

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
AGENDA  
April 19, 2005  
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.  
1138 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)  
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (van Geelen)  
Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Wylie)

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition – PRC Report** (Guest Julian Alston) 8.1  
**Nutrition – Proposed name change to Nutritional Biology** (Berger) 8.2  
**Senatewide Review – Universitywide Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD)**  
**Addendum to the Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School**  
**Admissions** (Berger) 8.3  
**Proposed Revised Family Friendly Policies** (Berger)  
**Systemwide Senate Review of UC Health, Safety & Environment Policies** (Berger) 8.5  
**Committee on Shared Governance Bylaw Revisions** (Berger) 8.6  
**Proposed Bylaw 35 Revisions – April 25, 2005 Representative Assembly meeting** (Berger) 8.6\*

**CONSENT ITEMS**

**Performance Studies – M.A. and Ph.D. degree requirement changes** (Guest Jack Meeks) 8.7  
**Art History – M.A. degree requirement changes** (Upadhyaya) 8.8  
**Psychology – Degree requirement changes** (Upadhyaya) 8.9  
**Molecular, Cellular and Integrative Physiology – Degree requirement changes** (Upadhyaya) 8.10

Trish Berger, Chair

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**April 19, 2005**

**PRESENT:** *Members:* T. Berger, J. Cadden, P. Chesson, A. Conley, J. Gibeling, L. Kavvas, A. Knoesen, R. Scalettar, J. Turgeon, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins, R. Wu

*Representatives:* D. Johns, A. Kelleher, A. van Geelen, H. Wylie

*Graduate Studies attendees:* S. Albrecht, E. Caswell-Chen, H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, C. Jurado

**ABSENT:** *Members:* C. de la Peña

*Representatives:* S. Blank, A. Cole, J. Karpel, E. Pyatt

*Graduate Studies:* L. Wilce

**GUESTS:** Julian Alston, Jack Meeks

**ACTION ITEM**

**Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition – PRC Report**

Professor Julian Alston, the PRC Liaison for the review, presented the Program Review Committee's report on the Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition. He stated that the assessment of the DE in SLA was positive. The main recommendations related to ensuring that students in the DE are able to take the required core courses and evaluating an explicit exception to the general DE requirement that the dissertation include an element pertaining to the DE. The report's recommendations were: 1) A solution should be found to assure that courses are freely available to meet the core requirements, at least once per academic year and preferably in the early part of the year. 2) The past policy of exempting the DE from the dissertation requirement should be evaluated. Professor Alston clarified that the dissertation requirement was specified in the general policy for designated emphasis programs. The faculty and students had expressed uncertainty about a dissertation requirement that had not been required in the past. 3) Guidelines should be developed for the implementation of the DE requirement in the qualifying exam. 4) The Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean of HARCS should give consideration to having different people appointed to the positions of Chair of the DE and the Director of the Second Language Acquisition Institute.

Council was concerned about recommendation #2 and if there was a past agreement in writing regarding the dissertation requirement, what the program's position was on the requirement and

how this requirement affected the students in the DE. Professor Alston responded that during the review he had asked for documentation, but the program did not respond with any information. The program wants an exemption. Not all of the students from the eight affiliated Ph.D. programs are enrolled in the DE, but more than half of the DE students, those who are writing dissertations on literature, will be affected.

Ms. Ann Kelleher, a Linguistics M.A. student who is enrolling in the Ph.D. program, offered her understanding of the situation in the DE program. She clarified that those students who are truly in literature are being required to be better language teachers in order to obtain faculty positions. There are students in language programs who are studying in linguistics and it makes sense for them to have a DE in SLA because it relates very intimately to their area of research. For literature students whose dissertations will not relate to Second Language Acquisition, there may be a question as to whether they should be allowed to have this DE on their diploma. Council questioned the level of the students' expertise in SLA if their dissertations were not related to SLA and thought that the DE notation should be reserved for those who exemplified that expertise.

Dean Gibeling suggested that it was a program approval matter and should be referred to EPC. If the curriculum was approved by Graduate Council when the original DE proposal was reviewed and the DE has not changed it without requesting Graduate Council's approval, then Council may not want to go back and un-approve something that was approved. The history of the approval is important and research should be done to see what was approved in the program proposal or if there is an exemption agreement in writing. The DE requirements on pages 27 and 28 (approved on January 29, 2004) address courses, independent study for research papers, and the qualifying examination requirements and degree conferral process. Nothing is addressed about requesting or granting an exception to this other policy – the DE dissertation requirement.

