect relationship of some of the academic concerns to the budget. Chair Berger pointed out that significant issues are dealt with in Council’s preliminary approval of proposals for new programs [May 2002 in this case]. The question facing Council today is whether the proposers satisfactorily have addressed the concerns raised by CAPBR, which did not support the approval of the program due to their concerns and the cost to establish and maintain the program.

Professor Alan Conley made the motion for Council to give its final approval to the CJS proposal, Professor Chesson seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Berger will notify Dean Gibeling in writing and request that the proposal be transmitted to the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors for review and recommendation to the Chancellor.

Animal Biology – Bylaws

Vice Chair Andrew Waterhouse chaired the meeting for the two Animal Biology items because Chair Berger is the graduate program chair. He reported that Graduate Council gave its final approval to the proposed graduate group and Ph.D. degree in Animal Biology and the proposal is currently under review off campus. Because UCD's Graduate Council requires bylaws of all graduate programs, these bylaws need to be approved as well. Vice Chair Waterhouse pointed out that the graduate group will have just two committees, the Graduate Committee to conduct most of their work and a membership committee. He referred to Section A under Article V. Committees on page 4., where most of the discussion explains how they are going to transition from a planning committee recognized by Graduate Studies to the actual Graduate Committee. The committee will have six members who will then be replaced two at a time over a three-year cycle. The replacements will be elected by the graduate group members. The committee will also include the Chair who is appointed by the Chancellor and two students recommended by the graduate student membership. Vice Chair Waterhouse recommended inserting "The initial Animal Biology Graduate Committee will be composed of the six member planning Committee." under the second paragraph in V. A. to clarify that six faculty members are involved here. Dean Gibeling pointed out that this will be a self-deleting paragraph in three years.

One Council member asked how the graduate adviser(s) appointed by Graduate Studies would communicate with the Graduate Committee. Council agreed to amend the third paragraph under V. A. to say that when the Graduate Committee does not include at least one graduate adviser, one non-voting adviser will be invited to the committee meetings.

Council discussed the limited and emeritus membership. Dean Gibeling reiterated Council's general principle of maintaining only one class of membership. Limited membership is described such that individual faculty members can continue to supervise a student dissertation or thesis if they have not been reviewed until that student has completed but they cannot take on new students or in any other way participate in the business of the group. Dean Gibeling asked for clarification of the emeriti faculty membership. Chair Berger responded that emeriti faculty could maintain regular membership if they met the criteria but would be able to have a more reduced status regarding activity and involvement in the graduate group should they prefer it. Council agreed to add the wording suggested by Dean Gibeling and modified by Professor Watkins: "Emeritus membership will be granted to individuals who have retired from the university and do not wish to continue regular, active membership, but wish to maintain an association with the ABIG. Emeritus members will not have voting rights and will not be eligible to chair dissertation or thesis committees." Dean Gibeling added that ABIG still needs to make it clear to emeriti that they can serve as regular members or they can opt for this reduced status.

Dean Gibeling made the motion to approve the bylaws as amended by Council's discussion today. Professor Chesson seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The vote in favor of the motion was 7, no one was opposed and Chair Berger abstained from voting. The motion carried. Vice Chair Waterhouse will notify CCGA in writing.

Animal Biology M.S. – Request to transfer administration from Department of Animal Science to Graduate Group in Animal Biology

Vice Chair Andrew Waterhouse asked Dean Gibeling to present the second Animal Biology agenda item. Dean Gibeling presented the background: On April 27, 2004 Graduate Council approved the simple name change of the M.S. degree program offered by the Department of Animal Science from “M.S. in Animal Science” to “M.S. in Animal Biology.” Council next reviewed and approved a proposal for an Animal Biology Ph.D. program to be offered by a Graduate Group in Animal Biology. [Council’s preliminary approval was on June 24, 2004 and final approval on October 21, 2004.] That proposal is currently under review off campus by CCGA. In a memo dated July 1, 2004, Professor Trish Berger, Chair of the Animal Biology M.S. program, and Professor Gary Anderson, Chair of the Department of the Animal Science, requested that the Animal Biology M.S. be transferred from the department to the graduate group. Dean Gibeling reminded Council that graduate groups are administrative units that are created on the campus, not created by systemwide review. To the extent that Council had already reviewed and approved the creation of a graduate group to administer the proposed Ph.D. program, Council has in a sense approved the existence of a graduate group and it could now take on ownership of the M.S. as well. Obviously, the end goal is to have the Ph.D. and the M.S. together in a graduate group. The last step in establishing the graduate group was the approval of the bylaws. Since Council has just approved those bylaws, it knows how the graduate group will operate. Council has been asked to consider the M.S. program’s request that it be transferred to the graduate group, the same graduate group that will hopefully offer the Ph.D. very soon.

