

**MINUTES  
GRADUATE COUNCIL  
May 17, 2007**

**PRESENT:** *Members:* N. Baumgarth, A. Britt, J. Gibeling, J. Gunion, W. Leal, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, M. Macri, S. Upadhyaya,

*Representatives:* T. Aguilar, J. Breslin, E. Caswell-Chen, M. Golub, C. Hom, C. Simmons, K. Thompson

*Graduate Studies Attendees:* Kathy Garcia, Annik Hirshen, Cathy Jurado,

**ABSENT:** *Members:* M. Farrens, L. Hunter, T. Kuhl, J. Schank, R. Wu

*Representatives:* B. Pande, J. Hodgson

**GUESTS:** Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Virginia Hinshaw, Associate Vice Chancellor Kelly Ratliff, Lisa Dorn

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Announcements from the Chair (Upadhyaya)**

Chair Upadhyaya made the following announcements:

- ⌚ The letter written by the Council to CCGA explaining the procedure used in reviewing and approving the Master's of Public Health (MPH) Phase II proposal was accepted and retained by CCGA for its record.
- ⌚ The School of Public Health (SPH) proposal was revised and it included Council's comments. The Executive Council will review the proposal on May 17, 2007. The oversight of the Graduate Programs will reside with Graduate Council and Office of Graduate Studies similar to UC Berkeley model. Faculty who are not affiliated with SPH will receive credit for teaching and advising graduate students enrolled in the SPH. The funding for SPH will come from the State and other external sources. The Chair thanked Professor Mueller for his efforts in assisting the Council in preparing a draft of the response letter to the original SPH proposal.
- ⌚ DDR 520C - Dissertation Plans ABC will be considered at the Executive Council meeting on May 17, 2007. The regulation will be presented to the Representative Assembly (RA) on June 7, 2007 as a reworded regulation to enhance clarity

without any substantive change. The Chair informed Council that we cannot make any changes at this point. The Chair encouraged the members to attend this RA meeting on June 7<sup>th</sup> from 2 to 4 PM to show their support to the policy.

- ⌚ The Chair mentioned that the proposed policy on “Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction” has been revised by CCGA and UCEP. The revised draft of the policy permits the graduate student TAs to retain the “Instructor of Record” title, if they take full responsibility for a course. The policy is being finalized by CCGA.
- ⌚ The Chair informed Council that he and Dean Gibeling met with the Provost and discussed funding for graduate education, particularly the NRT issue. The Provost feels it’s important to give something back to those who generate funding, and she’s committed to the buy-down program. She would also like to help resolve the funding problems faced by the Humanities and Arts Programs. She will join Council later in the meeting and members will have an opportunity to listen to her and ask questions.

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

The Dean announced that the Sacramento Bee published an article regarding the numbers of female students earning graduate degrees in Science and Math. The title of the Article was ‘Ph.D gender gap in sciences thins’. The writer looked at computer science, the physical science, mathematics and engineering degrees. Professor Kuhl and one of our UC LEADS students were highlighted in the article. The Dean told Council that he would provide them with an electronic copy of the article.

The Dean announced that there has not been much recent activity on the NRC assessment. He said that the response rate to student questionnaires was higher than the response rate from faculty.

The Environmental Policy and Management proposal has been submitted to CCGA for review. The Dean informed Council that future proposals for new graduate programs must have a realistic budget upon submission and that an agreement to provide funding will be part of the approval process.

A CSU/UC faculty summit was held last week under the auspices of the UC AGEF program. The goal of the summit was to identify ways to strengthen the pipeline for talented doctoral students in California. It is likely that this was the first time that faculty from all 33 CSU and UC campus met.

The invitations for commencement have been sent out to Council members. This year we are making an effort to reduce the time of the ceremony, and Council is invited to share any suggestions on ways to reduce the time. The Provost will be the Presiding Officer this year.

## CONSENT ITEMS

Minutes of April 19, 2007 (the Chair asked Council to respond by e-mail if they have any changes).

QE Decision 4 to 1 – The Chair told Council that if the vote is 4 pass to 1 fail on a QE, it now comes to the Administrative Committee for a final decision. The Administrative Committee may collect additional information from the QE committee members. However, it usually sides with the majority vote. In years past, Dean has usually dealt with 4:1 decision. The chair proposed that 4:1 decision on QE be delegated to the Dean. Vice Chair Baumgarth told Council that it's helpful to receive written comments from each of the committee members. The Dean suggested that the Chair of the QE should provide a report stating there was a split decision and have each member submit a written report. The Council agreed with the proposed change.

Master of Laws PRC Report - approved

Art History Graduate Program Bylaws (not approved please send comments to the Chair)

DE in Reproductive Biology Bylaws -approved

Philosophy Graduate Program Bylaws - approved

Biophysics Graduate Group Bylaws – approved subject to minor changes.

Biostatistics Graduate Group Bylaws - approved

## PROVOST'S VISIT

Provost Hinshaw was the guest at today's meeting. The Provost told Council that UC Davis has come a long way and has made a lot of progress during the past six years, but we're now trying to strengthen the core. We've had a lot of growth in faculty. We're going to need a longer term enrollment plan, and to consider which areas we need to grow and also address the issue of do we want to grow? UCD has approximately 30,000 students (graduate, professional and undergraduate) enrolled currently and the campuswide discussion needs to be about how much, if any, growth we want.

