

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
Thursday, June 22, 2006
2:00 – 5:00 p.m.
1017 Wickson Hall**

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
Ecology – PRC Report (Guest Susan Kauzlarich)	11.1
Epidemiology – PRC Report (Guest Susan Stover)	11.2
[Master of Laws – PRC Report] <i>Item deleted.</i>	11.3
Cultural Studies PRC Report Transmittal Letter – Revised draft (Waterhouse)	11.4
Biomedical Engineering PRC Report Transmittal Letter – Draft (Waterhouse)	11.5
Entomology PRC Report Transmittal Letter – Draft (Waterhouse)	11.6
History – Appeal of QE Exception Denial (Waterhouse)	11.7
DE in the Biology of Vector-borne Diseases (de la Peña) <i>Enclosed.</i>	11.8
Master of Public Health Phase 2 - Proposal to Establish Phase 2 (de la Peña)	11.9
Education M.A. – Proposed Track for Practicing Teachers (de la Peña) <i>Enclosed.</i>	11.10
S/U Policy – Administrative Committee’s recommendation (Waterhouse) <i>To be distributed.</i>	11.11
Teaching Opportunities for Postdoctoral Scholars (Gibeling/Breslin) <i>Please bring Attachment 9.12 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.</i>	
Enhancing Graduate Education at UC Davis – APD Report (Baumgarth) <i>To be distributed.</i>	11.12
Environmental Policy and Management, Revised Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program – Academic Senate Committees’ Responses (Waterhouse) Addendum – E-mails from Sperling and Lund regarding CPB’s comments <i>Enclosed.</i>	11.13
<u>CONSENT ITEMS</u>	
Minutes from May 25, 2006 Meeting – Draft	11.14
Minutes from June 2, 2006 Meeting – Draft	11.15
Electrical and Computer Engineering – Degree Requirement Changes (de la Peña)	11.16
DE in Critical Theory – Affiliation Request for Cultural Studies Ph.D. Program (Waterhouse)	11.17
<u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>	
APD Recommendations (Baumgarth) <i>Please bring Attachments 9.10 and 9.11 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.</i>	
Survey and Database of Key Recurring Impediments to Graduate Education Core Course Development and Self Review	
Report on the School of Public Health Committee (Mueller) <i>To be distributed.</i>	11.18
Essential Features of the Doctoral Qualifying Examination (Waterhouse)	Revised 9.4
<u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u>	
<u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	

Andrew Waterhouse, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Thursday, June 22, 2006

PRESENT: *Members:* N. Baumgarth, A. Britt, J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, M. Farrens, J. Gibeling, W. Leal, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, R. Wu
Representatives: J. Breslin, E. Caswell-Chen, J. Karpel, S. O'Neill, A. Sheets
Graduate Studies attendees: H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, C. Jurado, L. Wilce

GUESTS: Susan Kauzlarich, Susan Stover, Barnaly Pande

ABSENT: *Members:* T. Kuhl, E. Watkins
Representatives: C. Bates, C. Hom, A. Kelleher

ACTION ITEMS

Ecology – PRC Report

PRC Chair Jay Mechling introduced Professor Susan Kauzlarich, the PRC liaison for the review of the Graduate Group in Ecology. Professor Kauzlarich reported that Ecology is an outstanding program and is ranked number one nationally by the *U.S. News and World Report*. The Ecology Graduate Group is very large and has ten areas of emphasis (AOEs). The program responded to all of the recommendations from its last review. There are no major recommendations in the current report. Ecology faces the same challenges now as before. The graduate group is difficult to manage because of its size. The biggest issues are administration, communication, funding for students, and rewarding faculty members for their teaching in the graduate group. These are common issues for graduate groups; there was nothing unique to Ecology except its size. Council agreed that Ecology should be commended for its recognition as an excellent graduate program.

Council agreed the primary issue was for the faculty to continue improving the core courses. The review team did not review the individual AOEs, which vary considerably in size. Council members asked whether there might be a better way to configure the graduate group and suggested Ecology consider this in a retreat of the group or a subsection of the group. Members raised questions about the diversity of faculty speakers at the seminars and whether graduate students should be TAs in the core courses. Council also discussed Recommendation 3 for a policy regarding nominations to campuswide fellowships and students applying to more than one competing graduate program at UCD; Council suggested that this recommendation should also be addressed to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Council recommended an amendment to the language of Recommendation 10 to ensure that teaching in this program is recognized and rewarded as part of the personnel review and merit step process, to more closely match the weakness it addresses.

Professor Walter Leal made the motion to approve the PRC Report with the amendment to Recommendation 10. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Andrew Waterhouse thanked Professor Kauzlarich for her work on the review and for presenting the report to Council. He will draft the transmittal letter to the addressees.

Epidemiology – PRC Report

PRC Chair Mechling introduced Professor Susan Stover, the PRC liaison for the review of the Graduate Group in Epidemiology. Professor Stover reported that the program is very vigorous, viable and diverse. Its previous (and first) review was very critical and the program responded so

aggressively, effectively, and thoroughly that Epidemiology is greatly enhanced. The graduate group is well aware of its challenges and is addressing them.

Council members asked about the issue of faculty not sharing a common set of core values, which is possibly related to their different backgrounds and training (M.D. versus Ph.D.). A substantial number of the faculty do not have formal training in epidemiology. Council agreed that the program needs to create a common set of core values and criteria for curricular rigor. Another issue Council emphasized was how to increase faculty-student interaction during the students' first two years when they have a heavy course load. Half of the faculty is at UCDMC and the other half is on campus. Faculty diversity is a great strength but interactions need to be increased. Council's suggestions included laboratory rotations, time to socialize before seminars, and a retreat. Council agreed with Dean Jeffery Gibeling's observation that the program has improved dramatically since 1997 and that the faculty should be commended for having made so much progress in a relatively short amount of time.

Professor Joan Cadden made the motion to approve the PRC Report and commend the faculty. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse thanked Professor Stover for her work on the review and for presenting the report to Council. He will draft the transmittal letter to the addressees.

Master of Laws – PRC Report

Professor Mechling reported that the Master of Laws PRC Report will be presented in the fall.

Cultural Studies PRC Report Transmittal Letter – Revised draft

Chair Waterhouse reminded everyone that the Cultural Studies transmittal letter was discussed at Council's last meeting and additional wording changes were requested. The letter has been revised. Professor Nicole Baumgarth made the motion to approve the letter. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. The PRC Report and transmittal letter will be mailed to the addressees.

Biomedical Engineering PRC Report and Draft Transmittal Letter

Chair Waterhouse reminded Council that at its last meeting the Biomedical Engineering PRC Report was tabled after Council's lengthy discussion of Recommendation 5 and request that it be reworded. PRC Chair Mechling explained that the rewording, "institute a special meeting of the BME Graduate Group faculty with a standing agenda to discuss key issues that may arise year-to-year," addresses the faculty's need to discuss such issues as core course and curricular issues, which is a direct concern of the current review, without students present. Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen reported that another question that was raised at the last meeting was the differences in pay that GSRs in different tracks were receiving. This issue is addressed by Recommendation 7, which reminds the graduate group that they have a compensation plan that they need to follow. Professor Nicole Baumgarth made the motion to approve the amended PRC Report. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous.

Chair Waterhouse presented the draft transmittal letter, which includes a bulleted list of issues on which Council wanted Biomedical Engineering to focus. In order to address the issue of recognition of faculty participation in the graduate group, he enlarged the list of addressees to include the faculty chairs of the relevant schools and colleges. A Council member recommended removing the faculty chairs from the addressee list because they are just advisory to the deans and those executive committees that appoint them do not instruct the personnel committees in any

meaningful way. The member thought that the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) ought to be charged with informing its subcommittees, i.e. its personnel committees, that this is a perceived problem. Dean Gibeling suggested that graduate group PRC Reports could be added to a summary of the APD report and sent to CAP. Also this issue of faculty recognition for teaching in graduate groups might be discussed at the Chancellor's Fall Conference.

Based on Council's discussion Chair Waterhouse suggested amending the letter by striking the fifth paragraph "The final recommendation..." A Council member suggested the addition of the word "special" to the third bulleted recommendation in the third paragraph. Professor Cadden made the motion to approve the amended transmittal letter. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. The amended PRC Report and transmittal letter will be mailed to the addressees.

Entomology PRC Report Transmittal Letter – Draft

Chair Waterhouse presented the Entomology PRC Report transmittal letter. PRC Chair Mechling reported that PRC has not received Entomology's "correction of fact." The program was notified that it had until June 14, 2006 to submit its response and that if one was not submitted, PRC would assume they did not have any corrections. If Entomology should submit one later, the Program Review Closure Committee would address that in its letter to Council. Professor de la Peña made the motion to approve the transmittal letter and the motion was seconded. Ten members voted in favor, no one was opposed, and one abstained.

DE in the Biology of Vector-borne Diseases

EPC Chair Carolyn de la Peña presented the proposal for the Designated Emphasis in the Biology of Vector-borne Diseases and EPC's letter describing the review's timeline. She highlighted two items. First, there was some expertise on the committee that allowed them to ask some questions and suggest some clarifications for improvements that were very useful. Secondly, at the beginning of the proposal, there is a description of the DE and the rationale of the DE's objectives and the normative time to degree are very clear.

A Council member asked about the small number of faculty. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen reported that the DE anticipates that it will grow. The core group of faculty involved is very energetic and enthusiastic about making the DE successful. Although the primary focus initially is on arthropods, the proposal does not exclude other vectors. Council members raised a number of questions about the DE's curriculum, including whether all of the listed 400-level courses were approved for graduate credit, the small number of required units, the need to restrict seminars to satisfy just one elective (they may not be repeated for elective credit), and the need to remove the undergraduate 198 and 199 courses. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen pointed out that the coursework is not the only component of a DE. The fact that students must have a DE faculty member on both their QE and Dissertation Committees is an equally important facet of what a DE represents.

Another member pointed out that the biology of vector-borne diseases requires special training and different procedures that are separate from traditional biology. Clearly vector-borne diseases are a hot topic currently. In addition, the brand new quarantine greenhouse facility on campus is just now being certified by APHIS (Animal Plant Health Inspection Service of the USDA) and CDFA (California Department of Food and Agriculture) for use and will be available for a new types of student research.

Council members also raised the issue of the proliferation of DEs and the potential need for more stringent or extensive guidelines. The EPC and Council are not currently asking questions about how these DEs fit into the larger context of graduate education on campus. This should be a future Council discussion topic.

Professor Cadden made the motion to approve the proposed DE in the Biology of Vector-borne Diseases, with the amendments above and the motion was seconded. Nine members voted in favor, none were opposed and two abstained. The motion was carried. Professor de la Peña will request the clarifications to the curriculum from the proposer. When these are received and found to be satisfactory, Chair Waterhouse will notify Dean Gibeling of Council's approval. [The proposers made the requested clarifications to the curriculum in the proposal, the Chair notified the Dean of Council's approval in a letter dated June 30, 2006, and the DE's approval is effective as of June 22, 2006.]

History appeal of denial

Chair Waterhouse reminded Council that at its meeting of May 25, 2006, it considered History's appeal of the Administrative Committee's denial of its request for an exemption to the QE Policy rule that requires an external member on the QE committee. The attachment describes Council's previous discussion; there was a motion to approve History's request but no second to the motion. Chair Waterhouse has brought this appeal back to Council for a decision.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to approve History's request for an exception to the QE Policy rule that requires an external member on the QE committee. The motion was seconded. Chair Waterhouse reported his discussions with the graduate program chair and the Administrative Committee. A previous concern regarding student enrollment in History graduate seminars has been resolved; students outside History are not restricted from History's seminars but some seminars are oversubscribed by both History and non-History students. Chair Waterhouse distributed a list of History faculty members and the interdisciplinary campus programs with which each of them is affiliated. In the field of history throughout the U.S. there is a very specific expectation that each member of the QE committee has instructed the student in a seminar. The requirement of an external member would make it very difficult or impossible for students to fulfill that expectation.

Council discussed the rationale for the QE Policy and the varying structures for preliminary examinations and QEs across disciplines on campus. Council discussed whether it should retain the requirement for an external member on QE committees and the rationale for this rule. The primary reasons were to facilitate questions that focus on more general issues of scholarship and not just on the student's narrow dissertation topic and the importance of having some formal interaction between faculty members in different graduate degree programs, to have a better understanding of the scholarship outside one's own programs. A Council member thought that the *Essential Features of the Doctoral QE* may be a more useful document for students and faculty. Dean Gibeling suggested that program reviews could be the place where a program's QE is examined to ensure that it is not becoming too narrowly focused on the student's dissertation research topic.

Eight members voted in favor of the motion to approve History's request, one member was opposed, and two members abstained. The motion was carried. Chair Waterhouse will notify History's graduate program chair that Council has approved its appeal for an exception to the QE Policy rule to have an external member on the QE committee.

Master of Public Health Phase 2 - Proposal to Establish Phase 2

PRC Chair de la Peña described the current and proposed MPH programs. The MPH Phase 1 program, a one-year program for students who already have medical training, was approved in 2002. The proposed MPH Phase 2 two-year program is for students with baccalaureate degrees but not any advanced training in medicine. The proposal includes all of the language from the approved original MPH Phase 1 program and the additional information regarding the Phase 2 program. The MPH has various areas of emphasis. The proposal includes justification for the two-year program.

Chair Waterhouse pointed out that the Phase 1 requirements were much greater than they needed to be considering these students already had medical degrees. With the addition of the Phase 2, there will be two types of MPH degrees, one for people with the MD/DVM and one for those with just a bachelor's degree. Professor de la Peña pointed out that the difference in the number of units required in the two Phases is addressed in the letter from Professor Stephen McCurdy. The EPC asked him why there was just an 8 unit difference between the Phase 1 with 48 units and the Phase 2 with 56 units. He responded that the accreditation requirement that the Phase 2 falls under is for 56 units, so they are working within that structure. The 48 unit requirement was a choice that was made to make the MPH Phase 1 degree program especially rigorous and intense. The EPC and Council are only evaluating the Phase II program proposal and the 56 units required is appropriate for that program.

Council discussed the lack of specified MPH Phase 2 admissions requirements beyond the bachelor's degree and the potential problems of having Phase 1 and Phase 2 students in the same courses. Council agreed that applicants for the MPH Phase 2 should have some background or preparation for the program beyond the baccalaureate. Typically, graduate programs require that students who are admitted have the prerequisites for the courses they are planning to take, specific courses, or specific degrees.

Dean Gibeling noted that in Graduate Council's approval letter of the MPH Phase 1 program, Chair Christopher Calvert wrote, "Graduate Council requested that the program reach out to faculty outside the Schools of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine as there are others on campus whose research makes them appropriate for this program." For example, these others include faculty members from Nutrition, Human and Community Development, Sociology, and Law. This outreach has not occurred and is not part of the current proposal. Because the MPH Phase 2 program will be offered to applicants with the bachelor's degree, it is much more like other academic graduate programs on campus than the more professionally oriented MPH Phase 1 program. Although the MPH Phase 1 program does not appear to have bylaws (probably due to being reviewed first by the Academic Senate and then by Graduate Council), it is essential that the MPH submit bylaws for review and approval now that the Phase 2 will become part of the degree program. The administrative structure of the MPH appears to be that for a graduate group rather than a departmentally- (or single school-) based graduate program. The bylaws would clarify Council's structural questions, including who is the lead dean and what is the appointment process for the graduate program chair. Another question was the status of the School of Public Health and this program's relation to the School.

Council agreed to table the proposal and to ask the Dean of Graduate Studies to address the issue of the program's admissions requirements and bylaws, which would resolve the questions regarding the MPH's structure and breadth. The Dean will write Professor McCurdy, notifying

him of Council's general support for the MPH Phase 2 program and relaying Council's concerns regarding several aspects of the program.

Council's discussion and action regarding this proposed program raised other issues regarding how reviews of proposals for new programs are conducted by EPC and Council. The EPC Chair expressed concern regarding the good faith efforts on the part of her committee to review these proposals and of the proposers who respond to EPC's requests for revisions and clarifications of the proposals, only to have Graduate Council raise new issues at the end of this process. She thought that EPC needed to receive more macro guidance or expertise on the meta-concepts from the Dean of Graduate Studies or from Council much earlier in the review process. Chair Waterhouse thought that Council was the appropriate place for considerations of how the proposal fits into the overall structure of the university and that the larger questions are only going to arise in Council. Two members suggested that Council might do a preliminary conceptual review of proposed proposals and point out any larger issues before the proposals are submitted to EPC for review of the actual details. Many members agreed that this was a good idea.

Education M.A. – Proposed Track for Practicing Teachers

EPC Chair de la Peña presented the Education M.A. program's proposal for a new track for practicing teachers. Currently there are two tracks; one is a basic M.A. and one is the combined M.A./credential track. The justification for the practicing teacher track is that there are a many people who have been practicing in the classroom for a number of years who would like to obtain a master's degree and who in particular would like to do research that is related to classroom practice. One of the unique aspects of the Education program at Davis is that the faculty members engage in research that is about how the process of learning takes place and teach and encourage self-reflection activity in their students.

In reviewing the proposal, it was not clear to the EPC how the students would progress through the new track, what courses they would take and when, how they would be advised in order to make certain decisions and what they would produce at the end and what would it look like. The EPC requested the timelines and the comparative breakdowns across the three tracks that are included in the document.

Although the Education M.A.'s existing two tracks will be under review next year, EPC considered the new track for practicing teachers in relation to them so that incoming students could see where they fit into the program. Once they arrive, they are all students in the program and they are not separated. So they need to understand what their expectations should be within that program. She reported that PRC Chair Mechling has informed her that changes could not be made to the two existing tracks at this time because of their upcoming review. Professor de la Peña reported that there is quite a bit of confusion within these tracks because there are both a Plan I and a Plan II. Students often are not even clear what their M.A. Plan is. The EPC as a whole could not understand the Education M.A.'s symposium and how having students from both Plan I and Plan II in the same symposium worked. Following conversations with the EPC Chair, the graduate program chair and her faculty decided that they would like to make a change to the two existing tracks and just offer the Plan I and that would clear up a lot of problems.

Dean Gibeling thought that this document is a very clearly written program description and commended EPC for the fine and thorough job they have done on reviewing this proposal. Academically, having all students write a thesis will be a better experience than the comprehensive examination. He thought that it was a sufficiently positive change for this program for Council to

consider approving it now. Chair Waterhouse pointed out that because Professor Mechling had left the meeting, Council was unable to consult him about the change in relation to the upcoming review. A suggestion was to approve the change but withhold the approval until the program review was completed.

Dean Gibeling suggested that Council give its preliminary approval to the Education M.A. proposal and notify the program chair that it supports the proposed changes; then, when the program review is complete, Council will ensure that the review recommendations are consistent with the proposal and if they are, the approved changes will be implemented. Professor de la Peña made the motion to approve all three tracks as described above and the motion was seconded. Chair Waterhouse added that approval and implementation are contingent on completion of the 2006-2007 program review. Professor de la Peña called for the vote which was unanimous in favor of the motion. Chair Waterhouse will draft the notification to the graduate program chair. [At its meeting of July 6, 2006, Council reconsidered its decision and approved both requests without contingencies.]

CONSENT ITEMS

No one requested that any of the items be moved off the consent list. Therefore, they were approved as presented. The minutes will be posted on the Web and Chair Waterhouse will notify the program chairs that their requests have been approved.

- **Minutes from May 25, 2006 Meeting – Draft**
- **Minutes from June 2, 2006 Meeting – Draft**
- **Electrical and Computer Engineering – Degree Requirement Changes**
- **DE in Critical Theory – Affiliation Request for Cultural Studies Ph.D. Program**

S/U Policy – Administrative Committee’s recommendation

Chair Waterhouse held this item over to the next meeting.

Teaching Opportunities for Postdoctoral Scholars. *Attachment 9.12 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.*

Dr. Jerry Breslin reported that the Postdoctoral Scholars Teaching Program (PTP) was developed by the Postdoctoral Scholars Association (PSA). In a 2001 survey of postdocs, the PSA found that they wanted opportunities to teach above the TA level. Because obtaining faculty positions is becoming more competitive, postdocs need to have teaching experience as an instructor, especially when applying to liberal arts colleges. Currently, some postdocs are applying to become instructors at community colleges to get that experience. The PSA wants to create a program to facilitate teaching opportunities here at UC Davis. Dr. Breslin introduced Dr. Barnaly Pande, who has revised the PTP document. Dr. Pande explained that the program’s concept is to provide a forum where there would be a listing of interested faculty who would be prepared to allow a postdoc to teach their class while they were away on sabbatical or at meetings. Interested postdocs could view that information and the interested parties would then have the opportunity to make contact. In their own meetings the PSA has talked about available teaching opportunities. There are financial issues with some of those opportunities; they are competitive so not everybody has the opportunity to teach. The idea is to present teaching opportunities that are training experiences.

Council members asked whether postdocs would teach entire courses or just a couple of classes, whether there would be a monetary exchange, and about the mentoring aspect of the teaching experience. In addition Dean Gibeling noted possible postdoc teaching opportunities in freshman seminars and summer sessions, where postdocs would have full course responsibility, which raises

issues of how postdocs are compensated and how they are released from their regular research obligations because most postdocs are expected to be conducting research. Teaching is something that would have to be negotiated with an appropriate teaching title, with release time from the faculty mentor, who is expecting the postdoc to do research. Obviously, this is a bit more complicated to organize and a bit more expensive. For postdocs, it would have to be their primary pay.

One Council member was particularly supportive of the idea of the PTP but suggested that having postdocs substitute for faculty away from campus would not be the kind of experience that would be productive in the ways that the PSA is envisioning. First, the mentoring and the feedback would not be there. Secondly, as the faculty members and supervisors of the postdocs ought to be able to write letters of recommendation to that liberal arts college saying they were there, they saw the postdoc teach, they talked it over together afterwards, and the postdoc had these ideas.

Council endorsed the postdoc teaching program and the other campus opportunities for them to teach.

Enhancing Graduate Education at UC Davis – APD Report

Dean Gibeling praised the APD report and noted there was much to discuss. He thought the report forms the basis for the Chancellor's Fall Conference to a large extent and will be discussed there. He suggested that Professor Baumgarth and others from the Council should meet and discuss the report over the summer and edit it to ensure that it ready to be presented.

Chair Waterhouse suggested that Council have one more meeting to complete its discussion of this report as well as the remaining agenda items. Professor Baumgarth thought that APD's most important accomplishment was to identify the 18 recurring key weaknesses of graduate programs and thought that the survey should be part of the graduate program review process. She thought that it would not take much work to complete this survey for each program reviewed and to have a computer database that tracks these key issues. Over time, one could see whether there are changes for the better or for the worse and whether there are new key issues arising that have not been mentioned. Council discussed referring this recommendation to PRC and who would complete the survey. Professor Baumgarth thought that it should not be part of the program's self-review but should be completed by the ad hoc committee or external reviewer. Committee Analyst Kathy Garcia will bring this recommendation to PRC Chair Mechling's attention. They will be making revisions to the program review report formats within the next two weeks for next year's reviews.

Vice Chair de la Peña thanked Professor Baumgarth for preparing this stunning report, which has so much good information in it. She reported that all of Council's subcommittee chairs will be attending the Chancellor's Fall Conference and could discuss the report before then. Chair Waterhouse concluded by saying that he was very impressed by the report and it would be discussed at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Chair Waterhouse will schedule one more Graduate Council meeting to consider and act on the remaining action items and to consider the discussion items.

ACTION ITEM

Environmental Policy and Management, Revised Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program – Academic Senate Committees’ Responses

DISCUSSION ITEMS

All of the discussion items were carried over to the next meeting due to lack of time.

APD Recommendations. *Attachments 9.10 and 9.11 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.*

- **Survey and Database of Key Recurring Impediments to Graduate Education**
- **Core Course Development and Self Review**

Report on the School of Public Health Committee

Essential Features of the Doctoral Qualifying Examination

All of the subcommittee reports and announcements were carried over to the next meeting due to lack of time.

OGS – lsw