Dean Gibeling thought that academically, the transfer of the Animal Biology M.S. from the department to the graduate group was appropriate. However, he pointed out that the Dean of Graduate Studies provides some financial support for the administration of graduate groups so the transfer will cost Graduate Studies some money. However, the Ph.D. was proposed to be offered by the graduate group so the graduate group would be in place for it anyway. Dean Gibeling added that at some point he would like Council to assist in revising the way graduate groups are administratively supported. The costs of running graduate groups have gone up and because UCD has created so many graduate groups, there is not enough money to support them.

Council discussed the faculty membership of the Animal Biology M.S. program as it currently exists. Not all of the faculty members of the Department of Animal Science are members of the graduate program, and there are members of the graduate program faculty who are from outside the department. The faculty of the graduate program voted in favor of the transfer from the department to the graduate group. The graduate group will be administered by the same body of faculty but will offer two degree programs.

Professor Conley made the motion to accept the proposed transfer and Professor Watkins seconded the motion. A Council member asked about the time gap between the July 1, 2004 request to transfer the Animal Biology M.S. and today’s consideration of the request. Dean Gibeling explained that Council’s approval of the revised Animal Biology bylaws was the last necessary step to establish the graduate group and that

just took place today. There were 7 votes in favor of the motion, none opposed, and two abstentions (Chair Berger and one member who arrived near the end of this item). The motion carried. Vice Chair Waterhouse will notify CCGA and copy the proposers and Graduate Studies Deans.

Doctoral Qualifying Examinations – Draft policy

Chair Berger presented the background on the current draft policy for Doctoral Qualifying Examinations (QEs). She reported that the QE has more variety on campus than previously realized and that Council has done some work to establish a uniform policy. This year the Chair's Advisory Committee re-drafted last year's Educational Policy Committee's draft of a QE policy. Chair Berger said that the draft policy is a synthesis of the thinking of the EPC and CAC. She asked Council whether there should be campuswide regulations for the QE and if so, what they should be. The question before Council was whether it supported the draft policy. If so, it would be circulated to the graduate program chairs for their input before adoption.

Dean Gibeling pointed out some of the questions that Council discussed when it reviewed EPC's drafts last year. These included whether the dissertation chair should be allowed to be on the QE committee; there were some comments that this could be, or perceived as, a conflict of interest.

Dean Gibeling asked Council to consider whether to include the paragraph in parentheses under Timing on page 2, regarding students being allowed to take their final 1 or 2 courses in their program of study during the quarter in which they take their QE. Council agreed to add this paragraph and inserted the word "required" after "final 1 or 2 courses."

Council discussion included the written portion of the QE (prepared by a few faculty members for all the students, then those faculty do not participate in the oral examination), the difference between this written portion of the QE and a preliminary examination, the drift of QEs away from an examination of breadth of knowledge to the dissertation research, the number of committee members required, and the need and role of a committee member external to the graduate student's program (to provide quality control and a broader committee).

Council agreed to distribute the amended draft policy to the graduate program chairs for their input. The chairs' comments will be distributed to Council for its consideration.

Mending the Wall: Report of the Special Committee on Shared Governance and Senate Operations, UC Academic Senate Davis Division, December 13, 2004

[The full document was available at the URL:

http://www.mrak.ucdavis.edu/senate/shared_governance_report.pdf]

Chair Berger presented Chapter 10 of the *Mending the Wall* document. She pointed out the recommendation for policies of standing committees to be readily accessible and for a standard format to be developed. Graduate Studies and Graduate Council have already considered the need for such a format and has suggested one at the bottom of the draft QE policy.

Dean Gibeling thought that since the report highlighted the relationship and interactions between Graduate Council and its subcommittees with the Office of Graduate Studies as a model of successful and effective communication and shared governance that Council should acknowledge that in its response to Professor Daniel Simmons, Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate.

