

MINUTES
GRADUATE COUNCIL
Monday, November 13, 2006

PRESENT: *Members: S. Upadhyaya, N. Baumgarth, J. Gibeling, J. Gunion, L. Hunter, W. Leal, M. Macri, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, J. Schank, and R. Wu*

Representatives: T. Aguilar, E. Caswell-Chen, M. Golub, S. O'Neill, and K. Thompson

GUESTS: *Gary Sue Goodman, Chris Thaiss*

ABSENT: *Members: A. Britt, M. Farrens, and T. Kuhl*
Representatives: J. Breslin, J. Hodgson, C. Hom, and B. Pande

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Chair Upadhyaya, welcomed everyone to the second meeting. He announced that we have updated and corrected the membership list. He requested the members to let him know, if there are any errors.

Postdoctoral Scholars Assoc. (Breslin/Pande)
There were no announcements from the Postdoctoral Scholars Association

Grad Student Assist to the Dean and Chancellor (Thompson)
Kara Thompson - no announcements.

Graduate Student Association (Aguilar/Hodgson)
Thomas Aguilar - no announcements.

Chair Upadhyaya mentioned he's the representative on the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), and Matt Farrens is the alternate for the committee. Matt will be attending the CCGA meetings in place of him this winter quarter. Reen Wu is the chair of CCGA. One of the items that came up at CCGA was the recurring NRT issue. CCGA has been informed by UCOP that whatever amount of NRT is generated from a particular campus that is being returned to that campus as a part of the general budget. It doesn't come back as a separate item but is hidden inside the general budget. i.e. if the legislature approves \$100.00 for UC budget, they only give \$90.00, and expect the remaining \$10.00 to come from sources such as NRT. However, starting next academic year (2007-08) all of the NRT money will be tagged and identified as it is returned to the campuses so that each campus will know exactly how much is the NRT money. CCGA has asked Chair Upadhyaya to find out how much NRT is collected at UC Davis and what portion actually comes from graduate students. Chair Upadhyaya asked Dean Gibeling if he would provide that information to him so that he could present that information to CCGA. A formal letter from CCGA will be forthcoming.

CCGA also talked about the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minorities. They are also looking at effect of prop 209 -- what has happened 10 years later? The Chair said that they will try to get the information from UCOP first. CCGA may also ask us to collect data from our campus at a later date.

Chair Upadhyaya, also mentioned the issue surrounding Joint Ed.D review as some of the CSU's are withdrawing themselves from joint programs. This will be discussed later on the agenda.

Announcements from the Associate Dean for Research Programs - Professor O'Neill reported that she has been working with faculty and providing them with support on training grant applications. She was pleased to report that they've had some success recently -- the campus landed the Clinical Translational Science Center award from NIH. It's a 25 million dollar award that will support three training grants. There will be a celebration for getting this award on November 30, 2006, at the UCDCM. It was also announced in the Dateline two weeks ago.

Announcements from the Dean - Dean Gibeling welcomed and introduced Annik Hirshen, the new Assistant Dean in Graduate Studies. Annik is from the Office of the President where she worked in Student Affairs for the last five years working on systemwide policies -- both developing policies and helping to share them across the various campuses. She also had five years of experience at UCB generally in the area of student affairs. She's had a chance to work with undergraduate and graduate students. Dean Gibeling said that he's looking forward to her leadership. Dean Gibeling also acknowledged Marcia Thompson for stepping in and expressed his appreciation for helping out while Carla Lacey got up to speed.

Dean Gibeling talked about the in-absentia policy; he's promoting a revision to this policy. He said students only save one half of the registration fee which is \$350.00 for the entire year out of the total fees of approximately \$9,000.00. It's too much money for a student to pay when they're away from the campus. They have made some proposals and OP wants a guarantee that this will be revenue neutral, so that the system won't lose any money. The Graduate Deans have been trying to change the way registration fees are collected and Dean Gibeling is going to continue to work on this issue with the systemwide graduate Deans until they get this fixed. The Dean is also going to start working on limited registration so when a student has advanced to candidacy and is just writing their dissertation/thesis fees will decrease significantly. Some universities just charge a small amount of money when students are doing research.

Office of Graduate Studies is working on the NRC assessment project of doctoral programs, although the requirements set by the NRC keep changing. UC has asked for a delay in the implementation of some of the deadlines but we have yet to hear from NRC. The Dean encouraged Graduate Council, chairs and faculty to share information about the NRC assessment with their programs. All faculty who participate in doctoral education as defined by being on a qualifying exam committee or on a graduate group administrative committee, will receive a survey to fill out. Good response rates are critical to the value of the survey. There's a lot of data to be collected and checked. He said that we're not yet sure how the NRC intends to use the data..

Graduate enrollment is up ever so slightly, at least by half percent. Enrollment of underrepresented students is up in the ten to twenty percent range depending on which ethnicity you look up. The numbers are so small that it does not take very many people to cause a ten to twenty percent increase. For several years we've been making a change in the positive direction in that regard -- thanks to the work by Hector Cuevas, Director of Outreach, Recruitment and Retention. The campus is formulating a new enrollment plan and as these develop at UCOP, there's a consensus that the whole university needs to grow at the graduate level. This is a challenge in trying to offer the kind of support graduate students need. There is recognition at OP that having enrolled so many undergraduate students that its time to attend to graduate enrollment. We'll be doing our best to attain the goals that are set out.

Announcements from Graduate Student Association - Thomas Aguilar said that they're going to start inviting groups to come to the coffee-bagel hour, and to bring distinguished people, who come through this area, to make a presentation to students. These events get around 200-250 students. They are working on a mentoring program for graduate students to hopefully have second, third, fourth year students mentor first year students to help them feel as a part of the community and end some of the isolation, improve retention and have a better environment for incoming students. They had 35 students from the Geography group volunteer to mentor 29 students.

Announcements from the Chair - The Chair announced that we still need a fourth graduate student to represent on the Council. APD, Program Review, and Support and Welfare are all short of students. He asked Mr. Aguilar if he would look into this to get more students to participate. GC also needs another postdoc to serve on the APD committee.

Chair Upadhyaya, announced that the agenda packets are getting thicker and he would like to reduce at least a part of the packet. The informational items can be found on “mySenate” website. He suggested that everyone should go to “mySenate” to get these informational items. Or, we might put them on the Graduate Studies site. The agenda will include links to the items that you will need to look up on “mySenate.” If this is successful, we may try to move forward to electronic method of delivering the agenda by January or February. He asked Carla Lacey to find out how everyone on the Graduate Council can have access to the information on the “mySenate” website.

Chair Upadhyaya, asked about the School of Public Health Planning Committee. Professor Mueller said that the plans have been submitted to the Vice Provost and they will come to Graduate Council at some point for comments.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Graduate Student Writing – University Writing Program Assistant Director, Gary Sue Goodman and Director Chris Thaiss - The program was funded by undergraduate studies. So they were limited to what they could do for graduate students. Two years ago, Vice Provost Wood gave the go ahead to experiment with graduate students to work on their writing. Last year they received funding from Office of Graduate Studies in order to support graduate student writing. This was the beginning of the conversation about how best to develop a graduate writing program. Dr. Goodman provided information on what they’ve done on a small scale and would like to find out how they should move ahead. She would like to present the idea to the Provost to say this is what they would like to do. How should the writing of graduate students be improved? Some ideas would be to integrate writing into their current courses; have sample writing examples on line; organize a round table of faculty to have them coach graduate students on writing; collaborating w/Graduate Studies; present workshops in graduate courses. They can present these workshops in different place and some can be done in classes or TA training workshops. They can also provide individualized follow-up consultations with graduate students and design and offer credit-bearing courses in graduate writing.

Vice Chair Baumgarth, said she thinks student writing is so important and many graduate programs would benefit from the course. There could be groups of programs that would benefit. Her feeling is that every graduate student should have to be enrolled in a writing course early in their program Professor Hunter agreed and said some of the items on the list can be done and others can fit into existing courses in the departments and some of her faculty would also benefit from this program. She also said that the Arts students should be included.

Dr. Goodman said that the science groups were well attended. The information is publicized through Grad Link, but she realized that they should have informed the faculty. Professor Thaiss said that they would develop these courses working closely with the faculty.

Dean Gibeling commented that it is also important for Graduate Council to think about the resources that will be needed for the writing program. This program was set-up for undergraduates. Office of Graduate Studies is not in a position to fund additional activities in this area. If the Council would like to endorse a writing program for graduate students, it would need to take the form of a recommendation to the Provost that it be funded.

