

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA**

**February 22, 2006
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
3201 Hart Hall**

AGENDA ITEM

ATTACHMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development (Baumgarth)
Administrative (Waterhouse)
Bylaws (Watkins)
Courses (Kuhl)
Educational Policy (de la Peña)
Program Review (Mechling)
Support and Welfare (Farrens)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair (Waterhouse)
Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)
Announcements from the Associate Dean (Caswell-Chen)
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Upadhyaya)
Graduate Student Association (Karpel)
Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Sheets)
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Breslin/Cole)

CONSENT ITEMS

Minutes from February 1, 2006 meeting – Draft *To be distributed.* 6.1

ACTION ITEMS

Designated Emphasis in Studies in Performance and Practice – Proposal (de la Peña) 6.2
International Commercial Law – Request to change title from M.A. to LL.M. (Waterhouse) Handout

DISCUSSION ITEMS

CCGA Items – Copyright Issue and Independent Course Responsibility (Upadhyaya) 6.3
Integrated Pest Management M.S. – Graduate Group request to suspend admissions(Waterhouse) 6.4
Procedure for Requesting a Suspension of Admissions to a Graduate Program – Draft (Gibeling) 6.*
Academic Federation Response to Academic Senate Report on Shared Governance (Waterhouse) 5.10
Please bring Attachment 5.10 from the February 1, 2006 meeting.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Graduate Council and Subcommittee Membership Lists. 5.11

Andrew Waterhouse, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Wednesday, February 22, 2006

PRESENT: *Members:* A. Britt, J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, M. Farrens, J. Gibeling, T. Kuhl, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins
Representatives: C. Bates, E. Caswell-Chen, J. Karpel, S. O'Neill, A. Sheets
Graduate Studies attendees: S. Albrecht, H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, C. Jurado, Y. Shi, L. Wilce

ABSENT: *Members:* N. Baumgarth, W. Leal, R. Wu
Representatives: J. Breslin, C. Hom, A. Kelleher

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development

APD Chair Nicole Baumgarth was absent. APD member Professor Anne Britt reported that the members were examining graduate program review summaries for recurring recommendations across programs. For example, two common recommendations are for more space and more funding. Dean Jeffery Gibeling added that a graduate student is being hired to assist the committee with data analysis.

Administrative

Chair Andrew Waterhouse reported the committee will meet tomorrow, February 23, 2006.

Bylaws

Professor Evan Watkins had not yet arrived.

Courses

Professor Tonya Kuhl reported her committee was reviewing its next set of graduate course requests and plans to complete all the reviews so there is no backlog.

Educational Policy

Professor Carolyn de la Peña reported EPC has one item on the agenda today. The committee is waiting to hear back from six programs about degree requirement changes and it is in the process of reviewing several other items. It hopes to move those forward at its meeting next week. Incoming items include several new DE proposals as well as a proposal to re-open the Textile Arts and Costume Design M.F.A. The committee is large and she expected it would be able to handle the workload.

Program Review

Professor Jay Mechling reported that two on-site reviews have already taken place and another one is scheduled for this week. He expected to have PRC's first reports to Council for review in early April. The program reviews are on track.

Support and Welfare

Professor Matthew Farrens asked Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen and Director Steven Albrecht to report. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen reported on the Outstanding Graduate Student

Teaching Award. The deadline for submission of nominations and packets was last Friday, February 17, 2006. Committee Analyst Kathy Garcia reported that there were 27 nominations. The application procedures have been streamlined. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen said the numbers are down from last year, when there were 70 or more applications, a particularly high number. In previous years there had been 35-40 nominations. The 70 applications last year represented a huge increase in workload for the committee reviewing the applications. He and Analyst Garcia have made the process more specific and clearer this year. That may have led to there being fewer nominations. They will attempt to understand the decrease in the number of nominations by examining where the nominations came from and who made them, students or faculty or self. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen reported that there could be 12 to 15 awards this year.