Chair Berger asked about recommendation #4, if there was confusion for the students and if the issue was whether the students know who the DE Chair is and who is the Director of the Second Language Acquisition Institute. Professor Alston responded that the claim was that there was significant confusion about what was what between the Institute and the DE. People in the program strongly suggested having two people in the roles instead of having one.

Professor Alston was asked if the argument for the exemption was that having a chapter on Second Language Acquisition in a literature dissertation would detract from the scholarly impact of the literature dissertation. He responded that the students do make a substantial investment in SLA but it certainly was not part of the dissertation on literature. The DE program's position is that people in the business of recruiting graduate students do not know what the DE means in a general way but they know that a DE in SLA means that students have had additional training in SLA, which is specific and valuable in the job market. If the current DE in SLA does not meet the criteria for a DE, then it would be reasonable to create an alternative that would work. This is a very valuable program, people want it, it is not doing any harm to anyone, and it seems to work.

It was pointed out that the program is supplying the knowledge that is required sufficiently, but it does not fit Graduate Council's definition of the DE. The students can still advertise that they have this extra information.

It was suggested that a certificate might be an option. Students would start off in the DE. If they decided that they did not want to continue the DE on the qualifying examination or dissertation

part, then they could obtain a certificate in the SLA. Sixteen units are required for a certificate, which is the same requirement for the DE. Students already would have taken these units and could count certain courses towards the certificate, but it is not a DE.

Following additional discussion, a motion was made to accept the PRC report and that recommendation #2 would be referred to Council's Educational Policy Committee to review the DE's history and make a recommendation to Graduate Council; it was seconded and approved on a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstaining.

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

Chair Berger asked Council if they wished to remove any items from the consent list. Dean Gibeling requested that the Performance Studies M.A. and Ph.D. degree requirements be discussed. The remaining items below were approved as presented and Chair Berger will send letters to the program chairs notifying them that their degree requirements were approved.

- Art History – M.A. degree requirement changes
- Psychology – Degree requirement changes
- Molecular, Cellular and Integrative Physiology – Degree requirement changes

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **Performance Studies – M.A. and Ph.D. degree requirement changes**

Professor Jack Meeks, a guest who chaired APD last year, briefly presented the degree requirements. Dean Gibeling pointed out that the Department of Theatre and Dance has presented revisions to the MA in Performance Studies and was also proposing a second track in the Ph.D. program oriented towards performance as research. Professor Meeks explained that the problem was that the graduate program has admitted students with the assumption that they would have the Track II Ph.D. and they really wanted to move students into that track. There is a demand in the program for this track, and they were afraid that they would lose students to other institutions if they could not begin to offer this track. Students want this performance as research track and faculty have put a lot of energy into this.

Dean Gibeling explained that this is a program with limited faculty resources. Three faculty are fully committed to the Ph.D. and MA programs and approximately 11 or 12 faculty are committed to the MFA program. The track II would engage some of the MFA faculty in the Ph.D. program. Track II may be desirable and may be the direction in which the department ought to move, but it would be wise for Council to be informed by the program review before deciding about the degree requirements. Council might learn some things about this program that might have some bearing on these proposals. The MA and the Track II Ph.D. are new. The MA is semi-new in the sense that it has been dormant for a number of years and is now being resurrected and brought up to date with current course listings and current faculty interests and so forth. He asked Council whether or not it ought to be moving ahead on this matter at this time or whether it should wait until the PRC report was presented at the next Council meeting.

The motion was made that the item be tabled until the next meeting, it was seconded and approved on a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstained.

### **Nutrition – Proposed name change to Nutritional Biology**

Council discussed the proposed graduate group name change from Nutrition to Nutritional Biology. Chair Berger explained her understanding of the change was that members of the program felt that when one hears “nutrition”, one thinks of “home economics”. The program wants a more technical sounding name that is more recognized. The students apparently instigated this change. Council asked if the Nutrition graduate program faculty were in favor of the change. Chair Berger responded that a simple majority favored the change although some did not.

A motion was made stating that Council sees no reason to oppose the name change; it was seconded and approved on a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstaining.

### **Senatewide Review – University wide Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) addendum to the Report on the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions**

Council was asked if they wish to comment on the Universitywide Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity addendum to the Report on the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions.

