

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

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
Spring Quarter Calendar Grid (Please return.)	7.0
<u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u>	
Academic Planning and Development (Knoesen)	
Administrative (Berger)	
Courses and Bylaws (Waterhouse/Watkins)	
Educational Policy (Upadhyaya)	
Program Review (Kavvas)	
Support and Welfare (Scalettar)	
<u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	
Announcements from the Chair (Berger)	
Representative Assembly Vote on Student Petitions	
Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)	
Planned Educational Leave Policy (PELP)	
Announcements from the Associate Dean (Caswell-Chen)	
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Wu)	
Graduate Student Association (Karpel)	
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (van Geelen)	
Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Wylie)	
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
Graduate Studies Development Officer – Draft letter (Berger)	7.1
Objectives for Graduate Education (Knoesen)	7.2
Internationalizing the Curriculum (Knoesen) The appendices may be viewed online. http://www.mrak.ucdavis.edu/senate/intlcurriculareport.pdf	7.3
Proposal for a Joint Chemical Engineering Ph.D. Program with the Middle East Technical University, Turkey (Knoesen)	7.4
Proposal to Discontinue the Civil Engineering/Materials Science and Engineering [Undergraduate] Program (Berger)	7.5
Proposed Bylaw Revision: Title II. The Representative Assembly (Berger)	7.6
* Air Quality Research Center – Proposed ORU (Knoesen/Berger)	
<u>CONSENT ITEMS</u>	
International Commercial Law – Revised bylaws (Watkins)	7.7
Comparative Pathology – Degree requirement changes (Upadhyaya)	7.8
Comparative Literature – Degree requirements, additional change (Upadhyaya)	7.9

Trish Berger, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Monday, March 28, 2005

PRESENT: *Members:* T. Berger, J. Cadden, P. Chesson, C. de la Peña, J. Gibeling, A. Knoesen, R. Scalettar, J. Turgeon, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins, R. Wu

Representatives: S. Blank, A. Cole, J. Karpel, A. van Geelen

Graduate Studies attendees: E. Caswell-Chen, H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, S. O'Neill, Y. Shi, L. Wilce

ABSENT: *Members:* A. Conley, L. Kavvas

Representatives: D. Johns, A. Kelleher, E. Pyatt, H. Wylie

Spring Quarter Calendar Grid

Chair Trish Berger requested that everyone return the spring quarter calendar grids.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair

Representative Assembly Vote on Student Petitions

Chair Berger reported that on February 28, 2005, the Representative Assembly considered and voted in favor of a graduate student petition for reinstatement after disqualification 12 years ago. The student attended the meeting. The student's academic records and the Graduate Council's Administrative Committee's deliberations were not available because they are confidential and private. The Graduate Council Chair, Graduate Studies Dean, and student's graduate program chair have received a statement of the resolution that the Representative Assembly passed.

Both the campus and systemwide representative assembly have a place on their agendas for student petitions. The campus Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) thinks that students have the right to petition the campus Representative Assembly regarding their individual academic matters as well as policy matters. In effect, CERJ is allowing the Representative Assembly to override the Graduate Council, its Administrative Committee and the Dean of Graduate Studies. Concurrently, the preliminary ruling from the systemwide University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has upheld UC Academic Senate Regulation 904, that states: "Disqualification of graduate students is at the discretion of the Dean of the Graduate Division concerned."

At the same meeting, the Representative Assembly approved a revision to Davis Division Bylaw 80 regarding Graduate Council, giving Graduate Council formal authority to delegate administrative implementation of academic policies to the Dean of Graduate Studies. This change is effective immediately.

The Representative Assembly also approved a Graduate Council proposal to revise Davis Division Regulation 520. (C) (4) Dissertation and Final Examination. The changes include the new Plan C and a modification of Plan B. These revisions will be effective in 41 days. Graduate Studies will begin implementing them in fall 2005.

ACTION ITEMS

Graduate Studies Development Officer – Draft letter

Chair Berger presented a draft request to the Provost for at least one development officer to be hired for the upcoming comprehensive campaign, whose focus would be on raising funds for graduate student support. Two minor corrections were made to the letter. Council discussed UC Davis's goal of raising \$200 million in comparison to the goals of other UC campuses and peer institutions. In response to Dr. Albert van Geelen's question, Dean Jeffery Gibeling described the upcoming \$900 million campus fundraising campaign over 7 years. Currently, annual campus fundraising is on the order of \$100 million per year so \$200 million is a modest increment over 7 years. The vote in favor of the motion to approve the amended letter was 11. No one was opposed and the Dean abstained from voting. Chair Berger will send the amended letter to the Provost.

Objectives for Graduate Education

Professor André Knoesen presented the history of this item. At its January 2004 meeting, Dean Gibeling suggested Council prepare a list of objectives for graduate education similar in format to a one-page document that had been developed for Undergraduate Education. Last year's Educational Policy Committee started working on the topic. In fall 2004, Chair Berger referred the matter to APD. This topic has been under discussion at all of APD's meetings since the fall. The committee worked from EPC's notes, examined several documents, including the 1998 report by the Association of American Universities, and drafted several iterations of the objectives for graduate education. The committee has tried to make the wording inclusive and active rather than passive. Council discussed the document and amended three words to make the objectives clearer and to include all graduate academic degree titles. The vote in favor of approving the amended Objectives for Graduate Education was unanimous. Dean Gibeling thanked APD and Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen for their work on these objectives.

Internationalizing the Curriculum

The appendices were available to Council prior to the meeting, online at <http://www.mrak.ucdavis.edu/senate/intlcurriculareport.pdf>.

Professor Knoesen reported that APD discussed the *Report of the Task Force on Internationalizing the Curriculum – 2004* at two of its meetings. APD was generally in favor of any initiative to internationalize the curriculum that contributes to diversification on campus but also wanted the campus to understand that nonresident tuition (NRT) hinders this goal. Without addressing NRT, the campus is limited in what it can do. While internationalizing means undergraduates go abroad and take courses, for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars it means international students coming here and thereby enriching the campus research experience. Council discussed the impact of NRT on internationalizing graduate education, recruiting out of state and international students, and retaining them. Council agreed that more NRT fellowships or partial fellowships are needed.

Council also discussed whether to emphasize the academic or economic issues of internationalizing the curriculum. In general Council thought that they could not be separated. Professor Joan Cadden indicated that in her discipline, which is history, the two issues are closely related for cultural and linguistic reasons. Professor Carolyn de la Peña suggested that Council's letter point out why having international students here is so important to diversity. Bringing international students into her courses as active participants contributes to the curriculum and shapes everyone's learning. Professor Andrew Waterhouse reported that his department receives 10-20 requests a year from European graduate students to come here to

work in a faculty's lab for about three months. His department accepts five to eight students a year. European institutions often encourage their students to go abroad. This is less often done here. Professor Cadden suggested including a statement encouraging graduate students to go abroad "to engage in **individual** as well as collaborative research in other countries." Council agreed to forward APD's report to Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons. Chair Berger will write a cover letter that includes Council's additional comments.

Proposal for a Joint Chemical Engineering Ph.D. Program with the Middle East Technical University, Turkey

Professor Knoesen reported that APD reviewed the two-page document as a letter of intent. APD's report supported the merit of incorporating an international component in graduate education. However, the committee had serious reservations concerning the feasibility of the proposed program, primarily for proposing to offer two Ph.D.s, one from each institution, for one dissertation. Dean Gibeling reported that he had talked with the proposers and had suggested that the two institutions could agree to an articulated program in which they accept courses from each other's university. A more difficult option would be to offer one degree awarded by two institutions although there is some precedent with joint programs between CSU and UC.

Council discussed the concept of joint international programs. Professor Reen Wu reported that CCGA was considering a UC Web site based program with another institution. He presented some of CCGA's concerns. Professor Wu reported that at the end of CCGA's discussion, the Chair formed a task force to consider systemwide and online programs.

Council was in unanimous agreement that it did not support the notion of students receiving two Ph.D.s for one dissertation or two Master's degrees for one thesis. Council accepted Professor Knoesen's offer to have APD draft such a policy. Council agreed to accept the APD report on the proposed joint international program and forward it to the proposers. Chair Berger will write a cover letter, including Council's comments.

Proposal to Discontinue the Civil Engineering/Materials Science and Engineering [Undergraduate] Program

Chair Berger summarized the proposal to discontinue the undergraduate program in civil engineering/materials science and engineering. Few students have graduated in the combined major recently and students in the undergraduate program in civil engineering are allowed one or two courses in materials science as electives. Dean Gibeling reported that Engineering has several undergraduate double majors. Council agreed there was no implication on graduate education and hence no objection. However, Council found it surprising that the Chemical Engineering and Materials Science faculty members were not solicited for comments. Chair Berger will write Academic Senate Chair Simmons.

Proposed Bylaw Revision: Title II. The Representative Assembly

Chair Berger reported that the proposed bylaw revisions for the Representative Assembly came out of the *Mending the Wall* document [*Report of the Special Committee on Shared Governance and Senate Operations*, December 2004]. Council supported the revisions to Bylaw 34. Membership, that each of the standing committees would have a representative to the Representative Assembly and the addition of a parliamentarian to advise the Chair. Council had no concerns with the revision to Bylaw 160. B., regarding the order of business.

Graduate Council discussed the revisions to Bylaw 35. Responsibilities and Functions, at length. Currently, the Representative Assembly has authority over business not specifically delegated to other committees. The suggested changes give the Representative Assembly authority over divisional committees and the division on all matters of policy and it would retain authority to review any policy statement, program approval, or program rejection of a divisional committee. Authority would not extend to individual faculty personnel cases. Council was concerned that authority to review program approval or program rejection might politicize the review process of new and existing graduate programs.

Council agreed that the establishing committee has oversight of its committees. It discussed who the establishing committee was for Graduate Council, whether it was at the systemwide or the divisional senate level. Council's membership is appointed at the campus level but its duties come from the systemwide level. Council's concern was that the primary work is done in the standing committees but the bylaw revisions suggest that the Representative Assembly is where the final decision might be made regarding that work.

Council agreed that the Bylaw 35 revisions need more consideration and work before being presented for approval. Chair Berger summarized Council's concerns. Council was particularly concerned about the Representative Assembly making decisions regarding graduate program reviews, which are conducted by Council's Program Review Committee, carefully selected *ad hoc* committees, and external reviewers, who spend hours of careful deliberation reviewing a program's self-review and confidential questionnaires, meeting with the program's lead dean, faculty and students, and writing reports. Graduate Council was highlighted in the *Mending the Wall* document as one of the three committees that were models of very good and successful shared governance. Council would like the Representative Assembly to think about these issues. By including graduate program review and program approval in these revisions, it might make it difficult for Council to recruit campus faculty to serve on its subcommittees. Chair Berger will write Academic Senate Chair Simmons.

CONSENT ITEMS

The consent items were moved to the Action List.

ACTION ITEMS (continued)

Comparative Literature – Degree requirements, additional change

Dean Gibeling pointed out that a Not Pass is not allowed on the second take of the Qualifying Examination (on page 5, in the paragraph above Dissertation); it is either a Pass or a Fail. If the student receives a Fail, s/he is recommended for disqualification. Dean Gibeling also pointed out that "dissertation director" should be changed to "dissertation committee chair" in the next paragraph under Dissertation. Professor Knoesen suggested moving the last sentence under Teaching Requirement (on page 3) because it is a department requirement. This is an employment requirement but not an academic requirement and is included as an informational item. Dean Gibeling suggested changing the last heading "Time to Degree" to "Satisfactory Progress toward Degree" (on page 5) and adding the sentence regarding incompletes and teaching appointments (mentioned above) either at the beginning or end of the paragraph. Professor Knoesen also thought that all Ph.D. programs ought to specify whether they are a Plan A, B, or C program. Dean Gibeling suggested saying the Comparative Literature program offers the Ph.D. under Plan B in the first sentence. Chair Berger suggested Plan B be in parentheses at the end of the heading "Dissertation." Professor Shrinivasa Upadhyaya reported that EPC is developing guidelines with

some minimum requirements for programs to follow in their written descriptions of their Master's and Ph.D. degree requirements.

Council voted unanimously in favor of the motion to approve the Comparative Literature degree requirements, contingent on Council's amendments. Professor Upadhyaya will notify the program chair. When these revisions are received, Chair Berger will write the approval letter to the program chair.

International Commercial Law – Revised bylaws

Chair Berger suggested the insertion of "at least" on page 4, under article V, in the line for number 2: "Each fall, **at least** one member will be elected for a three-year term." Council's vote was unanimous in favor of the approval of the bylaws, contingent on Chair Berger's amendment. Professor Evan Watkins will request the change and when it is received, Chair Berger will write the approval letter to the graduate program.

Comparative Pathology – Degree requirement changes

Professor Knoesen asked whether Comparative Pathology had a Plan B Ph.D. program. Professor Upadhyaya reminded Council that the modified Plan B was approved and can now require an exit seminar. He asked how that would be enforced. Dean Gibeling responded that the new Plan C and modified Plan B will be implemented in fall 2005. Dean Gibeling and Professor Upadhyaya discussed how the Plans and their options might be tracked and verified for individual students. The Dean pointed out that Graduate Studies needs to know whether to accept a thesis or dissertation and whether to ask for a certification form for a seminar. He suggested that Graduate Studies could have a form that every student has signed by the Graduate Adviser verifying completion of any required final examinations, defenses, or seminars, which the student would submit to Graduate Studies with his/her Master's thesis or Ph.D. dissertation.