Policy and Guidelines for Graduate Academic Certificates – Dean Gibeling said the issues of certificates come from a number of discussions. A number of students in Second Language Acquisition were not following the Graduate Council rules for a designated emphasis in having someone who’s an expert in SLA on their dissertation committee, because their dissertation didn’t

deal with second language acquisition. It was a skill they wanted for teaching purposes, primarily employment. The plan is to move forward with a draft suggestion for a graduate academic certificate in SLA. It's different from a D.E. Over the summer a policy to award certificate for completing graduate curriculum was put together for currently enrolled students. (A draft of that policy was provided at the meeting for GC's consideration). The unit requirements for the certificate would be in addition to the Ph.D. degree unit requirements. The Chair requested that the Administrative Committee take a look at it and bring it back to Graduate Council meeting in January or February. There's also a certificate given by UC Extension. For example, they give a certificate in Classics. The Dean's concern is that University Extension seems to have the ability to do whatever they want in a free market private entity mode of operation that it's not clear how it intersects with undergraduate, graduate, and other kinds of education. After much discussion, it was decided the chair would send a letter to Divisional Senate Chair, Linda Bisson and ask her to look into the University Extension guidelines for establishing certificates since this issue has implications to the Undergraduate Council also. The Chair said that CCGA will also be discussing the issue of certificates.

Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction - Chair Upadhyaya, announced that the Academic Senate has requested we respond back to them regarding the proposed policy statement, by January 5, 2007. The current policies are different from campus to campus. UCEP and CCGA have proposed two new Graduate student teaching titles – Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) and Graduate Teaching Fellow (GTF). He said that one key feature of this proposal is that a faculty member should always be in charge of a course. Professor Mechling said that 1/4 of the undergraduate courses are taught by graduate students in the summer. There's a faculty overload issue because the supervising GTFs may lead to faculty overload, particularly during summer since many are nine month employees. He said Vice Provost Wood and the Undergraduate Council are concerned about this issue. Dean Gibeling said that the Graduate Teaching Fellow (GTF) isn't very different than the current Associate-In. However, a GTF would be permitted to teach graduate courses, but Council has not supported the idea of graduate students teaching graduate students in the past. Professor Mechling hasn't seen the letter that Dan Potter wrote as a response from the Undergraduate Council.

Chair Upadhyaya, said this is a serious issue and maybe the Council should form a small ad hoc committee and have them come back and report to the Council at the December meeting. If the Graduate Council wants any changes made, it needs to let the Davis Division of the Senate know. All of the Graduate Council members agreed to set-up an ad hoc committee to review the policy. The Chair said that two people each are needed from Science, Arts and Social Science. Jeffrey Schank and Jack Gunion agreed to participate on this committee. Professor Macri, agreed to chair the ad hoc committee; Shrini Upadhyaya, Kara Thompson and Michelle Stewart also agreed to participate on the ad hoc committee.

Program Review Chair Jay Mechling announced and distributed the list of program reviews that will be initiated for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Proposal for the Re-Review of UC/CSU Joint Ed.D Programs – Chair Upadhyaya announced that CCGA is proposing review procedures for joint Ed.D programs as some of the CSU's are leaving the Ed.D Program. If there is a small change in the degree program as a result of CSU's departure, it would come to the Graduate Council for review. It will also be sent to CCGA at the same time. If there are major changes in degree requirements, it would go through the regular review process. If programs pull out, what should be done? Dean Gibeling said that if a CSU

partner pulls out, the question is whether the UC partner has the resources to offer the program. The joint program with Fresno would be ended since Fresno is pulling out. But the joint program with Sac. State and Sonoma State will continue so all of the resources will be transferred over. If Sac. State decides to pull out, which is a possibility, then joint Ed. D. with Sonoma State will have to be reconsidered.

CONSENT ITEMS

Minutes of the October 9, 2006 meeting – the Chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. None were voiced. The minutes will be placed on the Graduate Council web-site and also on MySenate.

ACTION ITEMS

Academic Senate Regulation 520C - Dissertation Plans, EPC recommendation for rewording Plans A, B, and C – Professors Hunter and Gunion were on EPC last year. The Chair reported that no substantive changes were made; they were reworded to make sure they are more understandable and are internally consistent. Professor Hunter said that it was sent off to two members of the committee for review. Part of the documents was in point form and the other was in prose. They don't say anything different. Professor Mueller was concerned about the wording and it was suggested that Plans A and C be further clarified; Dean Gibeling suggested wording changes that were adopted. The Graduate Council voted in favor of the amendment. A **Motion** to accept the wording, as amended by Dean Gibeling was seconded and carried.

Request for Changes in the DE in Biotechnology – Professor Hunter said EPC reviewed and agreed to the requested changes. Council approved the changes as outlined in the letter, dated October 30, 2006 from Dr. Dandekar, Chair Designated Emphasis in Biotechnology (DEB).

Proposal for a Concurrent DE in Critical Theory and Feminist Theory and Research – Professor Hunter presented this proposal and Graduate Council felt that the program needed to provide additional information before it could make a decision on this request. Some of the problems with the request were: What will appear on the diploma? Who is going to track the DE the student is completing and will a chair be appointed to the second DE? The Council suggested that this proposal should go back to EPC for further discussion.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Due to time constraints, the subcommittee reports were skipped. Chair Upadhyaya announced that all of the subcommittees are performing their tasks well.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Changes to Degree requirements in Civil and Environmental Engineering – Chair Upadhyaya informed Graduate Council that the program requested the approval for the adoption of an exit seminar requirement, for their Doctoral Dissertation Plan B. The Chair said that the request is straight forward and it will be approved as of today, November 13, 2006.

Academic Senate (Systemwide) proposed changes to Senate Bylaw 205 – Chair Upadhyaya said the systemwide Rules and Jurisdiction Committee, UCRJ, is being expanded from a five member committee to a seven member committee with a vice chair. This committee hasn't been meeting regularly due to various reasons which have made it difficult for the committee to respond to questions in a timely manner. For example, Davis Division of the Academic Senate and Chair's Advisory Committee (CAC) has requested clarifications on "Academic Senate Regulation 904 and Bylaw 80D." The Chair said that they did not respond to this request for quite sometime causing undue delays. The Davis Division and GC have now received the UCRJ resolution – SR 904 stands, i.e., the authority to disqualify a graduate student belongs to the Graduate Dean. Chair noted that the change in the structure of UCRJ would be beneficial as it may avoid excessive delay in rulings.

Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees: Chair included just three pages (two tables and one page that lists six proposed guiding principles) from Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional Fees as informational item to the GC, since he felt that the way the professional school fees have skyrocketed in the last ten years was astounding.

System-wide Review of the Universitywide Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) Report "Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at UC: IRB Operations and the Researcher's Experience" This item was deferred to the December meeting of the council.

Unfinished business dealt through e-mail correspondence

The informational items included in the agenda are proposed changes to guidelines, policies, regulations etc., or reports that have come to GC from the Davis Division of the Academic Senate or the Systemwide Academic Senate. GC has the choice of providing its feedback to them or ignoring them altogether. Chair Upadhyaya said that if an item deals directly with the Graduate Student Education or Training such as "Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction", GC should definitely discuss it at the council and provide its feedback. If the proposed items have indirect impact on the Graduate Education, GC should consider providing its feedback. Other items may not have much of an impact on Graduate Education and GC can ignore them. With this in mind following items were handled through e-mail correspondence subsequent to the meeting:

1. Five-year Review of the Center for Health Services Research in Primary Care (CHSRPC) 1999 THROUGH 2004 (attachment 2.12): Based on the e-mail discussion, GC provided the following comments to Davis Division of the Academic Senate:

"The Center for Health Services Research in Primary Care (CHSPRC) is playing a major role in training Graduate Students, particularly those in the field of epidemiology, but also some in the field of statistics, sociology, Chicano/a Studies and other social and clinical sciences. It has also contributed to Postdoctoral training through Primary Care Outcomes Research (PCOR) Fellowship. It is a highly successful ORU that has brought national reputation to UC Davis in health policy and health care research. GC also agrees with the proposed name change to "Center for Health Care Policy and Research" since the new name would better reflect activities of the center. The establishment of a School of Public Health would have significant implications on this ORU. GC echoes the sentiment expressed by the report that any such activity should be closely coordinated with the School of Medicine. Overall, GC is very

supportive of the recommendations of this review team that CHSPRC be continued as an independent ORU.”

2. System-wide Review of the Recommendations from the Joint Academic Senate and UCOP Workgroup on Recycling Multi-campus Research Units (MRU) funds (attachments 2.15): Based on extensive e-mail discussion, GC provided following comments to Davis Division of the Academic Senate:

GC agrees that MRUs are critical for positioning UC to address new and emerging areas of research using the talent pool and facilities that exist at various campuses within the UC system. It is likely that these MRUs will lead to additional opportunities for Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Training. However, continuation of existing MRUs indefinitely and establishment of new MRUs may divert UC internal resources from established areas of strength within the UC system. In view of this, GC concurs with the workgroup recommendations that there be no expectation for continued funding beyond the first five years for any of the MRUs and oversight by an Advisory Board is appropriate. However, GC feels strongly that as UC expands and opportunities for new MRU efforts multiply, attempts should be made to provide additional resources for worthy MRUs. In the absence of additional funding for MRUs, the continuing MRUs have to self-sustain or compete with new MRUs for UC internal resources. Furthermore, GC emphasizes the need to make sure that approval or continuation of MRUs should take into account the contribution of the MRU to Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Scholar training.

Meeting adjourned.