Council thought that some of the topics presented in the report were not addressed in the recommendations. Professor Knoesen pointed out that the report included the topic of release time for chairs of major standing committees, including the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council and Committee on Academic Personnel. Council agreed that it takes a significant amount of time for a faculty member to fulfill all the responsibilities and perform all the functions required of these chairs. Council agreed that it would like the release time for chairs added to the recommendations.

Chair Berger will send Council's comments on the *Mending the Wall* report to Academic Senate Chair Simmons.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Academic Planning and Development Committee Report

APD Chair André Knoesen reported that at today's meeting, which he attended, the Representative Assembly approved two resolutions regarding Graduate Council. The first was the proposed revision to DD Bylaw 80 adding Council's delegation of authority to the Graduate Studies Dean, to be effective immediately. The second was Graduate Council's proposed revisions to UC Davis Academic Senate Regulation 520. (C) (4) Dissertation and Final Examination, to be implemented later. [The new Plan C will allow graduate programs to require a final oral examination of the student with a three-faculty member committee. The second revision modified Plan B to allow graduate programs as well as individual committees to require a final exit seminar of the student.]

Professor Knoesen reported that APD would have items to present at the next Council meeting.

Graduate Student Association Announcement

GSA Chair Jonathan Karpel presented his informal **e-mail survey of graduate students of four graduate programs that have recently changed their names**. At a previous meeting a Council member asked whether programs were taking into account the opinions of their students when they proposed name changes. Mr. Karpel distributed the e-mail survey through the programs' GSA student representatives. The responses indicated that the name changes were not hidden from the students and that most students knew about the name changes. Some of the continuing students chose to stay with the old program name and some went with the new name. The responses suggested that most of the programs did not solicit the opinions of their students very well. Mr. Karpel thought that it would be good to have graduate students or a representative on the programs' Executive Committees; then students would be aware of proposed name changes. Chair Berger thought that there was generally a long lag between a program thinking about proposing a name change and implementing it. Although Mr. Karpel has not taken the survey back to the GSA

Executive Council, he was certain that they would think it was a good idea for programs to consult their students about program name changes.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association Announcement

PSA Chair Albert van Geelen presented the PSA's **First Annual Call for Nominations for the Award for Excellence in Postdoctoral Research**. He thanked Dean Gibeling for making the money available for this award. He also thanked Richard Scalettar, Laura Van Winkle, Thomas Ndolo, and Karoline Wiesner who helped with the guidelines, which were based on a UCLA program but scaled back a little. The PSA is soliciting nominations, hopes to receive many, and then present five awards in the spring at the Postdoctoral Reception. He asked Council members to spread the word about this award.

Courses and Bylaws Committee Report

Professor Andrew Waterhouse reported that the Courses Committee was now functioning and that course requests are received and reviewed online. The committee has met and reviewed 33 courses, which was one-third of the course requests. Since then, additional new courses have been received.

Professor Waterhouse brought up one issue regarding **statistics courses**. The committee has noticed that many social science departments have hired quantitative faculty members who are now starting to offer courses related to statistical analysis in their field. One of the committee members from the Statistics Department observed that these courses are very similar, in some cases identical, to courses offered by the Statistics Department. Professor Waterhouse reported that the committee was asking departments to explain why these courses are needed. This does raise an interesting problem, that if you hire these quantitative people for those skills and you want your students to study them, then should all these departments be offering these courses although they are essentially the same as what Statistics can offer? So this issue may come back to Council. If everyone gives the committee satisfactory responses, then it probably would not come to Council. Professor Waterhouse reported that it does seem to be quite widespread and the impact in the long run might be that Statistics would see a big downturn in demand for some of their upper division courses.

Bylaws Chair Evan Watkins reported that his committee has a number of bylaws in the pipeline thanks to the hard work of Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen, who has been reviewing bylaws. There are now seven or eight sets of bylaws in the final stages of review and negotiation with the programs.

Support and Welfare Committee Report

Chair Richard Scalettar reported that today is officially the last day for review of the internal fellowship applications. Approximately 1,700 out of the 2,000 have been reviewed. The rest will be completed in the next one to two days.

Dean--Graduate Studies Announcements

Dean Jeffery Gibeling reported that graduate admission applications are being processed and the numbers are down approximately 3% from last year. He cannot

report on admissions yet because they are so variable from year to year. The biggest **drop in applications** is attributable to international applications, which are down again. This is not surprising. This is a national trend in part due to immigration problems and visas, but also in part due to the aggressive marketing in certain countries like Australia, Canada, France, and Great Britain.