Discussion followed: Professor Knoesen pointed out that focusing so much on the procedures used during selection is really missing the point. There should be a much stronger emphasis on encouraging underrepresented students to apply to UC Davis or a UC campus, so that the applicant pool being looked at is rich in diversity. Once that pool is obtained, then your discussion can begin about the selection process. It was commented that UC is not doing enough to encourage underrepresented students to apply. Other universities are always present at recruitment fairs to try to recruit from historically black colleges. When asking students attending the fairs if they know about the University of California, surprisingly, they do not know much. The report should have more emphasis on increasing the pool of underrepresented groups.

It was pointed out that one of the major problems is money, the cost of graduate education and the resources a student has to repay student loans when they graduate. This is an issue in the Vet School. In the Medical School, where there are a lot of programs in place to help students, cost and diversity are not as much of a problems for the applicant pool. Cost is not always directly an issue, but it may be an indirect reason.

Chair Berger summarized the discussion: Council thought that the overriding principles in the addendum are straightforward and not sufficiently proactive. Aggressively increasing the applicant pool should continue to be emphasis. Admissions and enrollment decisions may be affected by financial constraints in some cases should be recognized. There are many complexities in initiating or instituting policies that would encourage an increase in the applicant pool.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen pointed out that the paragraph before the overriding principles section is much more useful as a general statement of principles. Modified a little, it would address applicants, admissions, student success, removing barriers, and distributing information widely to a quality and diverse pool.

Chair Berger summarized the wording for the response: We are in agreement with the recommendations, but the quality of these recommendations will not address the core problem. In order to address the core problem, we have to go to stronger recruiting methods. Council agreed to forward this response, pointing out the paragraph before Overriding Principles and that aggressively increasing the applicant pool will effectively increase diversity.

### **Proposed Revised Family Friendly Policies**

Council discussed the family friendly policies. Ms. Heather Wylie commented that studies have shown there are problems when faculty are “allowed” to stop the tenure track clock versus a policy of having the clock automatically stop. Studies show that women on average do not take advantage of this policy that permits stopping the clock. Princeton just extended it as a blanket policy so that no value judgment would be attached to it. Ms. Wylie suggested that it should be a blanket policy not something people can opt to choose.

Ms. Wylie quoted from the *New York Times* article “For Women in Sciences, Slow Progress in Academia”. “Princeton found that men were more likely to take advantage of the tenure extension than women who were afraid of requesting an extra year because it would be interpreted as a sign of weakness or lack of confidence. Princeton has recently made the tenure extension so automatic that it will have no judgment attached to it.”

A motion was made that Council will respond back that on bullet #2 the wording be revised to “All eligible faculty members will have the tenure clause stopped for one year” and that reference to the article also be included.

### **Systemwide Senate Review of UC Health, Safety & Environment Policies**

Council received a request from Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons for comment on the proposed policy under review by the Academic Senate. Council discussed the policy and will submit a response that Council feels this is not a workable policy and it appears to be un-funded. Council also thought that implementing the policy would entail a very heavy workload.

### **Proposed Bylaws 35 Revisions for April 25, 2005 Representative Assembly meeting**

Graduate Council thought that bylaw revisions are very important and should be carefully considered -- that there were too many revisions, too fast, and too rapidly drafted. Review by CERJ before, rather than after, review by the other standing committees would be more appropriate. Council also thought that most of the actual work was done in the standing committees and that it was inappropriate to diminish the role of the committees by giving additional power to the Executive Council. Council was in favor of *ex officio* members retaining their right to vote.

A few examples are presented below to make the point that Council thought the wording needed to be considered more and that mass rewording in an assembly meeting is not likely to be the most effective way to proceed. For example:

- Numbering a bylaw as a half number (16.5) seemed inappropriate.

- Bylaw 16.5 suggests that *ex officio* members can be voted off for good cause, yet *ex officio* members are on the committee because of a position that they hold.
- Formatting on Bylaw 28 looks awkward—there is no title or general paragraph.
- The wording for Bylaw 28D implies all task forces but it would only be Academic Senate Task Forces—not joint Administration/Academic Senate Task Forces.
- For Bylaw 28B, policy is clear; “direction” is vague.
- Bylaw 73 is the ultimate example that the bylaw revisions need to be more carefully considered. Everyone on the Executive Council will be *ex officio*.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Program Review**

Chair Kavvas reported that the reviews of the Graduate Programs in Dramatic Art and Performance Studies and the Graduate Program in Philosophy will be reported on at the next meeting.

There were no other subcommittee reports or announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

kg – Graduate Studies