Director Albrecht reported on the internal fellowship review process. Approximately 770 applications have been received. Because students apply for more than one fellowship, there are approximately 2,500 reviews to be completed. They started with a committee of 64 reviewers; two have withdrawn. Nine faculty have finished their reviews and approximately 20 have started their reviews. Optimistically, they are about half way through the reviews and faculty have another nine days to complete the reviews. Director Albrecht will contact those who have not started their reviews.

Committee on the School of Public Health

Professor Hans Mueller is Graduate Council's representative on the Committee on the proposed School of Public Health. Chair Waterhouse asked Professor Mueller for an update.

Professor Mueller reported that a questionnaire was distributed to almost everyone about the School of Public Health. There was a full day retreat to be followed by a second half day retreat. One item of discussion is how existing graduate programs would fit in the school. There are certain very strict requirements for accreditation of the School of Public Health.

Among many others, the president/CEO of the Association of Schools of Public Health, Harrison Spencer, gave a presentation, primarily focusing on accreditation issues. There exist many issues regarding graduate education, for example, creation of a Master and Ph.D. of Public Health, plus they want to cover some existing graduate programs such as Epidemiology and Biostatistics and possibly other programs somehow under this umbrella. At this point the committee is just discussing things and trying to determine what is needed for the accreditation. There is another retreat coming up in March, which he will also attend. They are talking about requesting 30 FTEs. There are several unresolved issues on the administrative side as well.

Chair Waterhouse expected that the Master of Public Health would be accredited by an external agency of some sort. Professor Mueller responded that the whole school apparently had to be accredited, not just the programs, and apparently the administrative structure is also subject to accreditation. Even the way the school reports to the university administration seems to be an item for the accreditation. Dean Gibeling thought that the academic programs offered by the Graduate Groups in Epidemiology and Biostatistics that cut across the campus might not fit in well with the accreditation reviewers. Professor Mueller responded that he has raised the point that these programs are controlled by the Academic Senate. It is not entirely clear yet what that means or what the requirements will be for accreditation. It is clear that the creation of a School of Public Health would have an impact on those and likely other graduate groups and the proposal will have an impact on graduate education overall, as they also are thinking about

starting new programs and there are resource issues. They have to have the Master of Public Health but the doctor of Public Health might be optional for the accreditation. It appears they need three graduate programs besides the MPH.

Regarding the timeline, they aim at a more comprehensive plan in June. Professor Mueller offered to present a more detailed report as an agenda item for a later meeting, for example later in March after the second retreat.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair

Chair Waterhouse reported that the UC Davis **NRT memorial** was adopted by the Academic Council systemwide. Every faculty member at UC will receive a ballot to vote on this memorial and, if approved, it will go to the Regents. Apparently, the UCB representative at the Academic Council felt they should alter it to include NRT for the students' first year, but that did not prevail.

Yesterday there was a town hall meeting to discuss the **vote of no confidence on the Chancellor**. People spoke on both sides. Even those who spoke against the vote expressed much dissatisfaction with the systemwide administration at UC. Chair Waterhouse expected this concern may stimulate much discussion and may come to Council later on, depending on how the vote goes and how it is interpreted. The proposers claim they are more concerned with the administration overall than with the Chancellor although the ballot is narrowly stated.

The Academic Council has posted some suggested **policies for executive compensation**. They are on the MySenate Web site under the news section. For example, they suggest that administrators' salaries follow those of faculty and staff. The press who investigated the termination agreement with Vice Chancellor Celeste Rose are now beginning to ask questions about termination agreements with faculty.

Chair Waterhouse reported that Dean Gibeling recently held two **graduate program chairs meetings**, where much concern was expressed about the Provost's plan for the support of graduate students next year, largely because the plan takes the control away from the program chairs. The new investment goes directly to a faculty member who hires a GSR. The funds are not aggregated for graduate programs to allocate. Several chairs made the point that this will decrease their leverage in recruiting particular international students because they will not have a large enough fund of money.

Chair Waterhouse explained that for the last two years and this year, the Dean of Graduate Studies has matched money with the deans of various colleges to support graduate programs. Everyone took what was called one-time carryover money decided to spend it over the last two years. That money was given to graduate programs as a block grant supplement. The program received the money, not individual professors. The programs used this money at their own discretion, for example to recruit students. Because many of those one-time funds have been expended, there is less money in those funding programs.