In regards to the budget, she said that we do need more money. We received growth offsets but we also received some cuts. Legislators consider primarily the numbers of undergraduates when looking at UC enrollments and the Governor hasn't changed the compact yet. The Health Sciences areas are growing and the university is working on plans for the School of Public Health. The university has been successful in keeping graduate fees down and Nonresident Tuition has not increased. There has also been a 52% increase in research awards at UC Davis. The Office of the President has come up

with an additional funding of \$10 million for graduate student support. The UC Davis share is about \$1.3 million. However, this has a matching requirement and we are currently working to see how to satisfy this requirement. The Provost stressed the need to obtain endowment funds to support graduate education. The Provost also told Council that Development Officer should be able to assist in raising endowments.

The Chair mentioned that approximate cost of eliminating NRT for second year students across the whole system is about \$20 million. If campuses matched the \$10 million from UCOP, then second year NRT could be completely eliminated. However, if campuses do not have the resources to match, he wondered whether the Office of the President should have reduced the second year NRT by 50% now and tried to eliminate it all together in the future once additional resources became available. He mentioned that one major drawback of NRT is the pressure some nonresident students are facing in advancing to candidacy as soon as possible. The Provost felt that although she wants many issues facing graduate education including NRT to be resolved, it should be done at the system wide level. UC Davis should be appealing to the state about graduate fees as a whole and not just about Nonresident Tuition (NRT). She will be leaving a list of issues with Barbara Horowitz, Interim Provost, once she leaves the campus. Council can also send questions to Kelly Ratliff. She mentioned that new buildings, operating costs on the campus, and start up costs of new faculty are placing a tremendous strain on the available resources.

Vice Chair Baumgarth shared information from a document called “Graduate Education at UC Davis, Challenges and Solutions.” She informed the Provost that graduate group’s work, but they are starting to hurt the campus and one of the problems that they face is a lack of faculty commitment. She said that each of the programs should have an MOU with the department chair. The MOU would indicate which classes the department is responsible for teaching and this should also be endorsed by the Deans. The Provost commented and said that a number of Deans feel that it’s working this way. Dean Gibeling said that the Vice Chair’s plan should be implemented.

The Vice Chair also said that there isn’t funding available for the graduate groups and the Dean’s offer no support. She feels that faculty should commit to teaching classes and graduate groups should find a way to link together.

Although, the graduate groups do not receive an operating budget, the Dean said that they do receive funding for administrative support and we should look into how much money is used for staff dollars.

Before the Provost left the meeting, she told Council that UC Davis has the right structure and it’s a very good time for us. The chair thanked the Provost and Kelly Ratliff for taking time from their busy schedule to come to the Council and discuss issues facing Graduate Education on the Davis campus.

## ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Education (MA) PRC report – Professor Carolyn de la Peña

Professor Mechling prefaced the discussion by noting that PRC is looking at several reviews and Council will notice consistency between the PRC reports and the ad hoc committee reports for the Ph.D. programs. This format will allow PRC to complete reviews faster. Occasionally, there are members on the Council who are from a particular group. If the review of that group is being discussed by the Council, the member or members will not participate in the discussions. However, if they are asked they can clarify issues raised. But if the Chair of the group being reviewed is a member of the Council, s/he will excuse herself/himself during the Council deliberations. He said that since Graduate Council has read the reports the reviewers will not need to go into all of the details.

Professor de la Peña presented the Education (MA) PRC report and said that the reviewers were able to identify several useful issues. The students gave a positive response to the program, but they feel like they are under pressure to come up with research projects during their first year since the MA in education follows master's Plan I (thesis option). The Dean asked if the committee felt the students could complete everything in one year. Professor de la Peña responded and said that the students come through with a heavy mentoring system and all of the students are doing the same thing at the same time. She also identified several questions: Are there too many students in the program? Should they limit the number of students in the program? The reviewers felt that the program needs to be told that they need to listen to what their students have to say. One of the recommendations was to increase the number of students in MA General Track in order to ensure the viability of that option. Students in that track know what an MA is and they do not want it combined with the MA/Credential students. The MA/Credential students feel that they are getting a unique experience, but the MA General students did not feel that way. Some MA General student wants to pursue a Ph.D. but they've been discouraged to apply.

Professor de la Peña told the Council that the admission requirements for the MA students should be relaxed so that more students could be admitted. Dean Gibeling mentioned that currently the program is allowed to accept 5% of the students with GPAs below the campus minimum. Given the success of these students, Professor de la Peña requested the Council and Dean to let the graduate program increase that percentage. Dean Gibeling said that he will consider such a request from the program favorably.

It was pointed out that on page 1 of the report, the GPA numbers were reversed. This will be corrected.

The Vice Chair moved a motion to accept the report and the motion was seconded and accepted. The Chair will send the School of Education a transmittal letter.

The Chair asked Council to submit any comments that they have regarding the Consent items to him via e-mail.

Graduate Program Membership item was deferred to the June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.