

Revised – Action Item 9.\* was added and Items 9.4 and 9.12 were moved.

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
AGENDA  
Thursday, May 25, 2006  
10:00 – 12:00 noon  
3201 Hart Hall**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>ATTACHMENT</b>
<b><u>ACTION ITEMS</u></b>	
<b>Chemical Engineering – PRC Report</b> (Guest Wolfgang Kollmann)	9.1
<b>Cultural Studies – PRC Report</b> (Guest Naomi Janowitz)	9.2
<b>Viticulture and Enology – PRC Report</b> (Guest Kathryn McCarthy)	9.3
<b>History – Appeal of QE Exception Denial</b> (Waterhouse)	9.5
<b>CCGA – Recommendation of the Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee</b> (Upadhyaya)	9.*
<b>Teaching Opportunities for Postdoctoral Scholars</b> (Gibeling/Breslin) [carried over]	9.12
<b><u>CONSENT ITEMS</u></b>	
<b>Minutes from April 21, 2006 meeting – Draft</b>	9.6
<b>Biostatistics – Degree requirement changes</b> (de la Peña)	9.7
<b>Applied Science Engineering – Degree requirement changes</b> (de la Peña) [moved to action list and carried over]	9.8
<b>Clinical Research M.A.S. – Bylaws</b> (Watkins) <i>To be distributed.</i>	9.9
<b><u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u></b> [All discussion items were carried over.]	
<b>Essential Features of the Doctoral Qualifying Examination</b> (Waterhouse)	9.4
<b>APD Recommendations</b> (Baumgarth)	
<b>Survey and Database of Key Recurring Impediments to Graduate Education</b>	9.10
<b>Core Course Development and Self Review</b>	9.11
<b>Master’s Thesis Definition</b> (Waterhouse) <i>Please bring Attachment 8.12 from the meeting of April 21, 2006.</i>	
<b>Designated Emphases – Affiliated with grant proposals</b> (Waterhouse)	
<b>Adjunct faculty proposers</b> (Leal)	
<b><u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u></b> [There were no 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)	
<b><u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b> [There was just one announcement.]	
Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)	

Andrew Waterhouse, Chair

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**May 25, 2006**

**PRESENT:** *Members:* N. Baumgarth, J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, M. Farrens, J. Gibeling, T. Kuhl, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins  
*Representatives:* J. Breslin, E. Caswell-Chen, C. Hom, J. Karpel, A. Sheets  
*Graduate Studies attendees:* H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, L. Wilce

**GUESTS:** Naomi Janowitz, Wolfgang Kollmann, Kathryn McCarthy

**ABSENT:** *Members:* A. Britt, W. Leal, R. Wu  
*Representatives:* C. Bates, A. Kelleher, S. O'Neill,

Chair Andrew Waterhouse acknowledged Professor Jay Mechling's recent receipt of the UCD 2006 Prize for Undergraduate Teaching and Scholarly Achievement.

Chair Waterhouse reminded everyone of the need to avoid a conflict of interest in Council's review of PRC Reports. Members of programs under review were reminded to refrain from commenting on their program's review. They may be asked questions of fact about the program but may not be asked for their opinions.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Cultural Studies – PRC Report**

This is the graduate group's first review. PRC Chair Mechling, a member of the Graduate Group in Cultural Studies, pointed out that Professor Bob Smiley signed the PRC report on behalf of PRC. He introduced Professor Naomi Janowitz, the PRC liaison for the review, who presented the report and its recommendations. Professor Janowitz described Cultural Studies as a small "gem" program that is very innovative and forward-looking and that is recognized nationally and potentially internationally. Of foremost importance, it has provided a solution to a long-standing problem in HARCS, a lack of graduate programs in which its faculty could participate. HARCS recruits top ranked faculty to the university and then these faculty members have no graduate students.

Because Cultural Studies is a graduate group and not a departmentally-based graduate program, it is not well funded and is dependent on goodwill and resources from outside the group. It had a difficult period when there was a change of chairs but currently, it has a very strong chair and administrative faculty and staff person. The students are excellent. Professor Janowitz emphasized that the graduate group was at a crossroads and needed more support. She thought that Cultural Studies was an added-value program for Davis as a whole and deserved special recognition and support for its role and contributions to graduate education in the humanities.

Council thought that critical issues were raised in the Cultural Studies review, including the lack of sufficient financial support, staffing, and space. Council discussed these recommendations and agreed they were not limited to this graduate group. Graduate groups may need particular attention. Council discussed the Graduate Studies' administrative support and block grant allocation formulas and whether they ought to be revised.

Recommendations regarding funding the program and retaining core faculty were addressed to the Provost and the Deans of HArCS and Graduate Studies. The other recommendations were addressed to the Graduate Group's Chair and Executive Committee. These concerned issues involving the percentage of time for the staff person's position, MOUs with related departments, student advising, core courses, relations with the larger campus, strengthening the faculty structure, and improving student support.

Council thought that the funding and core faculty issues were critical in Cultural Studies. A member suggested that in its transmittal letter Council emphasize that Cultural Studies potentially creates a pool of faculty that are committed to graduate education that otherwise might not be in a graduate program or take graduate students. Dean Jeffery Gibeling noted that this is one of only two graduate groups in HArCS and stands in a unique place in that regard. It is singularly successful and represents a new approach to graduate education in the humanities that did not exist before it was established. Professor Nicole Baumgarth made the motion to approve the PRC report and emphasize these points in the letter. The motion was seconded. Six members voted in favor, none were opposed, and four members of the graduate group abstained. Chair Waterhouse will draft a transmittal letter for Council's review and approval at its next meeting. Chair Waterhouse thanked Professor Janowitz for her work on the review and for presenting the report.

Professor Carolyn de la Peña requested that a comment be included in the minutes. She requested Council to review its rules regarding members of the program under review speaking about the program. She was concerned that four of Council's members could not speak about this program review. They were the only Council members from the humanities and their perspectives were not heard. The point of Council's composition is that there are representatives from as many diverse disciplines across campus as possible. Either Council should not include so many members from one graduate group or there needs to be another solution. Dean Gibeling stated that it was important to note that the four members on Council from the humanities and parts of social sciences are all members of this graduate group. This confirms the importance of this graduate group to faculty in the humanities and social sciences.

### **Chemical Engineering – PRC Report**

PRC Chair Mechling introduced Professor Wolfgang Kollmann, the PRC liaison for the review of Chemical Engineering. Professor Kollmann presented the PRC Report and its recommendations. The Department of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science offers two graduate programs, one in each area. Chemical Engineering has addressed the major recommendations from its previous review. Professor Kollmann reported that the review committee had very positive impressions of the Chemical Engineering graduate program. The report presents the program's strengths. The program's has a clear vision of its future and continually evaluates new research directions. Its research areas are highly interdisciplinary and faculty members from outside the department participate in the graduate program. The program also conducts research in cooperation with government laboratories and industry. The faculty is of high quality, enthusiastic and motivated. Their research funding has increased from \$429,215 in 1991 to \$5,820,195 in 2004. Graduate teaching is at a high level and is challenging to the students and prepares them for research. Students show genuine interest in their research projects. All of the Chemical Engineering students are supported as GSRs. Ms. Archie Johnson, the graduate program staff was highly praised for her efficiency and responsiveness.

Two recommendations, 2.c regarding out of state tuition and 5 regarding facilities, are addressed to the Provost, the Dean of Graduate Studies or the Dean of the College of Engineering. The remaining recommendations are addressed to the department chair, the Graduate Affairs Committee, or the faculty. From the program's previous review, two issues remain: the lack of laboratory space (and the lack of a central location for existing labs) and the lack of a faculty member with an emphasis in a biologic component such as biotechnology.

Chair Waterhouse pointed out that a program correction of fact had not been inserted in the PRC report. International students are pushed to complete the Qualifying Examination "before the end of fall quarter of the second year" instead of "before the end of the second year." Council raised several questions about the timing of the Qualifying Examination, for both the international and domestic students. Council members thought that the very early QE might compromise the students' education in order for the program to save NRT. The faculty members are bringing in \$4-5 million and could probably afford to pay for another quarter of NRT. In addition, some students are reported to have difficulty finding an adviser in their first year; that is an additional pressure because students are preparing to take the QE in the fall quarter. Also, there is a question of equity between the international and domestic students. Apparently, the program does not enforce the requirement of taking the QE by the end of fall quarter of the second year on the domestic students. Professor Kollmann responded that the faculty wanted all the students to complete the QE by the end of the fall quarter of their second year so as to be able to move on to their research projects.

Council was also concerned about the intensity of requiring the students to take four core courses in their first fall quarter of their first year. The question raised was whether students might not learn the material in those courses more thoroughly if the courses were more spread out. Professor Kollmann responded that the faculty had discussed this but still agreed that students should take four core courses in their first quarter on campus although students would prefer spreading them out over two or three quarters. A graduate student supported the students' point of view. There was some discussion of the core courses and whether there was a disconnect between the core program and preparation for research. Professor Kollmann reported that what might be lacking was a biologic component. One Council member thought that the biotechnology students might be unhappy and that the core courses might not be meeting their needs.

Council was particularly concerned about these two challenges facing the Chemical Engineering graduate students and agreed to emphasize them in its transmittal letter. Regarding the QE, Council will say that the timing seemed particularly early compared with most graduate programs and thought that the program might be compromising the students' education. In addition, if this timing is a program requirement, then it must be enforced equally for both international and domestic students. Council will add that the pressure of finding a major professor for those unable to find one by the end of the first year is an additional pressure on those students, who also are studying for the QE. Secondly, Council will request that the graduate program review the intensity of the first quarter's course work and discuss it with the graduate students and report back to Council on that consultation.

Professor Joan Cadden made the motion to approve the PRC report with the correction regarding the timing of the QE "before the end of fall quarter of the second year." The motion was seconded and there was no further discussion. The vote in favor was 9, none were opposed, and there was one abstention from a member of the graduate program. Dean Gibeling holds an

appointment in the Department, but as an *ex officio* member, is not a voting member of Council. Chair Waterhouse will draft a transmittal letter for Council's review and approval at the next meeting.

Professor Mechling requested that a comment be included in the minutes. In a discussion with the External Reviewer in this review, the issue was raised of the relationship between Chemical Engineering and Materials Science. The program chair thought that in the future perhaps these two graduate programs should be reviewed at the same time. It would save a considerable amount of staff time. To prepare for two reviews is an extra burden on the staff. Professor Mechling wanted to put this recommendation in the minutes as a marker and will ask the Program Review Closure Committee to consider it. The Graduate Council Analyst asked whether there would be two concurrent reviews. The PRC Analyst responded that it would be a combined review.

### **CCGA – Recommendation of the Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee**

Professor Shrinivasa Upadhyaya requested Council's endorsement of the recommendations in the summary of the Advisory Committee's much longer report. The bullets below summarize Council's discussion:

- CCGA would like Council's strong endorsement of the report's recommendations.
- Current student support awards are not fully competitive with those of peer universities, with an average shortfall of \$2000.
- The main concern is the NRT issue; new academic students declined by 10% between 2003 and 2004 and new international doctoral enrollment declined by 40% between 2001 and 2004.
- Report recommendations: Starting in 2006-2007, for students who have advanced to candidacy, their NRT would decrease to zero for three years. Starting in 2007-2008, NRT would be eliminated in two stages, starting with continuing students paying no NRT and potentially adding new students as early as 2008-2009 if possible. The system would lose \$79.2 M of which \$42.5M could be recovered by reducing graduate student support that is used to pay NRT.
- Council was concerned that the recommendations refer only to doctoral students and not terminal master degree students as well.
- One Council member pointed out Council is being asked to endorse an incomplete report.
- A Council member pointed out that the drop in international students is also due to repercussions from 9/11, including hostility towards some countries and the difficulty of obtaining visas.
- Dean Gibeling explained the USAP (University Student Aid Program) recommendation. If 1/3 of the increase in fees is returned to the campus as aid, the TA remission fee would be taken off the top. Then the rest would be divided between graduates and undergraduates. Graduates would benefit from this change.
- Dean Gibeling explained that if there is full implementation of the \$79M minus some of the block grant money, down to \$49 M, it will cost our campus about 1/9 of that so it would be between \$4-5 M or approximately half of the block grant.
- Other campus costs taking place at the same time – fixing the loyalty tax by funding the faculty salary increases of \$3-4,000 per faculty. Where does the funding come from?
- One faculty member thought it was Council's job to advocate for graduate education and for other units to advocate for other issues.
- Dean Gibeling said another way to consider this is if the university decided to invest \$40-80M in graduate education, what would be Council's priorities?

- Professor Upadhyaya reminded Council that our campus was the one that initiated the memorial to the Regents to eliminate NRT and that it has passed systemwide.
- Another member thought Council should be more proactive and prioritize the most pressing issues for graduate education on this campus, such as help eliminate NRT, support graduate groups...
- The item was tabled until the June 2 meeting.

### **Viticulture and Enology – PRC Report**

Vice Chair de la Peña chaired the meeting for the Viticulture and Enology program review because Chair Waterhouse is a member of the graduate group. She introduced and thanked Professor Kathryn McCarthy, the PRC liaison for this review. Professor McCarthy presented the PRC Report and its recommendations. She reported that this is the program's first review and that the Viticulture and Enology M.S. degree program was approved in 2001. It is a good program with a strong future. Its strengths include its unique mission, excellent national and international reputation, highly committed faculty, focused students, and strong staff support from Ms. Judy Blevins. Although it is a graduate group, it benefits from having its administrative home in the Department of Viticulture and Enology and heavily utilizes departmental resources.

Graduate Council had questions regarding the graduate group's relationship to the downsizing of cooperative extension. Professor McCarthy explained that because grapes are a commodity of great importance to the state, much of the research is mission oriented and because the department is part of the Agricultural Experiment Station, the graduate students are concerned with real and practical problems. Also, because this graduate group is supported by commodity groups, the awards are in the range of \$30-50,000 rather than much larger federal grants.

Professor McCarthy presented the program's weaknesses and recommendations for improvement. Recommendation 3. regarding laboratory and winemaking facilities is addressed to the Dean of CA&ES and the graduate group faculty. Recommendation 5. regarding graduate student funding is addressed to the Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. The other recommendations are addressed to the graduate group, its chair, faculty, advisers or Educational Policy Committee. These include Recommendation 2. regarding coursework load for the M.S. degree and Recommendation 4. regarding the perception that the graduate group is insular.

Council's primary concern was Recommendation 1. regarding the focus of the M.S. program and the apparent mismatch between the expectations of the faculty and some of the students. Professor McCarthy reported that the students are primarily interested in learning to be winemakers and view the program as a training ground while the faculty also want them to learn a research component as part of the master's degree program. It appears that many students do not value the program's research activity as highly as its training function. Council discussed the alternatives to the M.S. degree program which students could pursue: the Certificate Program in Winemaking through UC Davis Extension or a second baccalaureate in Viticulture and Enology. Council thought that graduate education should have a research component and that graduate students know that. Council agreed that the master's students need to listen to the faculty and understand the research expectation early on in the program. Council suggested making the research component clear on the graduate group's Web site and in other materials for applicants to the program. Professor McCarthy reported that in fact, the program has already done that. In addition, Council thought Viticulture and Enology should facilitate a dialog with students so that they understand the research component and its benefits. Council also supported the PRC

report's recommendation for the program to consider reinstating VEN 200 as a way to introduce students to the importance of research. These points will be highlighted in Council's transmittal letter.

Professor Evan Watkins made the motion to approve the PRC report and to include Council's comments about the research component of the M.S. degree in its transmittal letter. The motion was seconded. Nine members voted in favor, none were opposed, and there was one abstention from a member of the graduate group. Vice Chair de la Peña thanked Professor McCarthy for her work on the program review and for presenting the PEC report to Council. The Vice Chair will draft the transmittal letter for Council's review and approval at its next meeting.

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

#### **Applied Science Engineering – Degree requirement changes**

Dean Gibeling requested that the Applied Science item be moved from the consent to the action list. Due to lack of time, this item was carried over to the next meeting.

The rest of the items remained on the consent list and therefore, were approved as presented. The minutes will be posted on the Web. Chair Waterhouse will notify the program chairs in writing of Council's approval of their requests.

- **Minutes from April 21, 2006 meeting – Draft**
- **Biostatistics – Degree requirement changes**
- **Clinical Research M.A.S. – Bylaws**

### **ACTION ITEMS (continued)**

#### **History – Appeal of QE Exception Denial**

Chair Waterhouse reported that History is in the process of organizing its students' Qualifying Examination committees. History has asked Council to consider its appeal of the Administrative Committee's denial of its request for an exception to the QE Policy requirement of having an external member on its students' QE committees. The bullets below summarize Council's discussion:

- The Administrative Committee denied History's request because History did not meet the criterion for exception to the QE Policy requirement of having an outside member on the QE committee.
- History has a peculiar advancement to candidacy structure, which includes a separate written dissertation prospectus and defense of prospectus.
- History has a peculiar QE committee structure: two faculty members are from the student's major area and three faculty members are from the student's minor area, which does not have to be in history. The student has to have taken a seminar from each of these faculty members. This QE structure is one used by History departments at other institutions and is not unique to Davis. The requirement for students to take seminars from the members of the QE committee is a traditional expectation.
- The QE is a general examination, not a research examination; the QE is based on a book list, which is very broad and which is fairly standard across subdisciplines, so they don't specialize in the research area; and each student has a minor field in which a separate paper and a syllabus are prepared and that has to be outside of the major area.
- History has the reputation across campus of being insular and not opening its graduate program membership to historians outside of the department. However since its recent program review and bylaws approval, it has admitted one faculty member from outside of the department.

- Council was willing to reconsider the request for an exception to the QE Policy requirement to have an outside member on the QE committee because of History's peculiar QE structure.
- A faculty member pointed out that it would be an undue burden on the students to have to find an outside member for the QE and to take a seminar from that person.
- There was a motion to approve History's request, with the recommendation that the History graduate program continue to open up its membership to faculty members outside the department.
- There was no second to the motion and the motion died.
- [The item was carried over to the June 22, 2006 meeting.]

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There was just one announcement.

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

Dean Gibeling reminded Council of Dr. Geoff Davis's seminar "Improving the Postdoctoral Experience: An Empirical Approach," which will begin right after Council's meeting.

Due to lack of time, the remaining agenda items will be carried over to the next two meetings and there were no further announcements or subcommittee reports.

### **ACTION ITEM:**

**Teaching Opportunities for Postdoctoral Scholars** (Gibeling/Breslin)

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

The discussion items were tabled until the next meeting due to a lack of time.

**Essential Features of the doctoral qualifying Examination** (Waterhouse)

**APD Recommendations:** (Baumgarth)

**Survey and Database of Key Recurring Impediments to Graduate Education**

**Core Course Development and Self Review**

**Master's Thesis definition** (\Waterhouse)

**Designated Emphases – Affiliated with grant proposals** (Waterhouse)

**Adjunct faculty proposers** (Leal)

The meeting was adjourned at 11:57 a.m.

OGS – lsw