

Revised 7/5/06 – Addition of Education M.A., Attachment 12.5, and three e-mails to 12.4.

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
AGENDA
Thursday, July 6, 2006
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
3201 Hart Hall**

AGENDA ITEM	ATTACHMENT
<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
Ecology PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter (Waterhouse) <i>Distributed electronically.</i>	12.1
Epidemiology PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter (Waterhouse) <i>Distributed electronically.</i>	12.2
S/U Policy – Administrative Committee recommendation, update (Waterhouse) [No attachment:	12.3]
Education M.A. – Approval dates of proposed track for practicing teachers and Plan I for general and combined M.A./credential tracks (Waterhouse)	
Enhancing Graduate Education at UC Davis – APD Report (Baumgarth)	11.12
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	9.10
Core Course Development and Self Review	9.11
Environmental Policy and Management, Revised Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program – Academic Senate Committees’ Responses (Waterhouse)	8.2 11.13
<i>Please bring Attachment 8.2 from the meeting of April 21, 2006.</i>	
Addendum – E-mails from Sperling and Lund regarding CPB’s comments	Addendum
Letters of support from lead deans. <i>Distributed electronically.</i>	12.4
E-mail, Orel to Waterhouse, June 20, 2006 – CPB <i>Distributed electronically.</i>	
E-mail, Sperling to Council, July 4, 2006 – TTP and ITS <i>Distributed electronically.</i>	
E-mail, Lund to Waterhouse, July 4, 2006 <i>Distributed electronically.</i>	
Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine – Proposal to Establish a Division of Critical Care	12.5
<i>(Waterhouse) Distributed electronically.</i>	
<u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>	
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

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Andrew Waterhouse, Chair

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Thursday, July 6, 2006

PRESENT: *Members:* N. Baumgarth, T. Kuhl, W. Leal, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, R. Wu
Representatives: E. Caswell-Chen, C. Hom
Graduate Studies attendees: K. Garcia, C. Jurado, L. Wilce

ABSENT: *Members:* A. Britt, J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, M. Farrens, J. Gibeling, E. Watkins
Representatives: C. Bates, J. Breslin, J. Karpel, A. Kelleher, S. O'Neill, A. Sheets

ACTION ITEMS

Ecology PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter

Chair Andrew Waterhouse reminded Council that Ecology had a very favorable review with just a few problems related to its very large size. He pointed out the fourth paragraph in the transmittal letter where Council requests the Dean of Graduate Studies to consider Recommendation 9, which concerns a policy regarding nominations to campuswide fellowships and students applying to more than one competing graduate program at UCD. Council members requested two amendments to the letter, one to congratulate the program on the achievement of being ranked number one in the country by *U.S. News and World Report* and deleting a redundant part of a sentence in the fourth paragraph. Professor Reen Wu made the motion to approve the amended letter, the motion was seconded, and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will mail the letter and PRC Report to the addressees.

Epidemiology PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter

In the transmittal letter, Chair Waterhouse emphasized Recommendations 1 and 3. Recommendation 1 addresses the need to resolve divergent faculty views and experiences and to create a common set of core values and criteria for curricular rigor. Recommendation 3 is to enhance faculty and student interactions during the students' first two years when they have a very heavy course load. Professor Nicole Baumgarth made the motion to approve the letter and the motion was seconded. A member suggested rewording a phrase in the second paragraph to specify the nature of what the faculty accomplished. The vote in favor of the amended letter was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will mail the letter and PRC Report to the addressees.

S/U Policy – Administrative Committee's recommendations

Chair Waterhouse reported that there was no consensus among the members of the Administrative Committee regarding any recommendations related to the student feedback on the S/U Policy.

Education M.A. – Proposed Track for Practicing Teachers

Chair Waterhouse reminded everyone that at its last meeting, Council had recommended a contingent approval of the Education M.A. program's proposal for a new track for practicing teachers and a request to eliminate the Plan II from the two existing tracks. Council had discussed approving the changes but delaying the date of the approval until after the completion of the review process for the two current tracks and ensuring consistency between the program's requested changes and the PRC report recommendations.

However, Chair Waterhouse has reconsidered the approval's contingencies and reported that Council had told the Education M.A. program chair that if the proposal for the new track were

submitted in a timely manner, Council could approve it before the program review began. Because the Education M.A. self review is not due until October and Council has already agreed that the changes would be beneficial to the program, Chair Waterhouse asked Council to consider approving both requests now. PRC Chair Jay Mechling reported that he has considered this request and supported Council approving the changes now. The PRC will be reviewing two of the three tracks during 2006-2007.

Chair Waterhouse asked Council if it had any comments from the discussion at the last meeting. One member noted that the proposal was forwarded to EPC for review and then Council had second thoughts about the timing of the approval. Chair Waterhouse responded that next year Council can consider the date when no more proposed changes can be reviewed until the program review is completed. The PRC Analyst reported that a program review schedule and letter from the Chairs of Graduate Council and PRC will be posted on the Web. That will give programs ample time to submit changes prior to their reviews. Chair Waterhouse noted that it is an issue of timing. Also, graduate programs need to realize that reviews take place at all of the different times in the evolution of programs and that should not be a concern. Programs are always changing; if they are not, then that is a problem. The review is a snapshot of the program and the goal of the review is for the program to be the best possible program that it can be.

Professor Mechling made the motion to approve the Education M.A. program's two requests without contingencies; Graduate Council's approval date would be July 6, 2006. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will notify the graduate program chair of Council's approval of the new track for practicing teachers and of the elimination of the Plan II option in the other two tracks. All three tracks will offer just the Plan I (thesis) option.

Enhancing Graduate Education at UC Davis – APD Report

APD Chair Baumgarth reported that APD's report was based on two data sets, one qualitative and one quantitative. The qualitative data were taken from the last Program Review Committee report for each graduate program and included the program's challenges and the report's recommendations. The data analysis identified eighteen recurring challenges facing graduate programs. The top five issues were related to core courses, vision/cohesiveness, multiyear fellowships, student advising and access to graduate program information, and nonresident tuition (NRT) support.

In addition, APD sent the attached survey of the eighteen identified challenges to the graduate program chairs to obtain a current snapshot of the top five challenges facing each graduate program at the moment. These data have not yet been analyzed.

The quantitative data included the faculty membership list and number of students for each graduate program. These data were analyzed to demonstrate the connectivity between graduate programs. The tree diagrams show larger conglomerates of graduate programs that might get together to solve common problems. Quality by size has not yet been analyzed.

Council members discussed how the report might be used. Chair Waterhouse noted that the report will provide a basis for discussion topics at the Chancellor's Fall Conference on Graduate Education and that Professor Baumgarth will make a presentation on the second day of the conference. Council members thought that this report would have a larger impact in terms of change than most of Council's usual work. The fact that the report is data based will be very

helpful in presenting the problems facing graduate education, finding solutions to these problems, and planning strategically for the future of graduate education on campus. The fall conference can endorse the identified problems. Graduate Council would then be asked to find solutions with the sanction of the Chancellor and Provost, the problems would be returned to APD for solutions and then returned to the Provost by the end of the year with specific solutions to be negotiated.

Chair Waterhouse pointed out the APD report's recommendations regarding curriculum requirements. A goal might be the expectation that every new faculty hire must be connected to graduate education, including a commitment to teach a graduate course. One member suggested that all faculty FTE be 80% in undergraduate and 20% in graduate education. Council discussed who has the authority to make these decisions; currently, they are made at the levels of the deans and the department chairs. The Provost's new initiative process has the potential to strengthen existing graduate programs.

Professor Hans Mueller made the motion for Graduate Council to endorse the APD report. The motion was seconded, there was no further discussion, and the vote in favor was unanimous.

APD Recommendations:

(1) Survey and Database of Key Recurring Impediments to Graduate Education

Attachment 9.10 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.

PRC Chair Mechling asked whether APD intended the attached survey to become part of the program review process. The PRC currently asks faculty and students to complete confidential questionnaires, which form the basis of the review committee's discussion with a program's students and faculty. Professor Baumgarth explained that APD's goal was for a database to be created and for data to be collected and entered on a regular basis. Then the top challenges to graduate education could be determined at any point in time and whether any new challenges have been identified. Professors Mechling and Baumgarth discussed who might be asked to complete the survey and the reasons for choosing them. Professor Mechling noted that the PRC report's recommendations are presented in order of importance according to the review committee's judgment. Professor Baumgarth would like the review committee to complete the survey at the end of each program's review.

Chair Waterhouse asked Council whether it wanted to endorse the recommendation from APD that this survey of recurring problems or impediments become part of each graduate program review. Council discussed the possibility of sending the survey to all of the graduate programs as well and the time period, for example, every year or every other year. PRC Chair Mechling clarified that the recommendation was for PRC to ask the chair of each program review committee to complete the survey at the end of the committee's review process. PRC Analyst Kathy Garcia suggested that the recommendation be transmitted to Dean Jeffery Gibeling because Graduate Studies would be responsible for the database. It could be incorporated into the upcoming graduate program historical database. A Council member stated that it also was important for the program chairs to complete the survey and the data entered into the database more often than the program reviews, which are on a seven-year cycle. Another Council member thought that surveys of both the program chairs and the review committee chairs should be conducted. PRC Chair Mechling pointed out that PRC has the capability of collecting the student and faculty confidential questionnaires on line and the surveys could also be completed on line. Council discussed the need to have someone analyze the data collected. One faculty member suggested that there could be a comparison of the completed surveys from the program and the review committee.

Professor Baumgarth made the motion for Council to charge Graduate Studies to include the survey of key weaknesses as part of the PRC Report and for the data to be entered into a database to be set up. Chair Waterhouse said the motion was to implement APD's recommendation and ask the Dean to allocate resources for the database. The motion was seconded. Professor Mechling clarified that the motion was to request the Dean to please include the APD survey's information in the developing (graduate program historical) database and for the survey to be completed by the chairs of the program review committees. The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will notify Dean Gibeling and Professor Mechling.

Chair Waterhouse suggested Council consider a second motion to generate a similar database and ask the graduate program chairs to complete the APD survey every other year. Professor Baumgarth made the motion and it was seconded. A Council member suggested that the data collected would verify recurring problems that need resources allocated to solve them. Four members voted in favor of the motion, no one was opposed, and three abstained. The motion was carried. Chair Waterhouse will notify Dean Gibeling.

(2) **Core Course Development and Self Review** *Attachment 9.11 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.* This item was carried over to the first fall meeting due to lack of time.

Environmental Policy and Management, Revised Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program – Review for Council's Final Approval

Chair Waterhouse presented the history of the proposed program's review for approval. Late last year, the proposal was first submitted to Graduate Council with the recommendation for approval from the Academic Planning and Development Committee. Graduate Council raised a number of concerns, which were transmitted to the proposers, with the recommendation that the proposal be revised and re-submitted. The proposal was re-submitted to Council in April 2006 with the Educational Policy Committee's recommendation for approval. Council gave its preliminary approval, contingent on identification of a lead dean. Council consulted with the Academic Senate Library Committee and Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB). The Library Committee identified one key resource which was missing and that would cost \$8,000 a year. The proposers responded that the faculty was unfamiliar with the index and did not think it was necessary for them to access the information that it includes. The CPB had numerous concerns, several of which have been addressed, including housing a graduate group in an ORU. Of greater concern was creating so many new courses for the program, initially teaching several of these courses with incumbent faculty through \$6,000 course buyouts, and the lack of concrete plans for staffing all of these courses. The CPB requested that a plan be put into place outlining how this teaching would be addressed. Council discussed asking the Dean of Graduate Studies to hold off opening admissions to the program, if it is approved, until the new courses are approved and staffed.

A Council member expressed his concern about supporting professional master's programs instead of academic Ph.D. programs when resources are limited. However, most of the members thought that this master's program was an appropriate one for UCD to offer because it falls within UC's mission. It would demonstrate UCD's excellence in environmental sciences and would increase the visibility of the campus' research in these areas. Davis' proximity to Sacramento would allow the program to serve as a bridge between academia and the State.

Professor Wu made the motion for Council to give its final approval to the proposal and to request that the Dean of Graduate Studies hold off opening admissions to the program, if it receives final

approval from the UC President, until the new courses are approved and staffed. The motion was seconded and there was no further discussion. Six members voted in favor of the motion, one member opposed it, and no one abstained. The motion was carried. Chair Waterhouse will write Dean Gibeling, requesting transmittal of the proposal to the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors.

Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine – Proposal to Establish a Division of Critical Care

This item was not discussed due to lack of time. On behalf of Graduate Council, Chair Waterhouse will notify Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons that Council has no formal response because the proposal for a change of status of the Section of Critical Care to the Division of Critical Care does not appear to impact graduate education.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Report on the School of Public Health Committee

The charge for planning the proposed School of Public Health (SPH) originated with Provost Virginia Hinshaw. Professor Mueller has served as Graduate Council's representative to the School of Public Health planning committee during this academic year. He presented his report updating Council on the progress that the committee has made this year. The committee has five working groups. Professor Mueller participated in the Curriculum and Student Issues Working Group. A detailed proposal was expected to be completed in September 2006. If the SPH is approved, it would not start for several years. The SPH would need to be accredited by the Council of Education for Public Health (CEPH), which has numerous requirements, including a minimum of 25 FTE with five in each of five core areas. These FTEs would not be transferred out of the School of Medicine so they would have to come from somewhere else. The proposed SPH would have 50 FTE within the first three years of opening. The SPH would be located in either Davis or Sacramento; a building would be needed to house it.

The rationale for the SPH emphasizes public health needs, service to the local community, and training activities, including distance learning programs. The proximity of the state health department and inclusion of a veterinary medicine aspect at UCD are considered advantages in competing with a similar proposal from UC Irvine.

The SPH would be organized in a manner similar to the Graduate School of Management without departments. The SPH is interested in providing an undergraduate minor and eventually a major in Public Health, which would qualify it to receive Teaching Assistantships for its graduate students. Other sources of student funding were described.

The CEPH requires five core areas: Epidemiology, Biostatistics, Environmental Health Sciences, Health Systems Administration, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Currently, there is a general one-year Master of Public Health (MPH) program and a two-year specialist program has been proposed. The Doctor of Public Health program is optional for accreditation and the SPH planning committee has no plans to propose one. The CEPH requires Ph.D. degrees to be offered in three public health areas. The SPH plans to offer Ph.D.s in biostatistics, epidemiology and one other area to be determined. It is unclear whether or how the existing Graduate Groups and Ph.D. programs in Biostatistics and Epidemiology could be housed in the SPH and how students might be counted because these graduate group students are currently counted as academic graduate students. Also, the SPH could not have any control over the graduate groups' faculty or curricula. UCD graduate groups are administered through Graduate Studies and controlled by Graduate

Council. Therefore, there are structural issues that would need to be resolved. UC Berkeley has developed an arrangement between its Biostatistics graduate group and its SPH, which might serve as a model for UC Davis.

A Council member pointed out that UC Riverside is proposing a law school and a medical school, UC Irvine is proposing a law school and a school of public health, and UC Davis is proposing a school of public health. Davis may be in a unique and good position to have a school of public health approved because UC Davis has a School of Medicine and a School of Veterinary Medicine. The UC Office of the President provides resource allocations for new schools.

Graduate Council may be able to take a proactive approach and involve the Graduate Groups in Biostatistics and Epidemiology in Council's review process. Chair Waterhouse noted that he could contact the chair of the SPH committee.

Essential Features of the Doctoral Qualifying Examination

Chair Waterhouse asked Council for comments on this document. Because it will have so much impact on graduate programs, he will circulate a draft to the graduate program chairs for their feedback. Then it will be brought back to Council in the fall for a final decision. Because Council has not had time to discuss the draft today, Chair Waterhouse asked anyone who has specific changes to the draft to let him know either after the meeting or by e-mail. He will make any needed amendments to the document before distributing it to the graduate program chairs.

One Council member pointed out that there is an exception regarding the requirement for all of the committee members to be present at the Qualifying Examination, which ought to be included in this document. It is called the 72 hour rule. There are two ways in which absent faculty members can participate in the examination. He or she can give questions to another faculty member or can conduct an independent examination of the student and give the results to the chair of the committee. A Graduate Studies staff person explained that if Graduate Studies receives a telephone call that at the last minute a faculty member cannot attend, the committee is given the options of postponing the exam, reconstituting the committee if another person is qualified to examine the student in the area, or the absent faculty member can examine the student by telecommunication or can examine the student individually within 72 hours. Graduate Studies has a form on which the committee chair reports the names of all the committee members who were present or not present for the entire time and how the exam was conducted. The Office of Graduate Studies requires all of the committee members to agree to whatever solution is chosen. [The seventy-two hour rule is described in the Council's policy *Service on Advanced Degree Committees*.] Chair Waterhouse concluded the meeting by saying that the QE Essential Features discussion will take place next fall and thanked everyone for attending this last meeting.

There were no subcommittee reports or announcements due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

OGS – lsw