

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
AGENDA  
Monday, November 22, 2004  
9:00 – 11:00 a.m.  
203 Mrak**

**AGENDA ITEM**

**ATTACHMENT**

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Academic Planning and Development (Knoesen)  
Administrative (Berger)  
Courses and Bylaws (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)

**ACTION ITEMS**

<b>Dramatic Art M.A. and Ph.D. – Name change request</b> (Berger)	3.1
<b>Neuroscience M.S., proposal to establish an M.S. program to be offered by the Graduate Group in Neuroscience, which offers the Ph.D. – Council’s final review</b> (Berger)	3.2
<b>Clinical Research M.A.S., proposal to establish a new graduate group and M.A.S. program – Council’s final review</b> (Berger)	3.3
<b>Additional Ph.D. Plan – Proposed Plan C</b> (Knoesen)	3.4

**CONSENT ITEMS**

<b>French – Degree requirement changes</b> (Upadhyaya)	3.5
<b>Minutes from October 21, 2004</b>	3.6

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Graduate Council goals and topics for 2004-2005** (Berger, subcommittee chairs et al.)

Potential topics include:

- Graduate funding
- Electronic review for admissions
- Electronic submission of theses and dissertations
- Policy on enrollment restrictions in graduate courses

Trish Berger, Chair

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**Monday, November 22, 2004**

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

*Representatives:* J. Karpel, A. Kelleher, A. van Geelen

*Graduate Studies attendees:* S. Albrecht, I. Blake, E. Caswell-Chen, H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, S. O'Neill, L. Wilce

**ABSENT:** *Members:* A. Conley, C. de la Peña, R. Wu

*Representatives:* S. Blank, D. Johns, E. Pyatt, H. Wylie

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Dramatic Art M.A. and Ph.D. – Name change request**

Chair Trish Berger presented the request to change the name of the M.A./Ph.D. from Dramatic Art to Performance Studies. It was Council's understanding that the Department of Theatre and Dance would offer two graduate degree programs, the M.F.A. in Dramatic Art and the M.A./Ph.D. in Performance Studies. Council asked whether there were two separate faculties offering two separate degree programs and whether they needed to be reviewed separately. Prof. Levent Kavvas thought that there were two distinct faculties working toward two distinct missions. Prof. Peter Chesson suggested that this was not unusual in graduate programs that have different tracks. Prof. Evan Watkins thought that there was an overlap of dramatic art in the two degree programs. Prof. Joan Cadden made the motion to approve the name change and Prof. Chesson seconded the motion. The vote was five in favor of and three opposed to the motion. The motion was carried. Dean Jeffery Gibeling suggested that since the name change would have an impact on them, opinions of the current students should have been solicited. The continuing students will have the option of continuing with the old name or adopting the new name. Chair Berger will write Dean Gibeling requesting the transmittal of the proposal to the Chancellor via the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Studies.

**Neuroscience M.S., proposal to establish an M.S. program to be offered by the Graduate Group in Neuroscience, which offers the Ph.D. – Council's final review**

Chair Berger reported that at its meeting of June 24, 2004 Council gave its preliminary approval to the proposal, contingent on a wording change on page 7. The change was made. Dean Gibeling asked whether there would be separate bylaws for the M.S. and Ph.D. programs. Ms. Kathy Garcia, Committee Analyst, responded that there will be just one set of bylaws and that it is currently under review. Prof. Cadden made the motion to approve the proposal and Prof. Andrew Waterhouse seconded it. Council discussed the timing of the review and approval of new program bylaws. Although graduate program bylaws are a UCD, not a CCGA, requirement, Council's goal is to have the bylaws approved before proposals for new programs are transmitted off campus. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Chair Berger will write Dean Gibeling, requesting transmittal of the proposal to the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors.

**Clinical Research M.A. S. proposal to establish a new graduate group and M.A. S. program -- Council's final review**

Chair Berger reported that Council gave its preliminary approval to the proposal on June 24, 2004, contingent on resolution of a series of issues. These included:

- Whether the program is self-supporting. This is still not clear.
- Clarification of international applicants. This has been resolved.
- 400 level courses for credit. These courses have been submitted for review and approval.
- Academic Senate Regulation 600. B. states that no Senate faculty can earn campus degrees. The proposers revised the proposal's wording such that the MAS will be awarded only to non-Senate faculty

The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review was pleased with the proposal. The Library Committee requested \$6,000 for monographs and the proposers agreed.

A Council member has heard that the School of Medicine is discontinuing its support for the M.D./Ph.D. program, possibly due to its commitment to the MAS program. Council discussed the nature of the stipends for M.D./Ph.D.s and how they were paid. Typically, students spend the preceding summer and first two years in medical school, then they take off three years to do the research for the Ph.D., after which they return to their clinical work.