Dean Gibeling reported on a recent announcement that the government has decided that once an international student comes to the U.S. and goes through **Visa Mantis clearance**, the clearance will be good for four years. Since 9/11 these students have had to renew their clearance every year, but the Department of State and Department of Homeland Security together have changed regulations so the clearance is good now for four years. Chair Berger asked about international students who go home, for example to China after 2 or 3 years, and whether they would have trouble getting back into the U.S. Dean Gibeling responded that the student will no longer have to go through this Visa Mantis clearance if he or she is within the four year period. That would be a big improvement. So students who go home still have to renew the visa portion but not this clearance, which is what has caused the students so much trouble.

Dean Gibeling also reported that the Office of Graduate Studies is starting an experiment. He has been thinking about the idea that Graduate Studies needs to now start recruiting students internationally. The campus has had the luxury of having many and high quality applicants just coming in. The tide is turning and Graduate Studies is not receiving as many applications. It may still have enough applicants and they may still be of sufficient quality, but Graduate Studies needs to start making some **efforts to recruit internationally**, to go out and get students to come to UCD. Dean Gibeling announced that it just happens that there is a staff member, Dr. Dan Roy, who is retiring from the university in the near future, who has done a lot of outreach to undergraduate students and who is going to spend half of his time living in Europe. What the Dean and Dr. Roy are arranging is that as students apply and are admitted, Dr. Roy will be holding some workshops to tell them more about UC Davis and to answer questions and to put them in touch with the right people. He will tell them how the system works and may coordinate with some alumni who are in Europe (France, England, Spain, maybe Germany and Italy) and start building some connections even before the students get here. Hopefully, that will help them learn a little more about UC Davis and have a more personal connection with the campus and decide to come here. So this will be a small experiment in international recruiting, which the Dean thinks will be important in the future.

Professor Sharman O'Neill asked whether this new international effort was being funded out of the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS). Dean Gibeling responded that what Dr. Roy is doing is completely gratis. He is going to be retired and OGS might have to pay for a little travel, for example from the south of France to London, but that he was going to do this work for the fun of it. As a UCD alum, he feels pretty strongly about the campus and realized that being in Europe, there was an opportunity, not so much at the undergraduate level but much more important at the graduate level, because we still need more applicants from European countries. Dean Gibeling indicated that one of his goals overall is to try to diversify Graduate Studies' international student population, to have more students from South America and to

get back to attracting students from Europe, to get a better balance from around the world. Professor Peter Chesson pointed out that for some of those students, for example those from South America, the NRT would be the issue. Dean Gibeling responded that many students who come from South America have government support. It is not unusual for them and it is much more prevalent than for students from China for example. The home governments will send students here with at least some funding to study. Sometimes these students are already faculty members at universities but do not have a Ph.D. so they come here with funding from the government and/or the university. The funding is never enough to pay the full cost but still it is helpful. So that kind of partial support has been a traditional model that is a little more workable than the student who comes with absolutely no support from the home country.

Dr. van Geelen asked Dean Gibeling how he would make it attractive for European students to come here since many of them will not have any support of their own. Dean Gibeling responded that the campus still has to provide student financial support. There would be nothing different there than what UCD does for any international student. This experiment is just a matter of starting to get in the mode of recruiting international students that are of particular interest to OGS and that it wants to attract to the campus. OGS cannot sit back as much as it used to be able to do. The campus still has to offer the NRT and other forms of support. That would not change. Dean Gibeling added that OGS is not going to try to hugely increase the number of international students; that is not the goal. The campus is just entering what he sees as a new era of having to be a little more aggressive in how it pursues an international agenda. However, there are little things like students who come from countries that have socialized health care and who have no understanding of what the U.S. health system is like, and who often times can purchase health care at home for the time that they are in this country at UC Davis. If they do that in advance, they and their families will be fine. If students do not make these sorts of arrangements before hand, they often are unpleasantly surprised when they arrive here. Dr. Roy and/or alumni groups can help provide information such as that about health care. They can help students learn what it is like to come to the U.S. and be prepared. They can also do a little recruiting to make UCD seem a little more personal.

Professor O'Neill reported that she has heard recently about a call for a new NSF program to stimulate international research in education, which provides funding to bring graduate students here and send them there. This is an opportunity to obtain some money to support international students.

There were no further reports or announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Isw – Graduate Studies