The Provost came up with new money and asked how to spend it. One option would have been to allocate that money into block grants, using the existing formula. However, in the fall the Academic Senate made it clear that the cost of GSRs was out of control and the Provost allocated the money to buy down that cost. From the graduate program perspective, the consequence of that plan is that the chairs see the funding they have decline and this new money going straight to the

faculty members. Dean Gibeling added that how the chairs feel depends on how programs use their block grant money. In a program where the goal is to support students for the first one, two or three quarters on rotation, then faculty members having more money in their grants does not help the program support students on rotation. However, other programs may follow different funding strategies. In any case, there will not be as much money controlled by program chairs or committees this year as there was last year. There is more money in the system but it is not under the control of the people who are trying to recruit the students. Chair Waterhouse thought this would be an important point for consideration next year. Dean Gibeling said it was an important consideration for this year too as it may affect student enrollments if programs admit fewer students.

Announcements from the Dean

Dean Gibeling reported that at his program chairs meetings quite a bit of time was spent talking about **graduate student support issues**. In addition, there was an article on this topic in the February 17, 2006 issue of *Dateline*.

Dean Gibeling reminded Council that it has talked about **In Absentia Registration** for students conducting research outside of California. He hoped that the systemwide Council of Graduate Deans will come to an agreement on a policy at its meeting next week. Then the graduate deans would work with the Office of the President to implement it. He hoped that would be accomplished by the end of the year.

Dean Gibeling reported that the number of **admissions applications** is still just slightly ahead of last year at this time; they are up 4 or 5 %. It is difficult to compare the numbers from one year to the next because some programs move their deadlines a little bit and that throws the numbers off. The data will start to level off and approach more of a steady state in the next few weeks. Graduate Studies has had quite a reasonable increase in the number of under represented students applying to the campus. That is one statistic that is notable.

Dean Gibeling reported that Professor Sharman O'Neill has been working with him as Faculty Assistant to the Dean, helping faculty prepare training grant proposals and stimulating other sorts of activities such as GANN and NSF five year grant proposals. The Dean announced that she will continue with her current projects but now with the title of **Associate Dean for Research Programs**. Dean Gibeling added that he was still recruiting for an Associate Dean for Students.

Announcements from the Associate Dean

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen presented the idea of developing a postdoctoral scholars orientation and asked Council for their thoughts. When postdocs who are new to the campus arrive, they would receive an overview of the academic side of what it means to be a postdoc at UCD. They already receive an orientation with Human Resources relative to benefits but its focus is clearly different than an orientation focusing on the academic side of their experience and training.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Professor Shrinivasa Upadhyaya reported that CCGA met on Tuesday, February 7, 2006. He has two CCGA items on today's agenda. The only other issue that he thought was probably of interest to Council was that a number of UC administrators have expressed interest in supporting new graduate programs in applied health sciences such as audiology, physical therapy and nursing. Also, there may be opportunities to develop graduate programs in areas such as nanotechnology and bioengineering. Professor Upadhyaya thought that APD might consider these areas when

suggesting potential new graduate programs. Dean Gibeling added that there are discussions about reviving an old proposal in audiology, a joint program with CSU Sacramento. The campuses are also thinking about a nursing program where UCD would offer the Ph.D. and CSU Sacramento would continue offering the practicing part as they do now.

Graduate Student Association

Mr. Jonathan Karpel had no announcements.

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor

Ms. Alison Sheets had no announcements.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

Dr. Jerry Breslin was absent. Dean Gibeling reported that the UAW are back with an interest in organizing postdoctoral scholars, as Dr. Breslin described at the last meeting when he presented his letter. At that time the UAW was at UCSF and UCLA. There are reports that they are on the Davis campus, as well. Dean Gibeling said that before the end of the week there will be some clarifying communication to postdoctoral scholars and faculty specifying just exactly what is permitted. Reports indicate that the organizers are entering labs and office spaces. There is some lack of clarity about what PRO/UAW is and how it relates to the Postdoctoral Scholars Association. It was noted that faculty manage laboratories and are responsible for the safety and security of all those who enter them.

CONSENT ITEM

The February 1 minutes were tabled. They will be distributed for review before the next meeting.

Minutes from February 1, 2006 meeting – Draft

ACTION ITEMS

Designated Emphasis in Studies in Performance and Practice – Proposal

Professor de la Peña reported that this DE in Studies in Performance and Practice was spearheaded by Professor Lynette Hunter. EPC was very supportive of the proposal. They worked with Dr. Hunter to ensure that it was clear to them exactly what the courses were, how the DE differed from other programs on campus, and especially how the DE differed from what the Department of Theatre and Dance offers now. The proposal is very focused, includes specific examples, and places the DE within an array of programs of similar concentration. The DE will work to develop methodologies for research for students who are interested in the process of performance rather than the product of performance. Traditionally, performance graduate students might analyze plays and examine performance pieces that are completed and set before audiences. The DE is not simply for students in the Ph.D. in Performance Studies but for students in a wide variety of Ph.D. programs including Anthropology, Comparative Literature and Native American Studies. There are nine affiliated Ph.D. programs and an extensive list of faculty, who all see a benefit in having some key methodology course for students to think creatively about the practice of performance in everyday life. EPC felt that the DE proposal is strong, there is extensive support for it across the social sciences and humanities, and EPC was very comfortable approving it.

Council discussed the proposed program. Dean Gibeling wondered whether they have the faculty resources to offer the DE. The last program review reported that the faculty members were stretched thin. The performance side cannot sustain the level of activity they have now indefinitely without some relief and on the Ph.D. side there are very few faculty members, probably too few to offer a brand new program. Professor de la Peña thought that this was a really important point, that

the Department in Theatre and Dance was in transition, and that Professors Hunter and Peter Lichtenfels were creating excellent interdisciplinary collaborations. She said that this DE is heavily supported by the people in Theatre and Dance, as well as other programs.

Another concern was whether it made sense for a student to earn a Ph.D. in Performance Studies with a Designated Emphasis in Studies of Performance and Practice. Dean Gibeling asked if there was something pedagogically distinct in the DE for a student getting a Ph.D. in Performance Studies. Professor de la Peña responded that they are distinct programs. Another Council member thought that the DE's area or focus was broader than that of the Ph.D. Dean Gibeling clarified that he was not questioning the formation of the DE but only the affiliation of the Ph.D. in Performance Studies. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen thought that because the DE is about process, actually methodologies used to investigate process as a phenomenon in and of itself, that it was separate from the end points of processes. That could be something very different from what a student in Performance Studies was doing as their dissertation work. It was conceivable that the two things would overlap but that was not a given.

Chair Waterhouse reiterated the concern that the courses for the DE might not be that different from those for the Ph.D. in Performance Studies. Professor de la Peña responded that EPC thought that the DE made sense to the faculty in the Ph.D. in Performance Studies. In the DE there are new courses and courses outside the department. It was clear to her how the DE would benefit Cultural Studies and Anthropology and how the study of performance in everyday performance activity was important in many of the social sciences and humanities right now.

Council discussed several other topics. One was the future of the DE, whether it might evolve into an interdisciplinary track in the Ph.D. program or a separate graduate group. Council discussed the DE member on the student's Qualifying Examination and Dissertation Committees, and whether that DE member had to or should be outside the student's Ph.D. program faculty; this is not a requirement. Another topic was whether there was a limit on the number of units that could be used for both the DE and the Ph.D.

Council also discussed the DE's name which is similar to the name of the Ph.D. in Performance Studies. Council suggested other possible names: Analysis in Performance and Practice, Performance as Practice, and Performance as Research. Council agreed that if the name was not confusing to the Ph.D. in Performance Studies, it could remain as is.

Another Council member was interested in the relationship between the DE and social sciences. She thought that the DE would be appropriate for some sociology, history and political science Ph.D. students. The social sciences were under-represented in the affiliated Ph.D. programs and DE faculty. Professor de la Peña thought that the DE might grow in those areas.