Prof. Waterhouse pointed out that the memo from the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review (CAPBR) does not resolve the issue of whether the Clinical Research MAS is a self-supporting or state supported program. It appears that the program would not receive state support and that federal money, as well as the Dean of the School of Medicine, would support it. Some Council members questioned whether federal grant funds became "state" funds once they were received. Dean Gibeling thought that if the program were self-supporting, it would be clear that no state money was funding the program. Because there is no firewall, Council has to assume it is state supported.

Chair Berger thought that a more thorough financial accounting was needed to answer this question. Dean Gibeling suggested that Council request CAPBR to address the question of whether the MAS is self-supporting or state supported. Prof. Richard Scalettar asked whether it was true that no existing programs offer comprehensive clinical research and that the new program would have no impact on graduate enrollments. Prof. Judith Turgeon thought that this was correct. Dean Gibeling indicated that if the program is state supported, then the enrollments are counted as part of the graduate enrollments.

Prof. Kavvas pointed out the last line on page 3 of the proposal that says, "We estimate that the program will become self-sufficient within the first five years." Council was uncertain what "self-sufficient" meant and thought that it was a broader term than self-supporting.

Prof. Waterhouse read from CCGA's MAS policy statement, "According to UCOP's budget office, MAS programs must be either self-supporting or entirely state-supported." He made the motion to table further discussion of the proposal until Council has received a response from CAPBR. Prof. André Knoesen seconded the motion. Dean Gibeling asked for clarification of the relationship of the Clinical Research MAS and the M.D./Ph.D. program and where the School of Medicine's support is being directed. Prof. Waterhouse amended his motion to include a letter to the Dean of the School of Medicine regarding the program's relationship to and impact on existing programs. Council members suggested that the letter also would say that Council has heard that the School is discontinuing support for the M.D./Ph.D. and would ask for a description of the School's vision for academic training and clinical research. Prof. Shrini

Upadhyaya seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Berger will write the Chair of CAPBR and the Dean of the School of Medicine.

### **Additional Ph.D. Plan – Proposed Plan C**

Prof. André Knoesen reported that his committee considered the option of having three people serve on the dissertation committee and requiring a final examination. APD thought that it was important for students to communicate back to their programs about their research and the committee considered dissertation options offered by other UC campuses. Prof. Upadhyaya pointed out that the Plan C would be similar to Plan A but would reduce the number of faculty from five to three. Prof. Knoesen thought that some programs would want to retain Plan A and its five faculty members. Prof. Upadhyaya thought Plan C might be a replacement for Plan A and that programs would prefer Plan C. Council members discussed Plans A and C and the other campuses' dissertation options. Dean Gibeling pointed out that UC San Diego requires a final exam of all its Ph.D. students. Other campuses leave the final exam to the discretion of the dissertation committee or the graduate program. Council also discussed requiring a final exit seminar instead of, or in addition to, a final oral examination. Currently, under Plan B the dissertation committee may require the student to defend the dissertation in a formal oral examination. However, Prof. Upadhyaya pointed out that Plan B does not make an exit seminar or a final oral examination requirement enforceable since the requirement is at the discretion of the dissertation committee, not the graduate program. Once the dissertation committee signs the dissertation, nothing more can be required of the student to complete the degree. The graduate program and graduate adviser are not part of the dissertation approval process. Dean Gibeling thought that there was a genuine need for an exit seminar option.

Prof. Waterhouse suggested that Council accept the proposed Plan C and ask APD to consider an exit seminar under Plan A, B, or C. Council discussed polling the Plan A and Plan B graduate programs, as well as asking APD to consider editing the plans to include the exit seminar. Council also discussed Ph.D. students who submit their dissertations after they have left Davis and the fact that they must return for exit seminars and final examinations.

Prof. Chesson made the motion to approve the proposed Plan C and to modify Plan B to allow graduate programs to require the exit seminar. Prof. Upadhyaya seconded the motion. Council discussed whether to return the proposal to APD or to poll the graduate programs but did not amend the motion. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. A wording error in Plan A will be corrected in the proposal. Plan B was modified by the addition of "Graduate program degree requirements may require an exit seminar of each student. Satisfaction of this requirement shall be verified by the chair of the dissertation committee." Chair Berger will write Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons and request that the appropriate committees review for approval the proposed amendments to UC Davis Academic Senate Regulation 520. (C) (4) Dissertation and Final Examination.

Chair Berger reported that the previously proposed Davis Division Bylaw 80. "Graduate Council" amendment did get reworded by the Academic Senate Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ). No curricular issue would be delegated by the Graduate Council to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Bylaw 80 will be forwarded to the Academic Senate Representative Assembly at its next meeting.

## **CONSENT ITEMS**

Chair Berger asked Council if it wished to remove any of the items off the Consent List. Since no items were removed, they were approved as presented.

### **French – Degree requirement changes**

Chair Berger will notify the program chair that the degree requirements were approved.

### **Minutes from October 21, 2004**

The approved minutes will be posted on the Web.

### **Taping Graduate Council meetings**

Chair Berger asked Council whether it would be willing to have its meetings taped to facilitate accurate preparation of the minutes. Prof. Waterhouse asked if the tapes would be erased. Dean Gibeling thought that they would be erased when the minutes were approved. Council agreed to the audio taping of its meetings.

### **Online Proposals for CODVC**

Dean Gibeling reported that the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors (CODVC) no longer wished to receive hard copies of the proposals for new programs and has requested that proposals be posted on the Web for those who wish to read them. Council discussed various ways that Graduate Council might distribute and view electronic documents.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Graduate Council goals and topics for 2004-2005**

Chair Berger presented the first discussion topic: **graduate funding**. She reported that she has become aware that not just her colleagues in CA&ES consider that graduate education funding is in crisis. Chair Berger thought that if a large number of faculty consider it the number one problem, then the campus administration might be made more aware of its importance to the faculty. She reported that graduate education is part of the upcoming comprehensive campaign and that documented support for graduate education might help keep it from being eroded. She suggested a brief questionnaire for Academic Senate faculty and distributed a draft. The Academic Senate would help create the survey.

Chair Berger reported that the last big change in graduate education funding was the decrease of the nonresident tuition (NRT) after advancement to candidacy. The Council of Graduate Deans (COGD) works with the UC Office of the President (UCOP) on graduate education funding issues. Dean Gibeling suggested that moving to the Graduate Student Researcher (GSR) employment title from the Research Assistant (RA) title was another big funding support change for Davis.

Prof. Cadden was very much in favor of the general strategy and agreed that graduate student support is the number one priority but suggested an alternative tactic to the faculty questionnaire. She thought that the survey should be of the graduate programs rather than the individual faculty. She reported that the problem of student support was greater in the humanities, arts, cultural studies, and social sciences because it is exceptional for faculty grants in the social sciences to support students.

Prof. Knoesen said that faculty would agree that student support is a problem. He thought that finding out how each graduate program supports its students compared with other institutions would be useful information. He added that funding is so different across disciplines that it would not be helpful to compare different disciplines. A Council member suggested asking each

program how its graduate students were funded and how students were funded at its competitive institutions.

Council also discussed international students. Prof. Scalettar reported that at UC 10-15 % of the physics students are international compared with 50% elsewhere. Prof. Cadden suggested asking the programs for the reasons they need international students and elaborating on issues that make this important for their discipline. For example, the graduate program in History needs to be able to fund more international students for the benefit of the academic program because of the nature of the program itself. Dean Gibeling would like to obtain an estimate of the ideal percentage of international students for each graduate program. Chair Berger asked about Physics. Prof. Scalettar reported that Physics would like to increase its enrollment and get better quality students. Chair Berger stated that part of graduate education is the diversity that international students provide and that the Animal Biology program benefits although the diversity is not specifically required for the subject matter.

Prof. Waterhouse asked whether Council's goal was to survey a major issue or to strategize how to address the issue. He thought NRT needed to be addressed systemwide off campus. Chair Berger pointed out that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) worked very hard on NRT last year and that the Council of Graduate Deans works with UCOP on it. Prof. Waterhouse thought that a report from campus could stimulate some movement off campus.

Prof. Knoesen asked if Davis has unique graduate support problems or whether other campuses have the same problems and asked how they are addressing these problems. Chair Berger said that at CCGA, NRT is recognized as a systemwide problem.

Prof. Kavvas agreed with most of the issues raised. He thought a certain threshold was arising on campus with regard to NRT and that some faculty members were considering hiring postdoctoral scholars instead of admitting Ph.D. students. He thought it was important to ask the disciplines to articulate their critical issues. Prof. Cadden suggested adding an open-ended question to the survey to find out what the issues are for each program.

Chair Berger asked whether the Support and Welfare Committee could work on the survey before it reviews the internal fellowships in February. Prof. Scalettar agreed to take it to his committee. Dean Gibeling suggested that programs be asked to describe their funding strategies and whether they use lab rotations.

Due to lack of time, the following topics were not discussed.

**Electronic review of admissions**

**Electronic submission of theses and dissertations**

**Policy on enrollment restrictions in graduate courses**

### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no subcommittee reports due to lack of time.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Berger asked for announcements.

### **Dean-Graduate Studies**

Dean Jeffery Gibeling announced that the Regent's budget proposes no change to the nonresident tuition (NRT) for next year. The graduate student fees would increase by 10%, of which 50% would be returned as aid. He also reported that the Animal Biology Ph.D. program proposal was approved by the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors.

**Associate Dean for Programs**

Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen had no announcements.

**Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs**

CCGA Representative Reen Wu was absent.

**Graduate Student Association**

GSA Chair Jonathan Karpel had no announcements.

**Postdoctoral Scholars Association**

PSA Chair Albert van Geelen asked for a volunteer to work on the postdoctoral scholar award nomination process. The PSA would like an additional faculty member from Graduate Council. He will discuss this again at Council's December meeting.

**Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor**

Ms. Heather Wylie was absent.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 a.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies