

**Minutes**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**February 15, 2007**

**PRESENT:** *Members:* N. Baumgarth, A. Britt, J. Gibeling, J. Gunion, L. Hunter, W. Leal, M. Macri, J. Mechling, J. Schank, S. Upadhyaya  
*Representatives:* T. Aguilar, J. Breslin, E. Caswell-Chen, C. Hom, S. O'Neill, C. Simmons, K. Thompson  
*Graduate Studies attendees:* H. Cuevas, K. Garcia, C. Jurado, A. Hirshen, Lee Wilce

**ABSENT:** *Members:* M. Farrens, T. Kuhl, H. Mueller, R. Wu  
*Representatives:* M. Golub, J. Hodgson, B. Pande  
*Analyst:* Carla Lacey

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Announcements from the Chair (Upadhyaya)**

Chair Upadhyaya reminded Council of the decision to change the meeting format because nearly half the time was spent on announcements in the January meeting. The new format will include short announcements from the Chair and the Dean, and all of the representative will have the opportunity to make announcements at the end of the meeting.

The Chair announced that Carla requested you go to MySenate website and enter your availability for the spring quarter. The spring quarter meetings are harder to schedule because we have to make sure the PRC liaisons are available. Kathy Garcia and Carla will work together on the spring quarter meeting schedule. Carla will also send you a calendar grid as well, but please go to the MySenate website and update your calendar as soon as possible.

The Chair said that there was a conflict in scheduling Graduate Council meetings with Executive Council and we will try to avoid this in the spring quarter. The problem is that Graduate Council and the Executive Council meetings were both scheduled on February 15<sup>th</sup> and March 15<sup>th</sup>. This quarter Matt Farrens is representing the Graduate Council at the Executive Council. Apparently, the MySenate calendar does not recognize two different meetings at the same time. For spring quarter, Graduate Council will either have to have an additional meeting or have a longer meeting with working lunch. The Chair said that last

year the Graduate Council had to meet in July, but many members were not available to attend the July meeting. Therefore, he would like to schedule the last meeting after classes end.

The Chair deferred the second announcement regarding NRT to later in the meeting.

### **Announcements from the Dean (Gibeling)**

Dean Gibeling reported that graduate applications are up about 10% more than last year, mainly from international applicants, but there's also a slight increase in domestic applicants compared to last year.

As Council knows from periodic e-mails from Graduate Studies and announcements from various other places the National Research Council (NRC) assessment of doctoral programs is still underway. Many Graduate Council members are involved in doctoral education or have mentored students within the last five years. In this case, Council members would have received a request to fill out the faculty survey. The Dean encouraged Council members to fill out the survey. He told Council that we'll have the best outcome if we have a high response rate and it will give the best and truest picture of our graduate programs. He told Council that Yuhang Shi, Director of Analysis and Information Services along with Lee Wilce have been responsible for the success of this assessment.

The Dean said that once the NRC assessment is completed we will want to look at the data on campus to see how we can enhance the quality of our own graduate programs. This may be in connection with the program review or in connection with the work that APD has been performing. The Dean said that it will be a while before we have access to the data

The Dean mentioned the incident in which an undergrad had a mock assault rifle in the Mathematic Building and was detained. He is a NROTC student at Berkeley and had to return the training rifle to Berkeley. He didn't have a ride so he had the weapon in his possession. The real challenge now is that another graduate student was detained at Dutton Hall. The student who was detailed was African and the student who had the mock assault rifle was Caucasian. This incident is contributing in a new way to an old problem, which is the perception of climate for African American/African graduate students on the Davis campus and in the Davis community and it's in a negative way. The mock weapon incident is over but the other piece will continue. This affects the climate for graduate students and wanting them to succeed. This is going to be a big challenge in our efforts to diversify the graduate population and to make sure that UC Davis is seen as a welcoming and inviting community for students from all backgrounds.