Professor Joan Cadden made the motion to approve the DE in Studies in Performance and Practice. The motion was seconded. Regarding the new courses, Professor de la Peña reassured Council that the two core courses will be offered and that the electives have been assured by affiliated faculty. She added that Professor Hunter was very articulate about the mentoring of students regarding finding courses. Professor Watkins pointed out that if the DE is approved, that its bylaws need to be reviewed and approved as well. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will notify the proposer and the Dean in writing. [The bylaws were submitted with the proposal and have been transmitted to the Bylaws Committee. The DE has declined to change its name.]

International Commercial Law – Request for degree title change from a Master of Arts (M.A.) to a Master of Laws (LL.M.)

Chair Waterhouse reported that the Graduate Group in International Commercial Law (ICL) offers a Master of Arts (M.A.) degree title and apparently the convention in the field now is to offer the Master of Laws (LL.M.) degree title. This request is similar to a request for a name change, for which there is a well described procedure, but this request is for a change in title of the degree, for which there are no procedures for review for approval. Because there is no change in course content, a full review of the program does not seem necessary. Professor Farrens made the motion to approve the proposal and the motion was seconded.

Dean Gibeling thought that the LL.M. was an appropriate and good change and supported it. His only reservation was that there is another graduate program that grants the same degree, the LL.M. and the name of that graduate program is simply “Master of Laws.” PRC Chair Mechling assumed that there would be no change in how this program will be reviewed in August. Dean Gibeling reported that the other Master of Laws program is reviewed and accredited by the American Bar Association and PRC takes the ABA review in lieu of the PRC review. In ICL’s proposal, they state that this program will be offered through Graduate Studies not through the School of Law. Presumably, it will not go through the ABA accreditation process and Graduate Council will continue to do the full review. Also, ICL is a self-supporting program so UC Davis Extension is definitely involved too. There were some questions and discussion of the LL.M. degree, which is an add-on to a JD. Dean Gibeling thought that the ICL program was taken mostly by lawyers from other countries. The other Master of Laws program is taken entirely by non-US residents. One Council member asked whether the ABA would review and accredit the ICL program and what the Summary meant where it stated, “A Master of Laws would also be consistent with the standards of the legal accrediting body, the American Bar Association and the international legal community.” Another member thought that the current M.A. degree title is creating confusion and problems and is hurting ICL’s international enrollments. If approved, Chair Waterhouse will forward the proposal to Dean Gibeling for transmittal to the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors and the Chancellor. Then Chair Waterhouse will transmit it to CCGA. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. [Dean Gibeling transmitted the proposal to the two lead deans, of the School of Law and UC Davis Extension, for their review and input prior to transmittal to CODVC.]

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Integrated Pest Management M.S. – Graduate Group request to suspend admissions Procedure for Requesting a Suspension of Admissions to a Graduate Group

Chair Waterhouse presented two items. One was a request on which Council will vote. The other item is more of a policy question. The Graduate Group in Integrated Pest Management has requested to suspend admissions because their enrollment numbers have collapsed. Most recently, they have admitted just two students. They do not have a tenable situation at this point. Chair Waterhouse has brought IPM’s request to Council to ask for endorsement of suspending admissions.

The other issue is that in these circumstances, where a program’s faculty is asking for suspension of admissions, approval should be nearly automatic. The Dean is suggesting a simplified procedure, which would not require the request coming to Council for approval. Dean Gibeling’s draft document describes this procedure. Chair Waterhouse asked Council to consider the concept today and planned to ask the Administrative Committee to review it and then he would bring it

back at Council's next meeting. Dean Gibeling described the procedure for voluntary suspension, which is not a suspension that has been imposed by Graduate Council in relation to the graduate program review process. The procedure is for when a program makes a request. Dean Gibeling went through the document. Key points included how the group was consulted, how the program will provide the academic program for the continuing students, how long the suspension is expected to last, and who is going to be in charge while admissions are suspended. The idea is that the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Chair of Graduate Council would review the program's request. Dean Gibeling described what would occur during the admissions season. If admissions were closed for five years, the program would be asked to justify the continued suspension versus closing the program all together. With appropriate justification, they could receive another five years of suspended admissions. After ten years, the Council would assume that the program was not viable and close it automatically unless the program still had students, in which case the program would be closed after the last student completed the degree. The approval process for new graduate programs is long and cumbersome but a program should probably have to go through a new approval process at some point if it has been ten years since it has admitted new students. The Dean answered a Council member's questions regarding taking the programs off the Web site. One Council member thought that the actual vote of the program faculty members should be reported. There might be cases where the faculty is very divided and the Dean and Chair might want to consult with the faculty. Chair Waterhouse thought that was a good point to add to the procedure. The procedure will be brought back to Council's next meeting.

Chair Waterhouse returned to the IPM request. A Council member thought that Council needed to know that the membership had been notified and they have all decided that they want to suspend admissions. Another member pointed out that the document refers to a meeting. Another Council member thought there were some other issues that needed to be addressed; there may be a larger issue about how the field currently is defined. When a sustainable agriculture initiative develops within CA&ES, it may re-create a reason for this graduate group. A Council member suggested that the faculty may need some assistance in envisioning how to attract students. Dean Gibeling suggested that Associate Dean Caswell-Chen might volunteer to work with the graduate group and also with Director Hector Cuevas, who is in charge of outreach, recruitment and retention, to see if IPM is using effective recruitment methods. Another person suggested that the curriculum may no longer meet current needs. Council discussed the efforts made by the faculty thus far.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to approve the IPM proposal to suspend admissions and ask Associate Dean Caswell-Chen to speak with Professor Ferris regarding recruitment strategies that may be more effective as they work towards rebuilding the IPM enrollments and program.

Council amended the motion to say Council approved the request to suspend admissions of the Integrated Pest Management graduate program pending receipt of report of a vote of the membership, confirming that a majority of the members have approved suspending admissions and requested that Associate Dean Caswell-Chen work with the program to explore options for recruiting students and re-opening admissions." The vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will request the report from IPM and notify the Dean for his action.

CCGA Items – Copyright Issue and Independent Course Responsibility

Copyright Issue

Professor Upadhyaya presented two issues from CCGA's last meeting on February 7, 2006. The copyright issue is from the Academic Council, which appointed a Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) that prepared a 30-40 page report, including 5 white papers and one

policy document. The committee has recommended a change to the UC copyright policy. CCGA considered it and some representatives were concerned that this policy statement may not be acceptable to a certain group or certain disciplines.

The issue is that faculty will not be allowed to give all their rights to the publisher under the new policy. The policy states, "...In the event a faculty member assigns all or part of the member's copyrights to a publisher as a part of the publication agreement, the faculty member must retain the right to grant this license to the Regents." The Regents would have the final right and the publications and monographs could be put into a repository so anyone could have access to that material.

The SCSC's white papers dealt with several issues, including:

- (1) publications and their role in academic personnel processes,
- (2) journal publishing – the general permission aspects; the policy requires faculty to provide only exclusive rights for first commercialization if possible when s/he signs copyright papers,
- (3) the development of scholarly books such as monographs; there is a feeling that less and less emphasis is being placed on this important aspect of scholarly activity,
- (4) the other white paper relates to scholarly societies and scholarly communication; transactions of the associations and societies are costing more and more because they are trying to cover their other costs.

Taking all of this into account, UC would like to pursue an alternate method of publishing these materials – putting them in a repository, and making them available to anyone, anywhere for no cost. CCGA wanted to know what faculty from different campuses thought about this.

Dean Gibeling asked whether the policy affected students and postdoctoral scholars and other people on campus who publish. He asked about co-authored papers with faculty as well as single authored papers by student or postdocs.

Council's primary concern was that faculty have little choice regarding signing copyright forms if they want their papers published, which of course they do, whether they are seeking tenure or already are tenured. One member asked why this issue was not being negotiated between UC and the publishers; individual faculty members have no power in their relationship with publishers. Hiring a lawyer to rewrite copyright agreements is not an option because of the time involved.

Professor Upadhyaya reported that during UC negotiations with publishers of scholarly work in 2004, it became clear to UC faculty that the current models of scholarly communication have become unsustainable. The budget cuts and high costs of journals were affecting the libraries' ability to purchase journals. Dean Gibeling said faculty think they are getting the benefit because their papers are being published; the publication of books may be different. A faculty member reported that the journals her professional society publishes are not making money; one is breaking even and the other is losing money.

Professor Upadhyaya will take Council's comments back to CCGA. He reported that they want to go to new methods of publication, which would be electronic with peer review, so publication costs are low. Associate Dean Sharman O'Neill invited all of Council to attend an RCR (Responsible Conduct of Research) session on March 9th for graduate students on copyright issues and research questions and answers, offered by the attorney who specializes in copyright in technology rights for UC. A Council member reiterated the point that if the university or an

association of universities would like to address this structural problem, they might have some leverage but doing it one on one is not going to work. Another Council member reported that some of the special societies to which he belongs are solving a piece of this. Part of the membership fee pays for electronic access to a very large number of journals. Once the small membership fee is paid to the society, there is essentially free access to these journals. The Council expressed the opinion that the words “must retain” in the following policy should be replaced by “is encouraged or urged to retain” as indicate below.

“A faculty member’s ownership of copyright is controlled by the University of California Policy on Ownership of Copyright [<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/copyright>]. University of California faculty shall routinely grant to The Regents of University of California a limited, irrevocable, perpetual, worldwide, non-exclusive license to place the faculty member’s scholarly work in a non-commercial open-access online repository. In the event a faculty member assigns all or part of the member’s copyrights to a publisher as a part of a publication agreement, the faculty member ~~must~~ is encouraged or urged to retain the right to grant this license to the Regents.”

The proposal allows for faculty to opt out of this agreement for any specific work, or invoke a specific delay before such work appears in an open-access repository.

Independent Courses Responsibility for TAs, Teaching Fellows and PGRs

Professor Upadhyaya presented the second CCGA item for which he sought Council’s comments. He presented the background to the policy. In 2002 the UC President asked a UCB faculty member to report on issues of academic freedom and responsibility for a course taught by a graduate student instructor (GSI), a course to instruct undergraduates in basic skills of reading and writing. UCB had 60 sections of the course, each of them a small section taught by a GSI. The particular section of the course was titled “The Politics and Poetics of Palestinian Resistance” and the original description was especially harsh. Because there was an outcry over the course, the English Department appointed a senior faculty member to observe this class to make sure that the students’ academic freedom was not violated.

While this issue was resolved satisfactorily, CCGA was approached to look at the policies and regulations that clarify who is finally responsible for a course. The final analysis was that the faculty member in charge is responsible for the course and not the GSI.

Professor Upadhyay pointed out the statement in the proposed policy: “The TA is responsible only for conducting regular classes with a recitation, laboratory or quiz section under the active direction and supervision of the university appointee with a faculty title as in APM 110-4 (14) to whom the responsibility of the course’s instructions including the performance of the TA has been assigned.” This places the responsibility of developing the course and the way it is delivered in the hands of the faculty because they are the ones who have to abide by the faculty code of conduct.

Dean Gibeling pointed out the deletions of phrases that have been made to the policy in this revised version. He thought that UC needed to be very careful how this policy is worded, as UC enters into negotiations with the UAW for the next contract. The union is always arguing to get more responsibility for TAs, in a way that is inconsistent with the academic responsibility of the faculty. For example, taking the phrase “for the selection of student assignments” out of the existing policy could potentially be dangerous and start to erode the authority of faculty. The second line of the old version says, “The teaching assistant is not responsible for selection of

student assignments.” Now in some cases TAs may have some responsibility but it has been granted by the supervising faculty. Dean Gibeling thought that UC should have that in the policy, that students do not have that authority unless the supervising faculty has given them that authority individually in a class. He was not in favor of removing that phrase. Professor Upadhyaya said that he would bring this up at CCGA’s next meeting.

Council also discussed what is meant by TAs being responsible only for conducting “regular” classes. Normally, that is not the case. Council members thought that TAs were allowed to teach a discussion section of a regular class.

The items below were not discussed due to lack of time.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Academic Federation Response to Academic Senate Report on Shared Governance

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Graduate Council and Subcommittee Membership Lists.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

OGS – lsw