

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
AGENDA  
Friday, April 21, 2006  
10:00 – 12:00 noon  
912 Sproul Hall**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>ATTACHMENT</b>
<b><u>DISCUSSION ITEM</u></b>	
<b>Exam Accommodations in Context – Appropriate accommodations for student disabilities in a Qualifying Examination</b> (Guest Joseph C. Silva at 10:00 a.m.)	8.0
<b><u>ACTION ITEMS</u></b>	
<b>Initiative Hiring – Request for Council’s comments</b> (Waterhouse)	8.1
<b>Environmental Policy and Management, Revised Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program – Council’s initial review</b> (Waterhouse)	8.2
<b>Textile Arts and Costume Design M.F.A. – Requests to re-open admissions, for a simple name change to “Design” and for degree requirement changes</b> (de la Peña)	8.3
<b>Graduate Program Self-Assessment – APD Committee recommendation</b> (Baumgarth)	8.4
<b>Political Science – Degree requirement changes</b> (de la Peña) <i>Attachment 7.8 from the 3/17/06 meeting.</i>	
<b><u>CONSENT ITEMS</u></b>	
<b>Minutes from March 17, 2006 meeting – Draft</b> <i>To be distributed.</i>	8.5
<b>Microbiology – Degree requirement changes</b> (de la Peña)	8.6
<b>Sociology – Degree requirement changes</b> (de la Peña)	8.7
<b>Cultural Studies – Revised Bylaws</b> <i>To be distributed.</i> (Watkins)	8.8
<b>DE in Studies in Performance and Practice – Bylaws</b> <i>To be distributed.</i> (Watkins)	8.9
<b>Biochemistry and Molecular Biology – Revised Bylaws</b> <i>To be distributed.</i> (Watkins)	8.10
<b><u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u></b>	
<b>Feedback on S/U Policy</b> (Gibeling)	8.11
<b>Master’s Thesis Definition</b> (Waterhouse)	8.12
<b>Designated Emphases – Affiliated with grant proposals</b> (Waterhouse)	
<b><u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u></b>	
Academic Planning and Development (Baumgarth)	
Administrative (Waterhouse)	
Bylaws (Watkins)	
Courses (Kuhl)	
Educational Policy (de la Peña)	
Program Review (Mechling)	
Support and Welfare (Farrens)	
<b><u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b>	
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)	

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**Friday, April 21, 2006**

**PRESENT:** *Members:* N. Baumgarth, A. Britt, J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, M. Farrens, J. Gibeling, T. Kuhl, W. Leal, H. Mueller, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins, R. Wu  
*Representatives:* C. Hom, J. Karpel, A. Kelleher, S. O'Neill, A. Sheets  
*Graduate Studies attendees:* K. Garcia, C. Jurado, Y. Shi, L. Wilce

**GUEST:** Joseph C. Silva

**ABSENT:** *Members:* J. Mechling  
*Representatives:* C. Bates, J. Breslin, E. Caswell-Chen

Chair Andrew Waterhouse announced that Professor Jay Mechling had received the UCD 2006 Prize for Undergraduate Teaching and Scholarly Achievement.

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

**Exam Accommodations in Context – Appropriate accommodations for student disabilities in a Qualifying Examination**

Chair Waterhouse introduced Dr. Joseph C. Silva, current Interim Director of the Student Disability Center (SDC) who was invited to speak to Council regarding appropriate examination accommodations for student disabilities. Dr. Silva began by presenting an overview of a very complex legal arena, some common language and concepts regarding disabilities, and what federal and state laws require of postsecondary educational institutions with regard to persons with disabilities. Basically, these institutions must not discriminate against otherwise qualified persons with a disability. The laws do not require special programs, special treatment, or having to admit persons who are not otherwise qualified into programs. However, UCD must ensure equality of access to all university programs and instruction. The laws apply to the policies and procedures, as well as to the actions of the university, which are examined from the perspective of whether they are equitable, deliberative, and consistent. Or conversely, are they arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory?

Dr. Silva presented several definitions of the term “disability.” The current term accepted by persons with disabilities is generally “disabled persons.” The legal definition of disability often does not match those commonly used by the public. For example, mobility impairment, mental disorders, and administrative definitions as in disabled veterans may not necessarily constitute a legal disability. The legal definition is a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities. The impairment may be apparent (someone in a wheelchair) or may not be apparent (someone with a learning disability or mental disorder). California law is more liberal: a disabled person is a person with a physical or mental impairment, the limitations of which make the achievement of a major life activity difficult. If the state law offers a greater level of protection, it prevails over federal law.

Regarding implementation, when students request a disability-based accommodation, or disclose a condition that they believe constitutes a disability, they have triggered an institutional responsibility. If they approach a faculty member or a group such as this committee, the first part of that responsibility is to engage in the interactive process. All a faculty member or group has to do to discharge its responsibility is to refer the student to SDC. The faculty member is legally constrained from asking the student about the nature of the disability. Dr. Silva recommended that faculty document their referral

of students to SDC in writing. There is a separate unit for faculty and staff; it is Disability Management Services in Human Resources.

The interactive process is where the SDC begins to work with that individual by determining whether he/she are in fact eligible for protection under the ADA and state law and whether there is a reasonable accommodation that can be made for the limitations of the disability. The SDC is bound by confidentiality. It determines whether the person is eligible for a disability-based accommodation and if so whether there is a reasonable accommodation that can be made. To achieve equality of access may require physical alterations, policy changes, and/or accommodations, and a subset of those are academic accommodations, which have certain characteristics. Academic accommodations are proactive, they are requested ahead of time, they are put in place ahead of time, and they are not retroactive. Accommodations by definition are proactive. They are reasonable and do not result in a fundamental alteration of the course, the program, or the exam. Also, they must be effective; they have to be keyed to the documented limitations of the disability. Sometimes the SDC makes academic accommodations in consultation if they are uncertain what the course or examination requirements are.

The end point of this process which began with a student disclosing the disability to SDC, with SDC engaging the interactive process, with SDC requesting and receiving documentation, with SDC analyzing the documentation for eligibility and with making a determination of reasonable accommodation, is SDC putting the accommodation in the form of a letter that the student delivers to the faculty member. An example of an academic accommodation is a letter stating that the student requires 50% more time for an examination.

Dr. Silva described another area confused with disability and disability-based accommodation. Those are special circumstances that are after the fact requests for accommodation. Those instances are difficult and complex and each situation has to be dealt with on a case by case basis. The student might be in process at SDC. Although faculty members are not under legal mandate to accommodate the student's disability, they might be willing to be flexible to the same extent that they accommodate similarly situated students. This depends on the faculty's determination regarding what is the right thing to do. As an institution, faculty members allow students flexibility routinely under special circumstances, such as when there is a death in the family, a medical condition, an illness, or a hospitalization.

Council members raised several questions regarding situations where students might not be aware that they had a disability. One member's example was students from outside the country, without medical documentation or ways of talking about disabilities, who do not do well on the Qualifying Examination. What claim, legal, moral, ethical, political, or social do they have at the level of an appeal? She said there is the right of appeal to repeat the examination. Dr. Silva said there are socioeconomic realities why some people come with documentations and others do not. Those who do not have documentation fall into the area of special consideration of mitigating circumstances. Another member asked about a student who might not have been aware of having a learning disability and how far back the accommodation should be allowed. Dr. Silva responded that faculty members only have to accommodate known disabilities, from the point that the disability was documented by SDC.

Graduate Council agreed that it would be best for students to be aware of SDC and its services before or as soon as they arrive on campus. Dr. Silva said all the information was on SDC's Web site and students could be referred to that. One member recommended sending a statement to the graduate program staff and chairs to remember to include SDC in their fall orientations and the SDC information should be included in all the graduate programs' student handbooks.

Chair Waterhouse thanked Dr. Silva for his presentation. The Chair concluded the discussion by saying that the SDC will need to receive information from Council on the critical aspects of the QE, the essential points of the Qualifying Examination that cannot be accommodated, because it is their responsibility to decide what accommodations are appropriate. [Chair Waterhouse drafted a statement that described the essential features of the QE, which was reviewed and revised by the Chair's Advisory Committee and Administrative Committee.]

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **Initiative Hiring – Request for Council's comments**

Chair Waterhouse described the proposed process for faculty hires driven by initiatives. The Academic Senate is very concerned with the process. Individual faculty hired must have the support of the department in which they are housed in order for them to be successful in the future. So any department that might house the individual is involved in the hiring process. Chair Waterhouse pointed out that graduate education does not appear to have a direct impact on this process. It is not apparent how Council could interject any graduate education aspect in this specific hiring process because the process is departmentally based and whether a faculty member who is being hired has a role in graduate education has to be decided before that point.

Dean Jeffery Gibeling agreed that some consideration for graduate education needs to be interjected when the faculty FTE allocation is initially made, in appointing the recruitment committee and developing the search plan. If these are really interdisciplinary hires, the faculty members are likely to be involved in some graduate group. He suggested that graduate group consultation might be included in the process in a way that is parallel with departmental consultation.

Chair Waterhouse will write Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons that Council suggested that the initiative FTE hiring process itself incorporate consideration of graduate education at the beginning in appointing the recruitment committee and developing the search plan.

### **Environmental Policy and Management, Revised Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program – Council's initial review**

Chair Waterhouse presented the background to this revised proposal for a graduate group and M.S. degree program in Environmental Policy and Management (EPM). The initial proposal came to Graduate Council last spring after being reviewed by the APD committee, which recommended Council's approval. The Council Chair's July 7, 2005 letter to the proposers outlined some specific issues that were raised and needed to be addressed in order for Council to approve this program. The proposers have submitted a revised proposal and a letter responding to Council's points. One critical issue was that the program needed additional FTE. EPM has a very heavy teaching load and the proposers thought that four new FTEs would be allocated to it, based on a letter from the Provost to the Vice Chancellor of Research. The Provost has recently clarified her commitment of FTE to the program. Chair Waterhouse indicated that Council's task today was to review the responses from both the Provost and the program proposers to determine whether the issues that were raised in last year's review have been adequately addressed.

One member pointed out that one of Council's concerns last year was whether UCD should offer non-research master's degree programs. That member thought that the revised proposal addresses that point sufficiently by making the case that this program takes the campus' expertise and transforms it into policy work that is very important to the land grant mission of the institution. She thought that the research point has been addressed.

Another member presented the four areas of concern from last year. The first was the needed FTE that the Provost has addressed. Another area was the program's administrative home and lead dean that has

been identified in the John Muir Institute of the Environment (JMIE). A third area was overlap and duplication with other programs on campus that is answered by the support from the relevant other units that might overlap with EPM. The remaining area of concern was that the proposers have explained how environmental policy is an appropriate area of graduate education at UCD. Therefore, all the concerns have been addressed.

Dean Gibeling pointed out that the identification of a lead dean for EPM has not yet been addressed. The initial proposal suggested that he might be the lead dean and the revised proposal recommends JMIE, whose director is also an Associate Vice Chancellor for Research. The lead dean must be the academic dean of a college or school. For example, Transportation Technology and Policy, which also is aligned with an ORU, the Institute of Transportation Studies, has the engineering dean as its lead dean. A Council member pointed out that most of the faculty members in the proposed graduate group are in engineering. Chair Waterhouse and Dean Gibeling thought that Council's preliminary approval of the EPM proposal could be contingent on the proposers identifying an academic dean who agrees to be EPM's lead dean.

Graduate Council discussed the FTE search process for EPM in light of the previous agenda item, the initiative faculty FTE hiring process. Council thought that EPM was a case where the search for FTE clearly must be for the benefit of a graduate group. Two suggestions to ensure that this takes place were to have the lead dean involved in the process and the search committee members appointed entirely from the graduate group faculty itself. This is an example of how FTE allocation could be linked with graduate education. The Provost has made a commitment to work with the relevant parties to ensure that linkage is enforced. Chair Waterhouse thought that it would be necessary to have an MOU between the graduate group, perhaps the JMIE and the department where the FTE is housed; the MOU might state that the department will provide X amount of teaching in a particular area. Probably the most specific agreement would be for the department to allocate a certain amount of teaching time in a particular area for the graduate program.

A Council member suggested that if the search process were placed in the hands of the people who are centrally and productively concerned with and committed to that interdisciplinary project and the field were narrowed down, this hiring opportunity would be an incentive to departments to obtain an additional faculty member. It would mean that the essence of the search process had been defined and controlled by the interdisciplinary goals. Another member thought that the lead dean responsible for the graduate group should be part of the hiring process by ensuring the participation of the graduate group members on the search even though the hires have to be by departments. Council agreed to request a record of the agreement of how these four FTEs for EPM will be allocated. A copy of the MOU that accompanies the FTE hires would be kept as part of the record for the program's initial and future reviews to ensure that the promised teaching was continued.

Professor de la Peña made the motion for Council to give its preliminary approval to the EPM proposal, contingent on identification of a lead dean, and for inclusion of Council's ideas regarding the four FTE to be hired in a letter to, or copied to, the Provost. The motion was seconded. Twelve members voted in favor of the motion, no one was opposed, and one member abstained. The motion was carried. Chair Waterhouse will write the proposers, requesting that they identify a lead academic dean for EPM. He also will forward the proposal to the Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget and the Library Committee for their review and advisory comments.

## **CONSENT ITEMS**

Two items were removed from the consent list:

- **Minutes from March 17, 2006 meeting – Draft**  
The minutes were pulled because they were not completed.
- **Sociology**  
Dean Gibeling requested that the Sociology degree requirements be moved to the action list.

The items below remained on the consent list and were approved as presented. Chair Waterhouse will notify the program chairs in writing.

- **Microbiology – Degree requirement changes**
- **Cultural Studies – Revised Bylaws**
- **DE in Studies in Performance and Practice – Bylaws**
- **Biochemistry and Molecular Biology – Revised Bylaws**

## **ACTION ITEMS (continued)**

### **Textile Arts and Costume Design M.F.A. – Requests to re-open admissions, for a simple name change to “Design” and for degree requirement changes**

EPC Chair de la Peña summarized the Textile Arts and Costume Design M.F.A.’s three requests and presented additional background information. In her letter Professor Pat Harrison, the graduate program chair, requested that admissions to the M.F.A. program be re-opened and explained that admissions were suspended because of specific problems which have now been addressed. The M.F.A. requested a simple name change from “Textile Arts and Costume Design” to “Design,” which fits the M.F.A.’s focus now. The M.F. A. program also requested Council’s approval to change its curriculum from a one-track to a three-track program that mirrors the undergraduate program. Professor Harrison detailed what happened before and how problems have been remedied. There were not enough faculty members to teach the M.F.A. program. Since the M.F.A.’s home Department of Environmental Design/Design Program has moved from CA&ES to HARCS, it has hired five new faculty members and have two searches still open to fill. Not only do they have plenty of faculty, but the members are all interested in, and committed to, working with graduate students. They are collaborative and friendly. Support and space issues also have been resolved and described.

Professor de la Peña described the EPC’s review. Two primary reviewers examined two versions of the documents and requested the clarifications listed in her letter to the program. EPC agreed that the proposed M.S. program in lighting and its relationship to the M.F.A. in Design can be examined when the M.S. proposal is submitted. EPC was concerned that the requirement of a publishable paper for two courses, DES 222 and DES 224, was too high an expectation for a one quarter class. The discrepancy in wording for Design 222 and 224 still needs to be corrected. Both courses require a paper, but the wording under DES 222 needs to be used for DES 224 too.

Other clarifications that EPC requested included allowing students to enroll in DES 290 more than once when the topic is different, including integration of outside courses in the curriculum, and providing advising sheets for the students’ second year, as well as first year. EPC decided not to require further clarification of assessment for four new or revised courses. The EPC recommends Council’s approval of all three requests. One Council member was concerned that because the M.F.A. does not require GREs that its students could not apply for fellowships. [After the meeting, the Director of the Student Financial Support unit of the Office of Graduate Studies reported that students in programs that do not require the GREs are still eligible to apply for fellowships.] Council briefly discussed the faculty and whether requiring 36 units per year was excessive for a research program.

Professor Evan Watkins reported that the Bylaws Committee has the program's revised bylaws and will review them.

Dean Gibeling asked whether courses DES 222 and 224 have been approved. These are the courses where the students have to attend an undergraduate course and write a paper on a topic but do not receive credit for the undergraduate course. He also asked whether 299D may be used for thesis, as well as dissertation, writing.

Professor Tonya Kuhl made the motion for Council's approval of the M.F.A.'s three requests as written. The motion was amended to approval subject to the approval of the courses. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. Chair Waterhouse will notify the program that the three requests have been approved with contingencies. The simple name change is contingent on receipt of a letter of support from the Dean of HARCS who is the program's lead dean. The recommendation to Dean Gibeling to re-open admissions will include the contingency of approval of the not-yet-approved Design courses. The degree requirements and curriculum change from a one-track to a three-track program are approved.

### **Graduate Program Self-Assessment – APD Committee recommendation**

APD Chair Nicole Baumgarth reported that her committee has examined the most recent PRC report recommendations for 77 graduate programs. They identified the top problems or weaknesses across the graduate programs. The reports are from 1998-2005. Because some of these reports are outdated, it is possible that weaknesses noted in the earlier reviews have disappeared and are no longer of concern to the programs. When APD presented these preliminary findings at Council's March meeting, one member suggested conducting a current survey of program weaknesses.

APD recommends conducting a very short survey of the graduate programs. Professor Baumgarth presented drafts of a letter and survey that APD would like Graduate Council to mail to the graduate program chairs. A Council member asked about APD's goal or expected outcome for the survey. Professor Baumgarth reported that APD has mostly completed the data analysis and would like to formulate some recommendations for the next steps. Because they have identified problems, they would like to work on solutions to the problems. They need a way to determine if the problems that they have found are still of concern to the graduate programs today. The additional data would validate what they have already done. The graduate programs talk about NRT or graduate courses being problems but now APD has actual data to confirm that these are problems across programs. The proposed survey data would strengthen their report.

One member thought that the survey was excellent and suggested that the survey might request programs to identify and rank their top five problems and encourage them to comment on these. Another Council member agreed that ranking the challenges to graduate education was important; otherwise, programs would just say "yes" to most of the top ten problems identified by APD.

In response to a comment, Professor Baumgarth reported that APD has identified differences between problems that departmentally-based programs and graduate groups have. Undergraduate teaching loads are a bigger problem for the departmentally-based programs; faculty recognition for participation in graduate education is more of a problem for graduate groups.

Council members suggested a few wording changes for clarity, to sound more positive, and to encourage participation in the survey. Another recommendation was to use the Academic Senate method for faculty voting, the two envelope ballot procedure which ensures confidentiality for the responders. An additional suggestion was to include a question or way to determine if the response was from a departmentally-based graduate program or a group. In response to a question, a graduate

student said there was a huge divide between programs that receive input from their students and those that do not and suggested adding or modifying a question to tap that.

Professor Kuhl made the motion to accept APD's proposal with Council's amendments. The motion was seconded. After a brief discussion to clarify an item in the survey, the vote in favor was unanimous. Professor Baumgarth will revise the letter and questionnaire. Committee Analyst Kathy Garcia volunteered to look into posting the questionnaire on line. [The letter and questionnaires were mailed to the program chairs on April 28, 2006.]

### **Political Science – Degree requirement changes, *Addendum.***

Professor de la Peña reminded everyone that at its March meeting, Council had a stimulating conversation about the Political Science degree requirement changes regarding what would happen when political theory students tested out of the language requirement. There was some concern that there might be inequity between the two tracks and that the political theory students might have fewer courses in the methodology sequence. Professor de la Peña reported that she talked with the new chair, Professor Jim Spriggs. In their conversation, they decided that removing the extra sentence regarding how the political theory students could fulfill their methodology requirement would remove the problem. The suggested wording change is in the addendum.

Professor de la Peña recommended that Council approved the Political Science degree requirement changes with the amended language. Professor Joan Cadden made the motion to approve the amended Political Science degree requirement changes. The vote was 11 in favor of the motion, none opposed, and one abstention due to being absent at the last meeting.

### **Sociology – Degree requirement changes**

Dean Gibeling pointed out Sociology's four grading options for the student's first attempt at the preliminary examination: High Pass, Pass, Low Pass or No Pass and the grading options for the second attempt at the preliminary examination: Pass or No Pass (Fail) where No Pass is equated to Fail. He reported that usually, the customary approach taken by the Office of Graduate Studies and Graduate Council is that a student can receive a Pass, a No Pass where he/she has another chance to take the examination, or a Fail which implies the student has failed and disqualification will be recommended to the Dean. Dean Gibeling thought it would be helpful for Sociology to adopt language like that in this scenario. It is unclear what Sociology means by No Pass, especially when it is later equated with Fail. Is it a soft way of saying Fail or does it mean something different? The Dean requested more clarity in the wording. Under D, students who receive a No Pass are eligible to take the exam a second time only. Then what happens if the student receives a No Pass again? It is really a Fail. Council discussed and recommended some wording changes to the degree requirements to clarify the grading options.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to accept Sociology's degree requirement changes, taking into consideration the Dean's suggestions for improving clarity. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Professor de la Peña will obtain Sociology's agreement to additional wording changes before Chair Waterhouse's letter of approval is mailed.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Feedback on S/U Policy**

The recently approved S/U policy was distributed to Council. Dean Gibeling reported that he and Chair Waterhouse have discussed the kinds of the feedback that he has received since he has been trying to invoke this policy. The letter included in today's agenda seemed particularly interesting and they agreed to bring it to Council to let everyone know what kind of feedback they have been receiving. The letter is from a student denied the opportunity to take a course S/U because it was not consistent

with Council's policy. The student has not advanced to candidacy yet and the course was in the student's major so the course was not approved to be taken S/U.

Chair Waterhouse said the key point is that it is a course that goes above and beyond the requirements of the degree program. Dean Gibeling added that the student does not have to take the course but wants to take it. The student's first point is that she will sit in on the course anyway and now there will be no record that she was there. The student argues that if she attends the course, nobody receives credit. It is not written down anywhere and that could be a disadvantage. Secondly, if not enough students sign up to take it, the course might be canceled. The third point is not as substantive. Because students sit in on courses all the time, why not give them credit? Because students do not want the grade, the policy discourages students from taking anything more than the minimum number of courses. Finally, having advanced students in courses raises the level of discourse, engagement and participation.

Dean Gibeling asked Council whether it wanted to change or rethink the S/U policy. One suggestion was to allow a student to take courses S/U if they are not on his/her individual Program of Study; this would be similar to allowing students to take courses S/U once they have advanced to candidacy. Council discussed how and by whom this change might be enforced; it would be the program's responsibility. One member recommended removing courses in the academic major from the disallowed S/U option courses. Chair Waterhouse suggested referring the S/U policy to the Administrative committee for discussion and perhaps a new proposal.

Due to lack of time, the remaining discussion items will be carried over to the next meeting

- **Master's Thesis Definition**
- **Designated Emphases – Affiliated with grant proposals**

### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Due to lack of time there were no subcommittee reports.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Due to lack of time, there was just one announcement.

#### **Announcements from the Dean**

Dean Gibeling was happy to announce that the Office of Graduate Studies has hired a Director of Development, Jan Kingsbury, who has been working in the College of Biological Sciences recently and will start her position for Graduate Studies on Monday.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon

OGS – lsw