Air Quality Research Center ORU proposal

Chair Berger presented the history of the Air Quality Research Center ORU proposal. It was forwarded to Council for its June 3, 2004 meeting at the end of last year, and required a very rapid response. Council commented that the proposal did not address the mandated graduate education issues. The Committee on Research also did not approve the proposal. The Committee on Academic Personnel and the Undergraduate Council did not have any issues with it. The Academic Council rejected it. On March 10, 2005, Chair Berger received an Air Quality ORU memo that she forwarded to Professor Knoesen. APD then met on the afternoon of March 11, 2005 but due to an already full agenda, could not consider it in the format in which it was presented. Council was requested to respond to the memo by today, March 28, 2005.

Professor Knoesen reported that the materials included the proposal that was submitted by the PI and subsequent correspondence. Council still has not received the new proposal. The correspondence includes communication between committees and Vice Chancellor Barry Klein's response. APD strongly felt that it was the proposer's responsibility to generate a new proposal that addresses all the issues brought up by all the committees and that it was not the Office of Research's responsibility to respond on behalf of the proposer. Professor Knoesen reported that it was very confusing and inefficient to try to follow the chain of e-mail messages between VC Klein and the committees. APD was quite sympathetic toward facilitating new programs being approved. However, APD would like to see a new proposal. APD thought it would set a dangerous precedent to have the Office of Research responding on behalf of proposers of new programs. Chair Berger pointed out that review committees off campus would not want to

receive the proposal in its present condition and that it would make a negative impression. Graduate Council has guidelines for what has to be addressed when it is reviewing ORUs. For example, the second section asks what makes this ORU distinctive from other graduate programs/groups. The campus has Exhibit A as well.

Professor de la Peña moved that Council request a new, revised proposal that would come from the original proposers and that addresses all the issues that were raised and incorporates the suggestions of Graduate Council and the other committees. Professor Cadden seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Berger will write Academic Senate Chair Simmons.

ANNOUNCEMENTS (continued)

Announcements from the Chair

Chair Berger reminded Council members that they have received an e-mail message regarding their availability to meet with the Graduate Studies Dean candidates and inviting them to the interviews. Responses are due by April 1, 2005. Dean Gibeling is one of the candidates.

Announcements from the Dean

Dean Jeffery Gibeling introduced Yuhang Shi, Director of the Analysis and Information Services unit. He joined the Office of Graduate Studies about a month ago from the Ohio Department of Education where he was a chief statistician. Dean Gibeling said the office was delighted to have him and that he will be assisting OGS organize its information in new and exciting ways.

Dean Gibeling reported that graduate applications have decreased about 6% due to fewer international applications. Almost a week ago, admissions were running about 10% ahead of last year. Of course, the relevant measure is how many students actually enroll in the fall.

Dean Gibeling announced that the **Planned Educational Leave Policy (PELP)** would be an upcoming topic for Council. Time to degree (TTD) on the undergraduate side includes a fairly good 6-year graduation rate but a fairly poor 4-year graduation rate. At four years, UC Davis has the lowest graduation rate in the system. One suggestion to improve time to degree for undergraduates is to eliminate PELP. There is a proposal being floated to scale back PELP, reducing the allowable time on PELP for undergraduates to one quarter from the current three quarters plus another three quarters by extension. People realize graduate students are different from undergraduates so Graduate Council will probably be asked to consider PELP for graduate students too. Graduate Council and Graduate Studies do need to attend to PELP because it is used quite a bit by graduate students although it is not clear that it has any significant effect on TTD.

Also coming up for discussion will be a revised disqualification appeals policy, now that Graduate Council can delegate administrative duties officially to the Dean and now that the campus seems to be moving clearly toward saying the Dean has the authority to disqualify. Council needs to revise its appeals policy, and especially to incorporate a time line so that these appeals do not go on for years. Dean Gibeling would like to map the time line so all appeals occur within one quarter so that students are given a clear decision and advice on whether they may continue or whether they would have to leave their degree program within a quarter.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Professor Wu reported that CCGA has decided that for new joint programs between CSU and UC, student and program committees must have equal representation from each campus system. The CSU:UC faculty ratio must be 1:1 instead of 1:2 as in the past. Affected committees include dissertation committees and executive committees. Chair Berger raised the question of committees comprised of odd numbers, 3 or 5 faculty members.

There were no more announcements and no subcommittee reports due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies