

Revised 12/10/04
Action Item 4.5 was changed

UC DAVIS: ACADEMIC SENATE

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, December 13, 2004
11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
203 Mrak**

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
Winter Quarter Calendar Grid (Please return.)	4.0

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)

CONSENT ITEM

Philosophy – Degree requirement changes (EPC)	4.1
--	-----

ACTION ITEMS

Admission of Graduate Students Transferring with their Advisors from Other Universities – Policy Guideline (Knoesen)	4.2
Design Program, Proposal to Transfer from CA&ES to HArCS -- Level of support (Berger)	4.3
Small Graduate Programs – CAPBR memo (Berger)	4.4
Textile Arts and Costume Design – Request to rescind suspension of admissions (Guest: Kathleen Ward) <i>To be distributed before the meeting.</i>	4.5

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Comprehensive Campaign as related to graduate students (Berger)
Graduate Council goals and topics for 2004-2005 (Berger, subcommittee chairs et al.)
Potential topics include:

- Graduate funding/fundraising
- Electronic submission of theses and dissertations
- Policy on enrollment restrictions in graduate courses

Trish Berger, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
December 13, 2004

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

Representatives: S. Blank, D. Johns, J. Karpel, H. Wylie

Graduate Studies attendees: S. Albrecht, I. Blake, E. Caswell-Chen, K. Garcia, C. Jurado, S. O'Neill

ABSENT: *Members:* P. Chesson, A. Conley, L. Kavvas, A. Knoesen, S. Upadhyaya

Representatives: A. Kelleher, E. Pyatt, A. van Geelen

Graduate Studies: L. Wilce

GUEST: Kathleen Ward

Chair Berger began the meeting by requesting the calendar grids for winter quarter be forwarded to Kathy Garcia. She will be scheduling Council's meetings for winter quarter for Lee Wilce, who will return in January.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

No subcommittee reports were made due to lack of time.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements were made due to lack of time.

CONSENT ITEM

Philosophy Graduate Program – degree requirement changes

The item was approved as presented.

ACTION ITEMS

Design Program, Proposal to Transfer from CA&ES to HARCS

Chair Berger stated that Graduate Council had initially looked at this proposal and approved it with the comment that the level of support made available to the graduate program provided by the HARCS dean should match the level of support that has been made available by the CA&ES dean. The motion, that Graduate Council still approved the transfer, was approved.

Criminal Justice Sciences Program, a Joint Doctoral Program with CSU Fresno

Council has not received a response from the Criminal Justice Sciences Program to the November 8, 2004 CAPBR report.

MAS in Clinical Research

Council has not yet received a response from CAPBR regarding the “self-supporting” status of the MAS program since its meeting is scheduled after Graduate Council’s meeting. A response was recently received from Dean Silva that the cessation of support for the MD/ Ph.D. program was an independent decision from the creation of the MAS program.

Small Graduate Programs – CAPBR memo

Last year, Council discussed the minimum viable size for a graduate program. Key issues included:

1. Quality of the graduate program: The results of the National Research Council survey suggest that larger graduate programs tend to rank higher.
2. The level of resources that is required to maintain a small program to educate a few students: In the case of limited or declining resources, the fact that small programs require a disproportionate share of resources to educate a student must be considered.
3. The educational experience of students in the program: When the entering cohort has too few students, the opportunity to learn from colleagues is diminished and the availability of needed courses is jeopardized.

The discussion noted that the disproportionate use of resources by smaller programs includes faculty and Graduate Council time. So the resources include faculty outside the program and also include Graduate Studies resources in the case of small graduate groups.

Dean Gibeling responded to questions about financial resources: the Block Grant never goes below the minimum, which currently is \$15,000. The history has been that Graduate Studies has always provided a minimum block grant with the theory that when program enrollment moves toward “0,” the money should not decrease towards “0” because there is a point where you do not have enough money to do any one thing. If a program has at least \$15,000, it can offer at least one NRT fellowship or fees for one or two students, but it is hard to have an impact with \$2,000 or \$3,000. A second issue is graduate group administrative support: There is a base line of funding that increases with increasing enrollment. The amount of money that goes into a small program is out of proportion compared with that of a large program.

A Council member suggested that the base line funds disappear and that funds be allocated down to “0”. This would give very small groups an incentive to either become larger or combine with other groups to gain enough administrative support to be able to function. However, most

discussion focused on size related to quality. One Council member suggested that in general a significant size was a good idea, but in certain cases, very good reasons exist to have very small programs. 1) Some fields are just small fields and have been for a long time. 2) An emergent field might begin as a very small program. When a program is being proposed, consideration should include whether it is redundant or too expensive per student and the same question should be asked when it is reviewed. In both cases the programs might function as subdivisions of larger umbrella programs.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen noted that one issue that has not been addressed is what our ideal vision of what graduate education at UC Davis should be and how much breadth do we want. It could be shortsighted to discourage smaller programs in the sense of the breadth that some of them provide to the atmosphere on the campus. It was suggested that Council needs to provide further guidance to allow the Program Review Committee to consider some metric for size and quality relative to the recommendations that are made about the program. We could put specific language in to watch particularly small programs and programs that have declined in numbers of students since the last review. It is appropriate to compare the size and scope of the program with national competition. In cases where there may be a very big impact but small numbers we should not have an arbitrary cutoff. However, if we have small programs that have been that way a long time and are not competitive, then the program and Graduate Council should be aware of that. Dean Gibeling noted that the only non-arbitrary number to define "small" is 4 students. Currently graduate courses are not typically offered with fewer than 4 students.

Following further discussion, Dean Gibeling made the motion that when the entering cohort of a program averages fewer than 4 students per year, the program will be asked to pay special attention in its program review to justifying its quality, use of limited resources, and a comparison of its size with that of the national competition. The motion was seconded and approved, to be implemented for 2005-2006 reviews.

Admission of Graduate Students Transferring with their Advisers from Other Universities Policy Guidelines

The Administrative Committee receives requests on a regular basis as the campus hires faculty from other institutions who choose to bring their students with them. In some cases these trailing students would like to receive their degree from UC Davis without being required to take courses or qualifying examinations here at Davis. The Academic Planning and Development Committee reviewed the regulations and proposed the following policy to Graduate Council: 1) If most of the degree requirements toward the degree have been completed at another institution, the student must not be allowed to transfer to UC Davis when the university in which the student is enrolled allows the student to get his/her degree while finishing remaining requirements at UC Davis. 2) All transfer graduate students must comply with University of California Senate regulations and in particular SR682, SR684, SR686 and SR726. 3) With the majority of degree requirements toward a PhD degree not completed at a previous institution, a student will be allowed to transfer with the following requirements. The student must complete both their PhD Qualifying Examination and their remaining research requirements at UC Davis. The student may obtain credit for work indicating superior scholarship at institutions of high standard other than the University of California for the partial fulfillment of the unit or course requirement for the PhD. Upon recommendation for admission, a Graduate Program will provide a report to both the student and the Dean of Graduate Studies that specifies what portion of graduate degree

requirements previously met at the other institution will be transferable for meeting UC Davis degree requirements, and those remaining degree requirements to be met at UC Davis. 4) With the majority of degree requirements toward a Master's degree not completed at a previous institution, a Master degree student will be allowed to transfer with the following requirements. The student can obtain credit for work indicating superior scholarship at institutions of high standard other than the University of California for the fulfillment of approximately one-fifth of the minimum unit or course requirement for the Master's degree. When such allowance is made it cannot be used to reduce the minimum requirement in strictly graduate (200) courses. Upon recommendation for admission, a Graduate Program will provide a report to the student and Dean of Graduate Studies on the transferable degree requirements to UC Davis, and those degrees requirements that must be met at UC Davis.

More explicit policy language was discussed that will require the completion of approximately one-half of the minimum unit or course requirement for the Ph.D. degree in the chosen graduate program. A vote was taken on the proposal by APD and the voted failed. A vote was taken on a revised proposal and it 7 in favor with 2 abstaining. The approved policy is:

Policy for Admission of Graduate Students Transferring from Other Institutions with Their Major Professor

- 1) If the majority of the degree requirements have been completed at another institution, the student will not be permitted to transfer to UC Davis if the institution in which the student is enrolled permits the student to complete his or her degree while finishing the remaining requirements at UC Davis.
- 2) All transfer graduate students must comply with University of California Senate regulations and in particular SR682, SR684, SR686 and SR726.¹
- 3) When a student has not completed the majority of the degree requirements for a Ph.D. at another institution, he or she will be permitted to complete the degree at UC Davis subject to the following requirements. The student must complete both the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination and the remaining research work at UC Davis. Credit obtained for work indicating superior scholarship at institutions of high standard other than the University of California may be accepted in fulfillment of approximately one-half of the

¹ SR682: "no graduate student will be recommended for any degree except upon completing at least one year of residence at the University of California, devoted to such a course of study as the Graduate Council concerned regards as a proper year's work, and upon complying with such other regulations as may apply."

SR684: "Candidates for degrees may, at the discretion of the Graduate Council concerned, be given credit for residence at other universities, provided at least three quarters (or two semesters) are passed in residence at this University."

SR686: Regulations as to Residence and Length of Study "The minimum requirement is three quarters (or two semesters) for the Master's degree, nine quarters (or six semesters) for the degree of Juris Doctor, and six quarters (or four semesters) for the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Engineering."

SR726: "Normally the entire program for the Master's degree must be completed in residence at the University of California. In exceptional cases, credit obtained for work indicating superior scholarship at institutions of high standard other than the University of California may be accepted in fulfillment of approximately one-fifth of the minimum unit or course requirement for the Master's degree. When such allowance is made it cannot be used to reduce the minimum requirement in strictly graduate (200) courses".

minimum unit or course requirement for the Ph.D. degree in the chosen graduate program. However, these courses and units will not be transferred to the UC Davis transcript. Upon recommendation for admission, the Graduate Adviser will provide a report to the student and to the Dean of Graduate Studies that specifies which portion of the degree requirements previously met at another institution will be accepted in partial fulfillment of the graduate program requirements at UC Davis and those remaining degree requirements to be met at UC Davis.

4) When a student has not completed the majority of the degree requirements for a Master's degree at another institution, he or she will be permitted to complete the degree at UC Davis subject to the following requirements. The student can obtain credit for work indicating superior scholarship at institutions of high standard other than the University of California for the fulfillment of approximately one-fifth of the minimum unit or course requirement for the Master's degree. When such allowance is made it cannot be used to reduce the minimum requirement in strictly graduate (200) courses. Upon recommendation for admission, a Graduate Program will provide a report to the student and to the Dean of Graduate Studies on the transferable degree requirements to UC Davis, and those degree requirements that must be met at UC Davis.

Graduate Funding and Fund Raising

Council briefly discussed a CCGA memo from spring 2004, specifically stating that "raising graduate funding to enhance opportunity needs to be a priority of the Chancellors." Current endowment efforts have almost entirely neglected the support of graduate education. CCGA suggested the Chancellors devote a portion of the development staff to enhancing external relations and fund raising for graduate education.

Dean Gibeling noted that the UCD comprehensive campaign is based at \$900 million. Graduate Studies submitted an umbrella proposal for \$200 million for graduate student support. The deans came in with their proposals, accounting for \$150 million of the \$200 million. That leaves Graduate Studies responsible for \$50 million. This is not a trivial exercise given the fact that Graduate Studies does not have a development officer. Much is unknown as to how we will actually achieve the goals of the comprehensive campaign. There are just not enough specifics at this point. A much more refined prospectus is taking shape, but it is disappointing since graduate student support is morphing into student support in a broader sense. Professional fundraisers may think it is easier to raise money for undergraduates than for graduates. Nevertheless, there are some institutions in the country that have been very successful in raising money for graduate students. Those who have tried have found ways to succeed. Further discussion was postponed in order to proceed with the agenda.

Textile Arts and Costume Design Graduate Program – request to rescind suspension of admissions

Council discussed the request to rescind the suspension of admissions that was submitted by Professor Patricia Harrison, Chair of the Department of Environmental Design. Dr. Kathleen Ward, PRC liaison for the previous review, was invited to attend the meeting.

The graduate program's last review was initiated in 2000. Based on the response received to the PRC report, the Program Review Closure Committee recommended either a full review or a partial review be initiated. Council's decision was to initially request a status report and based on that report, a full review might be initiated. Professor Harrison submitted the requested status report in March 2004. The situation in the program had worsened since the PRC report. Based on the status report, Council recommended, in October 2004, suspension of admission to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Upon Council's recommendation, the Dean suspended admissions.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen reported that he had met with Professors Harrison and Victoria Rivers and that it was clear that since the review was initiated in 2000, there have been a number of difficulties. These were relatively severe personnel issues that have influenced the ability of the group to respond effectively to the PRC review. The individuals who are communicating with Council acknowledge that and have made an effort to make sure those problems are corrected. Professor Kavvas, Chair of the Program Review Committee, Associate Dean Caswell-Chen, and Professor Berger, met with Professors Harrison and Rivers and suggested that a recommendation to conduct a full review in the 2005-2006 academic year accompany the request to reopen admissions. This suggestion was agreeable to all parties. By that time the move to HARCS should be completed and suggestions for renovating and/or revising the program should also be underway. Other discussions included that the program was also recruiting faculty positions, and it might be difficult to recruit positions if the admissions were suspended.

One Council member expressed concern as to how this program could have made as much progress as described in the current request when none of that was apparent in the March 2004 memo. One member recalled that when Council discussed this program before, deciding to suspend admissions, it was a move motivated to protect students. The numbers of faculty from 2001-2004 have not changed dramatically.

Current program leadership believes at the time of the review students were misled about opportunities but this problem has been rectified. A question is whether communication problems still exist.

Council discussed a number of relevant questions: Are we going to be admitting students to a program where they will get a good education? Are we convinced by this memo that the program will serve a new cohort better than they served the previous cohort? Is the program sufficiently better? One member raised the question of whether anything has been heard from the graduate students themselves. Further questions included: Does leaving admissions suspended give them further incentive to continue improving or does it strike a severe blow from which it will be difficult to recover? If we retain the suspension of admissions, what criteria would the program need to meet in order for Council to rescind the suspension of admissions? Would another review be initiated?

Following additional discussion, the motion was made to uphold the suspension of admissions; it was seconded and approved on a vote of 4 in favor, 1 opposed and 3 abstaining.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.