

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA**

Friday, March 17, 2006

10:00 – 12:00 noon

912 Sproul Hall

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
Spring Quarter Calendar Grid (Please return.)	7.0
 <u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u>	
Academic Planning and Development (Baumgarth)	
Administrative (Waterhouse)	
Bylaws (Watkins)	
Courses (Kuhl)	
Educational Policy (de la Peña)	
Program Review (Mechling)	
Support and Welfare (Farrens)	
 <u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	
Announcements from the Chair (Waterhouse)	
Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)	
Announcements from the Associate Dean (Caswell-Chen/O'Neill)	
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Upadhyaya)	
Graduate Student Association (Karpel)	
Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Sheets)	
Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Breslin)	
 <u>CONSENT ITEMS</u>	
Minutes from February 1, 2006 meeting – Draft	7.1
Minutes from February 22, 2006 meeting – Draft	7.2
Horticulture and Agronomy – Revised Bylaws (Watkins)	7.3
Immunology – Revised Bylaws (Watkins)	7.4
Psychology – Revised Bylaws (Watkins)	7.5
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology – Degree requirement changes (de la Peña)	7.6
Biomedical Engineering – Degree requirement changes (de la Peña)	7.7
Political Science – Degree requirement changes (de la Peña)	7.8
Civil and Environmental Engineering – Degree requirement changes (de la Peña)	7.13
 <u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
Procedure for Requesting a Suspension of Admissions to a Graduate Program, Revised (Gibeling)	7.9
Naming Opportunities for New Buildings – Letter from Chancellor (Waterhouse)	7.10
{Academic Council} Senatewide Review: Proposed Private Funding for Salaries (Waterhouse)	7.11
Dissertation and Thesis Committees – Proposed rewording of number of members (de la Peña)	7.12
 <u>DISCUSSION ITEM</u>	
Academic Federation Response to Academic Senate Report on Shared Governance (Waterhouse)	5.10
<i>Please bring Attachment 5.10 from the February 1, 2006 meeting.</i>	

Andrew Waterhouse, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Wednesday, March 17, 2006

PRESENT: *Members:* N. Baumgarth, J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, M. Farrens, J. Gibeling, T. Kuhl, W. Leal, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins, R. Wu
Representatives: C. Bates, J. Breslin, E. Caswell-Chen, C. Hom, J. Karpel, A. Sheets
Graduate Studies attendees: K. Garcia, C. Jurado, Y. Shi, L. Wilce

ABSENT: *Members:* A. Britt, S. Upadhyaya
Representatives: A. Kelleher, S. O'Neill

Chair Andrew Waterhouse requested everyone to return the spring calendar grids.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Development

APD Chair Nicole Baumgarth presented a summary of the committee's work thus far. In their first project, they are using a quantitative approach to examine faculty data from the graduate programs' membership lists to determine the connectivity between graduate programs. They also are looking at graduate program size by student numbers.

APD's second project is a qualitative analysis of the PRC report recommendations from each graduate program's most recent review. Of the 57 reports assessed so far, "core courses" is the top issue and NRT is the fifth. Each APD member will go back to his/her 19 programs and review the recommendations to find the specifics about the issue; for example, what exactly was the core courses problem. Professor Baumgarth reported that in her 20 programs, often there was no core curriculum or it was not taught every year. A large part of the courses challenge is also associated with vision and cohesiveness, which is related to the time that everybody has to invest in graduate education and is reflected in how many courses are taught, the faculty participation, and how much time they spend thinking about a cohesive vision. APD wants to determine the reasons for the challenges to offer recommendations for corrections.

Dean Jeffery Gibeling noted the importance of this project. He reported that in a recent conversation with the Provost, he mentioned that getting faculty to teach core courses each year for a coherent curriculum is a problem especially in graduate groups. Of course, such comments are based on anecdotal evidence. To have data to quantify and support these graduate education issues will be very helpful. He thought that it would be very important to know how program concerns are rated by graduate groups compared with departmentally-based graduate programs, especially on this issue of core courses. Some graduate groups do not have core courses, perhaps because of the difficulty of getting the faculty commitment to teach them.

Professor Baumgarth reported that APD has a database that they have created, which includes the distinction between graduate groups and departmentally-based programs so it is easy to separate and compare the data by graduate program structure. The other distinction that is easy to put out is the date of the last review, which could change the program concerns slightly. Those are two analyses that they want to do.

A Council member thought that it would be interesting to summarize some of these concerns and send them to the current program chairs and ask them for a ranking of the concerns for their program right now. This might provide more timely data. Professor Baumgarth reported that along the same lines, members of APD would like this list of program review concerns to be continually surveyed and updated. After the completion of each graduate program review, someone could quickly record the absence or presence of each of the weaknesses. Over time, Graduate Council and the Office of Graduate Studies could see which recommendations were made, any campus changes, whether trends were in the right direction, and whether Council saw fewer of any of these problems. The list and data could be used to monitor the quality of graduate educational overall.

A Council member praised the project and made some observations. The member suggested correlating some of the program review concerns with the size of the department or graduate group and thought that there might be a variety of different audiences for the data. For example, departments need to be reminded of the importance of cohesiveness and vision. They are already aware that they need more funding.

Another member asked where these findings might lead APD in their thinking about graduate education planning and development. Professor Baumgarth responded that APD has just done data gathering up to now. They are meeting again next week because they want to identify more of the details regarding the concerns and then come up with recommendations to improve graduate education to bring forward to and to discuss with Council at more length. The committee hopes to complete as thorough a data analysis as they can with the time they have left. Then they will select a few items that they can discuss in more depth and make some recommendations. Council can discuss these and decide how it wants to have this followed up next year.

Administrative

Chair Waterhouse reported that the Administrative Committee has been reviewing student appeals and program requests for exemption from the QE policy requirement that the QE committee include an external member. Another issue has come up recently: Student appeals of the Fail decision on their second QE attempt. After the fact, the students have obtained evaluation by a psychologist and made the claim of disability. This *ex post facto* claim is irrelevant and the committee cannot take that into account. Chair Waterhouse asked Council what should be done.

A Council member asked about the hypothetical case of a student who does not realize or is unwilling to admit he/she has a learning disability until experiencing a major failure. Chair Waterhouse thought that in order to be fair to everyone, a claim of disability would have to be made prior to the examination and that there cannot be retroactive reconsiderations of what has already been decided

Council members asked what information incoming graduate students receive about disability services on campus. A graduate student responded that the information is easy to find if you know you need it but it is not advertised; it is included in the Graduate Student Handbook. Dean Gibeling thought that telling advisers about it may not be effective because they may not be familiar with disabilities and it is the student's responsibility to seek accommodation by visiting the Student Disability Center. Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen suggested asking graduate programs to include SDC in their new student orientations regarding campus resources.

A Council member asked what kind of accommodation might be made for students beyond the length of the examination. Chair Waterhouse thought that was a very important question. Faculty have this fundamental expectation that part of the qualifying examination to be a Ph.D. researcher and scholar is that the student has to stand up in front of a group of people and answer questions on the spot. The exam could be structured in an entirely different way but Council should consider whether it thinks that is advisable and what kinds of accommodation should be made. The student needs to be able to defend his/her ideas.

A Council member pointed out that required accommodations for a student have to come from the campus Student Disability Center. The SDC letter specifies the kind of accommodation that the student needs, for example, a longer time on examinations.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen pointed out that the students that Chair Waterhouse mentions are students who have failed a second examination and did not raise the issue of disability until after the second examination. The students should have realized there was a problem for them with the exam format after the first exam. Because Council has concerns about this issue, Chair Waterhouse will place this topic on the April meeting agenda and as suggested by a member, invite someone from the Student Disability Center to come to the meeting.

Bylaws

Professor Evan Watkins reported there were several bylaws on the consent list and there will be more at the next meeting.

Courses

Professor Tonya Kuhl reported that her committee is reviewing many courses.

Educational Policy

Professor Carolyn de la Peña reported that EPC has four consent items on the agenda.

Program Review

Professor Jay Mechling reported that some of the program reviews have already had their on-site reviews and the committee is on course.

Support and Welfare

Professor Matthew Farrens reported that the applications for internal fellowships have been read and the reviews completed. Dean Gibeling added that the fellowship award offers have been mailed to the recipients.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements from the Chair

Chair Waterhouse announced that the issue of executive compensation continues to concern the Academic Senate, which has forwarded various statements. The Regents have announced a new plan to deal with executive compensation that did not take those comments into consideration.

In a meeting that he attended with the Chancellor and Provost, he heard about a simple and fair plan for next year to give every associate and full professor some sort of off scale compensation. The campus is so concerned with the failure of the pay scales to be competitive with peer institutions that the administrators are considering this approach. Dean Gibeling said the goal was for July 1, 2006. One concern is that the Office of the President and the Regents will say the campuses have solved the problem and therefore, they do not have to provide more money.

Chair Waterhouse pointed out another campus issue under much discussion is the Academic Senate's concern about the faculty hires related to the initiative process that were started this year. Council might be able to take advantage of this discussion. Because many of these hires are not originally planned to come from departments, there is much discussion of how to adjust the hiring process so that departments where this new faculty member will reside are heavily involved in the hiring process. The process has stalled somewhat. His hope was that Council could bring its graduate education FTE concerns to the Provost in the future in these initiatives. Future positions ought to have some reference to graduate education. How is the new faculty member going to support graduate education? APD's recent data analysis suggests that this is such a serious problem that there has to be linkage between new positions and graduate education.

Announcements from the Dean

In response to a question, Dean Gibeling reported that the Chancellor's Fall Conference is on graduate education. Chair Waterhouse, Vice Chair de la Peña, and he are on the committee developing the agenda for the fall conference. One of their expectations is that the APD Committee's report will be in place and can be presented at the fall conference and some of these ideas can form the basis for discussion.

Dean Gibeling reported that he and Associate Dean Caswell-Chen attended a meeting of the Western Association of Graduate Schools (WAGS), which is the association for deans and associate deans from universities in the west, and a number of interesting subjects were discussed. One was on joint, articulated, concurrent, blended graduate programs, and all the different things people are trying to do in novel and creative ways. There was no conclusion; no one has figured out how to define all the terms. What is a joint program? What is an articulated program? UCD is in the thick of it in the various things we do, especially with the GSM Master's/MBA concurrent programs that are currently under review by EPC. Another discussion topic was some of the graduate deans' concern about retirees who want to earn doctoral degrees and intergenerational issues in graduate education. Whether or not this is a serious issue, it raises some important questions about the role of the public university in terms of educating the population. Dean Gibeling also reported that Ms. Alison Sheets was on a WAGS panel to talk about student services and how campuses meet the needs of graduate students or what graduate students are looking for in terms of student services, and did an excellent job.

Announcements from the Associate Deans

Associate Dean Sharman O'Neill was absent.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen made a quick request of Council. At the systemwide Council of Graduate Deans (COGD), the deans are working on preparing an overview statement for UC as a whole, to make the case for graduate education and each campus is preparing a very short statement for graduate education on that campus and some of the benefits that accrue. Those benefits can be interpreted broadly. He invited everyone who has success stories or thoughts that specifically exemplify the wonders of graduate education at Davis and how they benefit the people of the state, the nation, and the world, to write a paragraph and send it to him.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

Professor Shrinivasa Upadhyaya was absent. Professor Reen Wu reported that CCGA is still struggling with the issue of independent course responsibility, which is a major concern. Chair Waterhouse distributed Professor Upadhyaya's update on the **Copyright Issue** and **Independent Course Responsibility**.

Graduate Student Association

Mr. Jonathan Karpel had no announcements.

Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor

Ms. Sheets had no announcements.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association

Dr. Jerry Breslin announced that PSA has a redesigned Web site, thanks in large part to Graduate Studies' help. The URL is still postdocs.ucdavis.edu. He also reported that the UAW came onto campus and were going into labs and signing up postdocs. He met with the Employee Labor Relations who clarified access policy to the UAW. Dean Gibeling reported that a communication went out to all the postdocs about what a union is and what it can do and what it will possibly do for them, without offering suggestions about whether the postdocs should or should not decide to join a union. There should be a similar communication going to department chairs about one of the key concerns – UAW access. Unions cannot just enter and interrupt people in their workplaces. For example, there are rules to follow related to safety. The campus is trying to get that information out so people are clear about what can and cannot be done.

CONSENT ITEMS

Two items were moved from the consent list to the action list.

- Political Science degree requirement changes
- Civil and Environmental Engineering degree requirement changes

Professor de la Peña requested to be allowed to present her action item now because Council's decision will affect two consent items, the degree requirement changes for Biomedical Engineering and Civil & Environmental Engineering. Chair Waterhouse agreed.

ACTION ITEM:

Dissertation and Thesis Committees – Proposed rewording of number of members

Professor de la Peña reported that EPC is receiving a number of program requests for changes to their degree requirements that include changes to the Dissertation Plan B because the recently modified Plan B offers flexibility regarding the final oral examination, which may or may not be required by the individual dissertation committee, but also allows the graduate program as a whole to require an exit seminar of each of its Ph.D. students in its degree requirements.

However, as stated in the Academic Senate regulations, Plan B currently says there are to be “three” members of that dissertation committee. As stated, there is no flexibility in that number “three.” EPC is receiving proposals for revisions that say “at least three” or “three or more” members. EPC has discussed this wording and agreed that it makes sense to them. The students are still aware that they do not have to have more than three members. Plan A requires “five” members so there is a reason Plan B says “three members” but programs are finding that for their own purposes, it is helpful for students to have a choice if they want to have three or more. EPC cannot find a logical reason why that should be prohibited, except the language in the Senate regulations prohibits it. So in order for some of these consent items to be approved today, Council needs to approve a proposed change to the Academic Senate regulations and forward the request for further review and approval. Professor de la Peña added that none of the programs brought the number of members up as an issue but EPC noticed it as they reviewed the other revisions submitted. So the action item is a request to change the language throughout the regulations to say “a minimum of” three or five members. Council discussed why programs might want more than the minimum number of members on a dissertation or thesis committee.

Dean Gibeling indicated that the Office of Graduate Studies' practice is to assume that the number stated in the regulations is a minimum number of members and to allow additional members; the form even has lines for additional members of the committee and frequently students do want to have additional members. It is a way to be inclusive but he agreed with one person's opinion that there is a point of diminishing returns. If more faculty members must sign the dissertation and all of the members have to agree to sign, it is a bigger challenge for five than three members to agree. Another Council member pointed out the challenges of scheduling meetings with more faculty members.

Professor Walter Leal made the motion to approve the wording changes noted in the document. The motion was seconded. The vote was 9 in favor, two opposed, and no abstentions. The motion was carried. Chair Waterhouse will write Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons and forward the proposed revisions for consideration for approval.

CONSENT ITEMS

The items below were left on the consent list and therefore, approved as presented. The minutes will be posted on the Web and Chair Waterhouse will notify the graduate program chairs that their requests have been approved.

- **Minutes from February 1, 2006 meeting – Draft**
- **Minutes from February 22, 2006 meeting – Draft**
- **Horticulture and Agronomy – Revised Bylaws**
- **Immunology – Revised Bylaws**
- **Psychology – Revised Bylaws**
- **Biochemistry and Molecular Biology – Degree requirement changes**
- **Biomedical Engineering – Degree requirement changes**

ACTION ITEMS

Political Science – Degree requirement changes

Dean Gibeling requested that this item be moved to the action list. He had both specific and more general comments. His experience has been that students in Political Science are challenged to navigate and understand their degree requirements more so than students in most other programs. He thought that the degree requirements could be organized much more clearly. He reported that he and Director Cathy Jurado have met with Political Science students over the years regarding problems that have arisen out of their misunderstanding of the degree requirements. He added that those problems have not been resolved by this document. The Dean noted that Political Science also leaves in the Designated Emphasis in Economy, Justice and Society as an example of a DE but this DE no longer exists so it is not a good example. Perhaps the requirements should just retain the generic DE information instead of citing specific DEs. He would argue for greater clarity.

Dean Gibeling raised one specific point in the summary of the changes to the program. Under Doctor of Philosophy degree, the new rule states, "Students whose major field is Political Theory must take the equivalent of one year of foreign language potentially relevant to dissertation research." In the History program review, a subset of history students was required to take a foreign language and Council decided that it was not appropriate to have the requirement only for a subset of students. The requirement either had to be for all or none of the students even though the program might have academic reasons why it might want to impose the language requirement on one set but not another. The Dean wanted to ensure that Council thought clearly about whether it had a different philosophy regarding Political Science than History.

Professor de la Peña reminded everyone that EPC and PRC are moving toward a system where they will work together during a program's review whereby EPC in conversation with PRC will be looking at the program's degree requirements and for just those sorts of issues – clarity. Currently, EPC is reviewing the specific request in light of the degree requirements to determine the effect of the changes on the rest of the degree requirements but are not trying to do a complete review of the entire document. However, Professor de la Peña thought that Dean Gibeling's concern about clarity is very important in demonstrating exactly why EPC needs to consider the program's degree requirements in the broadest sense. Professor Baumgarth reported that APD has found that the PRC report recommendations identified the access to information regarding degree requirements as a big and recurring problem in many programs.

Professor de la Peña was interested in how Council felt regarding the Political Science language issue. Political Science is suggesting that their political theory students need a different skill set for the research they plan to pursue compared with the rest of their students. The theory students want and need the language and are asking for increased flexibility so that they have the time for that. Political Science's solution is to not require the students to take the last of the three methodology courses or the game theory course. The issue of whether some students in a degree program have a language requirement and some who do not is an important one. For the purposes of Political Science, EPC thought that this solution seemed to make sense. Council discussed the reasons for requiring the language requirement for all History students. A Council member thought that the methodology/game theory courses allowed equity between the non-language and language students. Another member suggested having core courses and electives and a total number of units, whereby, the language could fall in the electives. Another member described the same format where different emphases within programs have different course requirements but there is equality of total units required across the program. Professor de la Peña explained that Political Science tries to make its two tracks equitable and that the students also have electives units.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to approve the Political Science degree requirement changes. The motion was seconded. Council continued its discussion of equity of units between the two tracks and the language requirement for the theory students and whether theory students could test out of taking any language courses. Because Political Science's most recent review was completed recently, Dean Gibeling thought that their degree requirements needed to be clarified before the next program review. In the interest of allowing EPC's review to be completed, Dean Gibeling agreed to write to the Graduate Council, expressing his concerns about the program and asking for a review of the program degree requirements as a special case. Council discussed when degree requirements should be thoroughly reviewed, whether when a request for a change is submitted or on a regular cycle tied to the program review cycle. Council does not wish to discourage programs from submitting changes for review. Chair Waterhouse thought the Dean's solution in this case was proper. The Dean has observed this serious difficulty with students getting through this program and he is willing to trigger a degree requirement review outside of EPC's normal course of business.

Professor de la Peña revised her motion to approve the degree requirements as revised by Political Science, with an addition to the stated wording that would make clear that political theory students who pass the language requirement by examination would be required to take two additional courses in consultation with an area adviser. Council continued to discuss equity issues between tracks within the same program, the two additional courses for political theory students and whether they should be language courses, and whether to require the program to specify the minimum number of units required of the Ph.D. students. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen and

Professor de la Peña agreed to work on these degree requirements together in the future. The motion was seconded. Two Council members requested further clarification of the motion and whether the theory students would be allowed to take fewer units than the rest of the Political Science students. The Chair tabled the motion with Professor de la Peña's agreement and the Political Science degree requirements were carried over to the next meeting. Professor de la Peña will speak with the graduate program chair to clarify whether the number of units for the two tracks is the same.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Academic Federation Response to Academic Senate Report on Shared Governance

Attachment 5.10 from the February 1, 2006 meeting

Chair Waterhouse presented some background to Dr. Catherine VandeVoort's November 29, 2005 letter, which was the Academic Federation's response to the Academic Senate Report on Shared Governance. The Chair introduced this letter by stating that in graduate education, there are quite a few Academic Federation members who participate as mentors of graduate students, as committee members on Qualifying Examinations, and on Graduate Council as non-voting representatives although they do participate effectively in Council's subcommittees as voting members. The question was whether Council should make any comments to the Academic Senate in support of this letter or make any other comments on the issue of how Academic Federation members carry their responsibility with regard to graduate education.

One Federation representative thought that the letter articulates very well the Academic Federation's concerns regarding the Academic Senate document on shared governance, *Mending the Wall*. The attached statistical information helps to clarify the very significant role that the Academic Federation plays in instruction at UC Davis. It is a question of deciding or talking about getting further illumination about the matter now, to decide whether Council would like to take a particular position on the Academic Federation's suggestions.

Chair Waterhouse thought that it was an issue of equity, from the point of view that there are Federation faculty who act in all other regards as Senate faculty because they are involved in instruction and examinations, but they are not allowed for instance to vote on issues that come before Council. The question is what Council wants to do.

A Federations representative added that the Academic Federation's concern is that *Mending the Wall* interprets the Standing Orders of the Regents in a way that is not appropriate, that overextends the definition of faculty to mean exclusively Academic Senate faculty. Then that gets played out in various ways. The Senate talks about whether non-voting Academic Federation members on committees is appropriate and so forth, but the real issue here is that there is concern that *Mending the Wall* tries to create a policy or a way of thinking that is not supported by the Regents' Standing Orders.

A Council member reported that some graduate programs depend heavily on its Academic Federation faculty. The APD would like to obtain more complete data on Academic Federation faculty participation in graduate programs so that they can make the point that this is a group of very important faculty members that need to be brought into every aspect of graduate education, including Graduate Council.

One member thought that Council should definitely offer some support of the principles that are articulated in this letter and report. It would be helpful to have the data that would show how important the Academic Federation faculty is for graduate education but Council could provide its

own anecdotal information to assert that they are important. This member proposed an oral draft or a statement for Council's consideration, which could be turned into a motion:

Whereas Federation faculty members do in fact participate in graduate education and in the oversight of graduate education, on this committee for example, therefore be it resolved that Graduate Council supports the idea that rather than a bipartite governance model, the Senate and the university support a model which incorporates the consultation, participation and authority of all faculty members.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to accept the proposed wording. Council discussed tabling the motion until its next meeting when it might have APD's data on AF faculty. Professor Watkins revised the motion to approve the wording of the statement and to send it forward when Council has the AF faculty data supporting it. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will write Dr. VandeVoort and copy the Academic Senate Chair.

Civil and Environmental Engineering – Degree requirement changes

Chair Waterhouse asked to move the CEE degree requirements from the consent to the action list. He had a concern under Changes, Dissertation Committee – Plan B. At the very bottom of the paragraph, there is a sentence "At the discretion of the committee, the student may be required to present an exit seminar." His concern was that the requirement could not be optional, that the program either must require all or none of its students to present an exit seminar. He suggested striking the last sentence. Council discussed its interpretation of the new wording that is in the regulation regarding the Dissertation Plan B: "Graduate program degree requirements may require an exit seminar of each student." The intent of the modified Plan B was not for individual committee chairs to decide whether to have a student satisfy this requirement. The program needs to decide and incorporate its decision in their degree requirements.

Professor Baumgarth made the motion to strike this sentence and for the program to decide whether to require the exit seminar of all the students or none of the students and for Council to approve the amended changes. Professor de la Peña will contact Professor Rob Chai, the CEE Chair. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen presented the possibility that the committee might require an exit seminar as part of the final oral exam, the format of which is at the discretion of the committee. Dean Gibeling pointed out the difference: students cannot fail an exit seminar but could fail a formal oral exam in defense of the dissertation. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen suggested that to be consistent with Plan B, CEE could use the sentence from the regulations that says, "After presentation of the dissertation, but before the final action has been taken on it, the candidate may, at the discretion of the committee, be required to defend it in a formal oral examination." The Dean agreed that was another possible solution.

Council discussed the wording of Plans A, B, and C. A member suggested revisiting Plans B and C. Dean Gibeling explained that Plan C was copied from Plan A but specifies three instead of five committee members. A member expressed the concern that Plan B is not fair to students because whether an oral defense of the dissertation is required is at the discretion of the committee chair.

Professor de la Peña thought there were two issues, CEE's degree requirements and the wording of Plans A, B, and C. The first could be decided today by asking CEE to change the language in their Plan B. Council continued its discussion of CEE's options and the dissertation Plans.

The motion to provisionally approve the degree requirements was seconded. Professor de la Peña clarified the motion. The CEE program has three choices and they have to make one. There are

three options: 1. Require that every student present an exit seminar, 2. Drop the exit seminar requirement altogether so that no students would be required to present an exit seminar, or 3. Change the wording to say that at the discretion of the committee, the student may be required to defend their dissertation in a formal oral examination. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Professor de la Peña will contact the Professor Chai.

ACTION ITEMS

Procedure for Requesting a Suspension of Admissions to a Graduate Program, Revised

Dean Gibeling's presented his draft procedure. He reminded Council that it came up very briefly at the end of the last meeting. Council had considered the request by the graduate program in Integrated Pest Management to suspend their admissions. In order to have a procedure to follow for such cases in the future, the Dean drafted this procedure. He would call this a UC Davis Graduate Studies Procedure, not a policy, and he called it Graduate Studies rather than Graduate Council because under this procedure, the request comes to the Dean and there is consultation with the Council. So the idea is simply that if a program wants to suspend admissions, they send a request to the Dean, who consults with the Chair of Graduate Council. If they agree that there is nothing controversial in the request, the Dean suspends admissions. The Office of Graduate Studies will deal with students who are in the admissions cycle. Applicants will be refunded their money or allowed to transfer their application to another program. If the Dean and Chair do not agree, the request would go to Graduate Council for review and recommendation for the appropriate action. Also, the procedure says that the request to re-open admissions must be received by January 1, in order to get into the usual admission process for the coming fall term, but if there are any modifications to program degree requirements, those have to come to Graduate Council, of course, before applications can be accepted. If there is a voluntary request to suspend admissions, it is for a maximum of five years. After that the program is asked to justify the continuing suspension. Assuming the Dean and Chair can determine who is in charge of the program and who the faculty members are, if their justification is acceptable, then the suspension can be extended for another five years for a total of 10 years. At 10 years, the assumption is the program is completely out of date and would be discontinued. If at five years, the program cannot justify why they should continue to exist with no students, then the program would be discontinued. Dean Gibeling reminded Council that when a program is discontinued, it is kept on the books formally until the last student graduates or withdraws. The Administrative Committee has reviewed and approved this draft procedure. Two corrections need to be made to the document, capitalizing Council and changing the word policy to procedure in the header.

In response to a question about notifying CCGA, Dean Gibeling explained that if he suspends admissions to a program, Council does not notify CCGA. However, if the program is discontinued, CCGA is informed. That is part of the standard discontinuation process. The Dean thought that this answers the CCGA concern that campuses have programs on the books that appear to exist forever. This procedure says they may continue to exist for five or maybe ten years, and then they will be taken off the books. In response to another question, the Dean noted that if there are no students in the program, the program administrative support falls to zero.

Professor Hans Mueller made the motion to endorse this Graduate Studies procedure. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous.

Naming Opportunities for New Buildings – Letter from Chancellor

Chair Waterhouse presented the Chancellor's letter. Council discussed how names for new buildings might be selected. Council agreed that recognition of contributions to graduate education

deserved recognition too. Chair Waterhouse requested that Council send him any suggestions of specific faculty members whose names might be forwarded to the Chancellor. [Chair Waterhouse received one nomination for Sean Duffey, an Entomology professor who was involved in graduate education and who served on Graduate Council and chaired PRC. The Chair forwarded his name to the Chancellor.]

{Academic Council} Senatwide Review: Proposed Private Funding for Salaries

Chair Waterhouse presented the request from the UC Academic Council to review some proposed principles of how salaries for senior leadership should be paid. The proposal says that the university should not be doing fund raising to find sources to support executive salaries. A Council member pointed out that these executives do not contribute to the university's core mission of teaching, research and service. Chair Waterhouse said the concern was that if such gifts were accepted, it would compromise the integrity and independence of the university. Professor de la Peña made the motion to send the Academic Senate Chair a memo stating Council supports these principles. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will write Academic Senate Chair Simmons.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

OGS – lsw