Professor Gunion, asked if any one has surveyed the minority groups in graduate education to see what their issues might be? The Dean said that we work closely with the different groups on campus, but we haven't conducted a survey. There are organizations; such as the Black Graduate and Professional Association, and several others. Hector Cuevas and Tom Aguilar remain in touch with a variety of different groups and organizations and

individuals across the campus and you may have read that African-Americans are concerned about how they are treated by the Davis Police.

Tom Aguilar said that he is preparing a letter for the administration along with people from the Cross Cultural Center and various groups on campus to request that we do a survey in order to find out if we are providing a welcoming environment for everybody. He told the Council that if we are going to create diversity we need to make sure people feel they are a part of the community and that they feel welcomed. He also said that he doesn't think anything has been done, but UC Davis needs to do something and have documentation on the environment.

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

The Chair said that we have three consent items.

#### **Minutes of the January 25, 2007 meeting – DRAFT**

(Approved Minutes are posted on the Web at

<http://gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/gradcouncil.htm>)

#### **Affiliation of the Graduate Program in Applied Science with the DE in Biotechnology**

Approved

#### **DE name change from Program in International Nutrition to the Program in International and Community Nutrition**

Approved

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **APD Charges – Availability of faculty time to graduate education**

The Chair distributed two handouts, a letter to Academic Planning and Development (APD) chair, written by the Chair, Dean Gibeling and Vice Chair Baumgarth and some information from Vice Chair Baumgarth's original report.

Vice Chair Baumgarth reported that APD has tried to identify the obstacles to graduate education, and the report will show how we can improve. She reported that now that we've had unrestricted growth, added new programs, we need to look at how we might better use resources. She also told Council that NRT is a big problem. Another challenge to enhancing graduate education is the lack of faculty time for graduate education. She said that there is no way to immediately take care of this situation. One of the problems is that we do not have FTEs to give out. Another approach is to look at strategic planning and look at the 83 graduate programs. A suggestion is to link graduate groups based on the dendogram included in the APD report. This means linking graduate groups based on the departmental affiliation of their members. She explained that if you have one faculty member who is a member of two different graduate groups the graduate groups become

linked because they have the same department affiliation. The closer they are linked, the closer the programs are on the dendrogram.

There are clusters of groups and APD identified key challenges. They overlaid the occurrences of the key challenges for each of the graduate groups. They were able to identify that certain clusters of groups had the same problems, i.e. Engineering graduate groups had a problem with technical support.

Vice Chair Baumgarth said that few can use this dendrogram as a starting point. She would like Academic Planning and Development (APD) to look at what we can do to facilitate the graduate programs to start thinking of themselves as part of a cluster and help them to see that this is a good idea to lobby for more resources.

The Chair said that giving this charge to APD is the next step to take and he asked if Council needed a formal motion. Dean Gibeling said that a formal motion was not needed and the charge was given to APD.

### **Concurrent DE in Critical Theory and Feminist Theory and Research**

The Chair introduced the Concurrent DE in Critical Theory and Feminist Theory and Research and reported that he and Professor Hunter, Chair of Educational Policy Committee (EPC) have come up with an idea. Professor Hunter presented the ideal to the Council. She told them that instead of a concurrent DE we could follow the pattern that already exist for a double MA and have a double DE. The pattern for a double MA states that 12 units or nearly a third of the unit requirements could overlap.

In the case of the two DEs in Critical Theory and Feminist Theory and Research which require four courses each, with the new plan students would have a total of six courses; thus leading to an overlap of two courses. The Chair said that this would not affect the program review. This would be similar to a second master's degree that is currently on the books. The Chair handed out a description for Graduate Council to review. He told the Council that for the qualifying exam the student must have one member from each DE, and for the dissertation committee, there will be a member from each of the DE's. The Chair asked the Council if they thought this was an acceptable compromise.

Professor Gunion asked if it would be reasonable to think that EPC should approve this on a case by case basis.

Professor Hunter responded and said that at least the overlap part of the DE courses should be determined by EPC on a case by case basis. The Chair said that the statement that was handed out and discussed is something that EPC could look at and use it as a guide in order to come up with a policy.

The Dean said it will be up to the faculty of the DE to tell Graduate Studies when the student has satisfied the DE requirements. He said that maybe we should set an upper limit to shared courses. The Dean asked for a rewording of first sentence of statement, especially "substantial overlap." He thought the duplicate of master's degrees is somewhat

different. If you are counting course work for degrees they must have some relationship, i.e. you are not going to count Art History courses for a Civil Engineering degree.

Professor Britt asked whether DEs are extra work on top of Ph.D. Professor Hunter said in this case it makes sense to take courses in Critical Theory and Feminist Theory that meet the needs of both.

Professor Gunion reiterated that this is something that needs to be done on a case by case basis and EPC should present the request along with their decision to the Graduate Council. He said that he can also see all kinds of variations.

Vice Chair Baumgarth told Council that she supports Professor Britt's comment and said that we do not like the idea of combined degrees. We don't want to give a student two DE's without doing extra work.

Professor Hunter said that she will take the comments back to EPC.

Professor Macri said that we shouldn't make extra work for ourselves and suggested that the graduate adviser of the student should determine what's appropriate and determine the exceptions.

Professor Mechling said two things were bumping into each other. On the one hand we need a simple system where you can easily see that the student received two DEs. He told the Council that right now for undergrads it's a simple system. If a student does a double major two classes can overlap, and between a major and a minor one course can overlap. The second issue is that the faculty members who are reviewing the DEs will have to sit down and think about what their lists look like. This will invite good things to happen in thinking about where there are courses and where there's some overlap. He also said that some models should be available for students. He didn't think there should be a case by case basis for saying yes and no and we have to trust the faculty to look at the courses. The Chair said that the draft can go back to EPC for revision. He would like for them to review it and have the right language included so we can make this a policy. Professor Leal made the motion to send the draft to EPC and Professor Gunion second the motion. All were in favor.

The discussion continued. Professor Mechling asked how many students are doing more than one DE. Cathy Jurado, said she knows it happens in the humanities, especially Critical Theory and Feminist Theory & Research. Professor Mechling asked for examples of a couple of models (programs of study) in each of the disciplinary areas. Cathy Jurado will provide some examples

### **NRT proposal**

The Chair said this information goes with the same report that Vice Chair Baumgarth discussed earlier. He told the Council that NRT is a major concern for most of the graduate groups. It's especially a concern for students in Arts and Humanities. If you look at the memorial, it states that we should get rid of NRT. If it is not practical to eliminate it

outright, it should be eliminated starting from year two. He also told the Council that at the systemwide level there is some pressure to eliminate NRT starting in the student's second year. The Governor has proposed an additional ten million dollars into the next year's budget for graduate education.

The Chair said that using the student numbers on the Office of Graduate Studies as a guide, he has looked at the possibility of eliminating NRT in lieu of the Provost's 25% buyback plan. He showed some computations that indicated that with some additional anticipated support from the Office of the President (about \$1.4 million from UCOP) and the 2.5 million dollars earmarked for the buyback program, it may be possible to completely eliminate NRT for all nonresident students starting with year two. He described details of his computations and several alternatives he explored. The chair outlined some of the other events that have occurred prior to bringing this proposal to the Council.

The Chair said he discussed the proposal with the Administrative Committee in December and with Dean Gibeling soon thereafter. The Chair said there's a monthly meeting between the Provost and Senate Chairs and he has brought this issue to Provost's attention. The Chair told the Council that he met with the Academic Senate Chair Linda Bisson and the planning and budget chair, [Bruno Nachtergaele](#), and discussed his proposal. They looked at the numbers and presented the details to the Provost at the Senate Chairs meeting and she said that she is interested in looking at the figures.

Based on all the discussions and alternatives, he mentioned that the alternative which leads to the elimination of NRT for all nonresident students starting with the second year in lieu of Provost's buyback plan is an attractive one. However, the plan requires that international students complete Master's degree in two years or Advanced to Candidacy in their doctoral program in two years. Under this plan the Graduate program pays the NRT during the first year (perhaps using block grants and other resources), the campus pays NRT during the second year, and regents take care of the NRT for three years after a doctoral student has advanced to candidacy. Vice Chair Baumgarth asked about the wording "the Regents pay three years NRT?" The Chair said once the doctoral student has advanced to candidacy the NRT is eliminated. The wording will be changed saying that the Regents will take care of NRT for three years.

The Chair said there is one small problem; even if we get the 1.4 million from the additional funds and with the Provost's buyback plan of 2.5 million reach almost 4 million and that takes care of the second year NRT, several proposals have gone out this year with the buyback included in it and the Provost has already committed 25% buy back. This could cost an additional \$500,000.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chan asked if after 5 years, the NRT for graduates goes back up to full NRT and for the Masters program it goes back up after 2 years. Professor Leal said the goal here is to pay what we have in place, but it would also become an incentive to have more international students. Programs could end up with more International students and where will the money come from?

The Chair said that NRT is part of the budget and that money comes back to the campus as tagged money instead of part of general money and hopefully that money will be used to solve the NRT problem. Vice Chair Baumgarth asked where the extra money is coming from. She said she's concerned that if the Governor commits ten million dollars to graduate education, then everything will go into eliminating NRT.

The Dean told council that the ten million dollars is for student support only. He said that the Chairs plan says that if a program is using money to provide non resident tuition (NRT) to second year students you save that block grant money but you don't save anything on the first year. If your program is organized where all of your block grant goes to first year students and the students in their second year are getting NRT some other way then there's not a huge change except in the second year.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen said he would suggest that the five year and two year limit be "explicit" and included in this proposal. The Chair said it would be explicit, 2 years for a Masters and 5 years for a Ph.D., or two years for a Ph.D before they advance to candidacy.

Vice Chair Baumgarth said that she's worried that if all the money goes to NRT, then the rush to advance to candidacy in two years would be a rigid schedule but it would be doable.

The Chair reported that the Provost expressed interest in coming to a Council meeting in February or March, but she wasn't available. The Council will invite her to come to a meeting in the spring. If the Provost isn't available to attend a scheduled Council meeting we may call an additional short meeting. The Chair asked Council to think of a way to design a formal proposal either to the Academic Senate or the Provost. The Chair said that he will work on the proposal with the Dean.

### **Doctoral Qualifying Examinations**

The Chair distributed handouts of the revised policy on Doctoral Qualifying Examinations. He told Council that the Administrative committee reviewed the policy and came up with a few changes. Most of the changes involved wording changes only. The administrative committee reviewed the policy and removed some redundant wording in the second paragraph since it was repeated at the end of the first paragraph.

The Chair said that Professor Leal was concerned that the make up of the qualifying examination committee of five members in the current policy was very confusing. So he talked to the Dean and revised this part to make it clearer. The main change was to decrease the requirement for the number of Academic Senate members on the committee from at least four to at least three. This change makes it possible to have an outside member; one member who is not a senate faculty member, and three senate faculty members on the qualifying examination committee. In addition, the Administrative Committee changed the QE committee membership part to bullet format from the existing paragraph format to enhance clarity.

The Dean mentioned that last year Council worked on the process of the QE, especially the essentials for the disability center. The breadth requirement was changed.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen suggested an additional wording change in the document which would require the QE committee to look at student's entire academic record.

On page 4 of the third paragraph is how the disability will be handled.

Professor Leal said that we have discussed membership in graduate programs; we have clarified who can and who can not be a member. By saying a graduate program member cannot chair a committee, we will have a problem with bylaws, which states there must be just one tier of membership and now we are saying someone cannot be chair of committee if they are not an academic senate member. The Dean said that the word that got lost is "normally", it used to say the chair of the committee is "normally" a member of the Academic Senate. This change was incorporated into the revision. Carol Hom questioned the first bullet and wanted to know if we want to say five faculty members? So this was changed to five members.

Professor Macri said when you remove "normally" instead of "at least three", it changes the meaning and it might be better to say normally. The Chair said that we will say; five members, normally 3 of the members will be members of the student's graduate program.

Professor Leal said that we now need to change the guidelines because they are contradictory. There are policies and guidelines on the web and the guidelines need to be updated. The chair said that the policies should have been updated. He will look into it.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen said that on bullet number 4, there's a missing right parenthesis. This was corrected.

Associate Dean O'Neill asked the Council to look at page four under point three. She provided suggestions for restructuring this information. She suggested that Council pull out the disability wording and put it in a different place, and edit the document a little more. The Dean said that Graduate Council approved this policy last year. He also suggested restructuring the first page and suggested changes on the second page.

Vice Chair Baumgarth moved to approve the revised document with Council's additional edits and Professor Mechling seconded the motion. The vote in favor was unanimous.

The discussion continued. Professor Mechling asked when the revised policy will be distributed to graduate program chairs. The Chair said the revised policy will go into effect as of today and the Dean will send an official notification out to the chairs.

\*\*\*

### **Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Grading Option**

The Chair told Council that the S/U policy was a left over item from last year. Professor Gunion told Council that the policy should not include "under any circumstances". The Chair said that this is the current policy and no changes have been made. The Administrative Committee felt that the policy should remain the same, but just reword it so it's clear to students and the student will know when they can and can't take a

course on S/U. Right now, there are only two rules and one is - if you have not advanced to candidacy you can not take a course for S/U, the other one is if you have advanced to candidacy you can take any course on an S/U basis. There is an exception, if the Graduate Council has given prior approval to the Graduate Program; certain course can be taken on an S/U basis. There were some concerns that the policy does not clearly specify when Master's students can or can not take courses on an S/U basis.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised S/U policy as is. A vote was taken, two members were in favor and others opposed. The S/U policy will go back to the Administrative Committee for revision.

### **Foreign Language TA**

This item was deferred due to lack of time but the information will be included in the next agenda packet.

### **UCD Master's Thesis Definition**

This item was also deferred, but it will be included in the March 15<sup>th</sup> agenda.

### **Senate-wide review: Senate Regulations 694 and proposed new regulation 695**

The Chair distributed the regulations so that Council could see the revisions to 694 and the new regulation.

He said that 694 is an existing policy and there are some changes. The first change is that extension does not have to be involved in an off campus instruction. It also defines what site is not an "off campus". A remote center or a satellite campus is not off campus. The Dean said there are a lot of off campus sites such as Bodega bay, Graduate School of Management at the San Ramon Campus, etc. Under this revision they will be considered on-campus.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen asked what is meant by "significant participation". The Chair said that there was a lot of discussion about this issue at CCGA and it did not want to include a number. They discussed this extensively and left it loose and did not want to define it. The other important point is that if you have a program and ¼ of the unit value moves from on campus to off campus, or off campus to on campus CCGA should be notified and the program should contact them directly. The Chair said he didn't understand why a program would contact CCGA directly and not include the local Graduate Council. The Chair said that he's suggesting that the notification should go to CCGA through the local Graduate Council.

The Chair discussed regulation 695. It defines what remote education means and read A&B to the Council. This clearly defines what on campus means and thereby implicitly defines what off-campus is. However, it may be worth adding a sentence that "all other modes of electronic delivery would be off-campus."

The Chair asked Council to submit any comments to him by e-mail so he can respond to the Davis Division of the Academic Senate by 3/8/07.

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

**Graduate Student Writing**

Deferred due to lack of time

**ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES**

No further announcements due to lack of time

Meeting adjourned (at 4:02 p.m.)