

GRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES

Wednesday, October 15, 2008

ATTENDEES: Buckpitt, Degnan, Farnham, Friesner, Gunion, Goodhue, Knoesen, Martin, May, Nincic, O'Donnell, Schank, Singleton, Weare

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Gibeling, Hodgson, Stimson, Stott, Tassone, Watts

GUESTS: Joy Sirikanchana (PSA)

Meeting began at 3:00 p.m.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

Chair Gunion announced that the Chairs Advisory Committee met and discussed the best way to proceed with the June 2008, *APD Report on Graduate Education at UC Davis* (<http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/APD%20Report%20Grad%20Education%202008.pdf>).

CAC recommend a two-pronged process: 1) Dean Gibeling should discuss the report with Deans and start vetting the recommendations; 2) Chair Gunion should discuss the report with the Academic Senate Executive Council. Once the Dean and Chair have received feedback from those two bodies, Council will be able to determine next best steps.

Dean Gibeling submitted a written announcement to the Chair which was read during the meeting:

Let me start with a general commentary regarding the current financial reality. As most Council members will know, the budget for the State of California is not in good shape. With the Legislature and the Governor having just adopted a budget for the current fiscal year, the State now finds that revenue in support of that budget is falling below projections owing to the general state of the national economy. We have been advised that mid-year budget cuts are a distinct possibility. These cuts would come on top of the 7% cut already imposed for the current year and the expected further cut for 2009-2010. In total, we could be looking at cuts of up to 20% over two years and an uncertain future after that. Cuts of this magnitude will require fundamental changes in the way we do business in the University.

In recent budget reductions, graduate student support has been protected. I would not be surprised if this category is cut in the coming year. Even if we receive no increases, there will most likely be an increase in fees that will erode the value of our current funds. If this is the case, we will need to look seriously at changing the allocation of funds to graduate programs, with the possibility that I will need to make some difficult decisions to reduce funding to programs that are not performing at a level of excellence that is appropriate. Of course, I will consult with Graduate Council if such reductions become necessary. We will also need to reduce administrative support for graduate groups. I don't believe this can be done across-the-board, given that such support is already below what is needed. Again, such reductions may have a greater impact on some programs than others. In the extreme, we will need to consider closing graduate groups or at least suspending admissions. Of course, we must think very carefully before initiating any new graduate programs and ensure that full funding for their operation can be obtained from the campus or the lead academic dean.

I am deeply concerned about our ability to even maintain, let alone improve, the quality of graduate education at UC Davis over the next 2-3 years. We will need to make strategic decisions, some of which will most likely be painful, if we are to avoid overall mediocrity.

Chair Gunion announced that he had been informed by the Academic Senate Chair Powell that the **School of Nursing** proposal had been approved at the Davis Divisional level (there was some question as to that). Council expressed concern that it had not seen a final version of the proposal. It had seen a version about which it had concerns and had written a statement expressing these concerns to Linda Bisson in the last year. Council discussed attachment 1.1, Dean Gibeling's update on Nursing proposals, from which it seems that the SON will definitely be working through the Council committees to get approval of detailed plans and will be forwarding a detailed proposal for implementation by perhaps November 1.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Representative Knoesen announced that the **School of Nursing** proposal did come to CCGA, and that body had some serious concerns. Representative Knoesen explained that originally the funding donated to start the School of Nursing had specific timeframes on implementation of the School, and that was why there was some hurry to approve. CCGA contacted the donor's representatives who affirmed that the timeframe could be flexible, as the donor's intent is to have a quality proposal put forward.

Representative Knoesen also reiterated the CCGA's position on the resumption of oversight of professional degree programs (which was also discussed at the September 24, 2008 Council meeting extensively, see http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/minutes/minutes08_09/Minutes%20Sept%2024%202008%20-%20approved.pdf). Council agreed at the September meeting to launch an ad hoc committee to examine options for oversight of the **L.L.M., M.P.V.M., M.P.H., and M.B.A degree titles**, but will continue to treat the degree titles in **D.V.M., M.D. and J.D.** as it has in the past (with the possibility of reviewing Council authority as the need arises). The ad hoc committee will report back to Council with its recommendations.

Representative Knoesen announced that the **UC Compendium** will be undergoing revisions in the coming year due to CCGA's concern with the quality of proposals that have been put forward over the last few years (three specifically from UC Davis). The *Compendium* provides guidance on the processes involved in educational initiatives (new program proposals, reviews, etc.) Formally titled as *Universitywide Review Processes For Academic Programs, Academic Units, And Research Units*, the *Compendium* can be found at <http://www.ucop.edu/acadaff/accomp/>.

Representative Knoesen also announced that the Environmental Policy and Management proposal was still under review at CCGA. Chair Gunion announced that there is an email from Provost Hinshaw guaranteeing four FTE will teach in the EPM program; the email states that the faculty's primary teaching responsibility will be in EPM.

Graduate Student Association (GSA) Vice Chair Singleton announced that GSA had their first assembly meeting October 1, and discussed voting issues on campus.

Postdoctoral Scholar Association Chair (PSA) Friesner announced that the PSA handbook is still underway, and that the postdoc orientation will begin November 5, 2008, in conjunction with the standard New Employee Orientation. All departments will be able to send new postdocs to this orientation to learn about benefits specific to postdocs. Chair

Friesner also announced that funds from Grad Studies are used to provide PSA scholarships, and PSA has a panel of representatives that awards these.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Academic Planning and Development** (Knoesen)

Chair Knoesen announced that APD requested additional information from the proposers of the departmental status requests below. Those responses were posted on ASIS and a hard copy was provided at the meeting. It is from these responses that much of the APD recommendations are based on. The deadlines for these responses is very short. Chair Knoesen presented the APD report for the following:

- **Proposal for Departmental Status - Asian American Studies**

The APD report affirmed that information provided by the programs in their responses superseded information found in their original proposal. APD found that:

The founding faculty are extensively involved in the plans to develop a Comparative Race/Ethnic Studies graduate program within HARCS. It is viewed as the primary focus of graduate study for most faculty. They are also committed to continue their existing participation in the activities of existing graduate programs in Psychology, Cultural Studies and those related to Women's Studies. There are no plans to develop a new graduate program in the Department of Asian American Studies. No new resources for involvement in graduate programs will be requested.

Council expressed concern that this response is, in fact, contradictory to the original proposal in which a Ph.D. program in Asian American Studies is stated as a future objective (pages 23-24). This future graduate program is the justification for: four new FTE's (page 26); a __Asst II to develop the graduate program (page 27), and 27 new TA's.

Council's response to the Academic Senate will specifically draw attention to these contradictions, and will be circulated by email for consent by Council.

- **Proposal for Departmental Status - Chicana/o Studies**

The APD report affirmed that information provided by the programs in their responses superseded information found in their original proposal, which contained very minimal information on graduate education. APD found that:

The faculty lays out convincingly that graduate education plays an important role in Chicana/o Studies, and that their faculty are actively engaged in existing graduate groups and programs on the UC Davis campus. While developing an independent Chicana/o Studies graduate education [program] appears on their radar screen, with some discussion to initiate a designated emphasis in Chicana/o Studies, their focus will be to develop more graduate level courses to serve existing graduate programs. The existence of such courses will then build a stronger foundation for future growth. The faculty makes a commitment towards playing an active role to enhance diversity in graduate education at UC Davis.

Council's response to the Academic Senate will include the APD report and the responses from the programs, and will be circulated by email for consent by Council.

- **Administrative** (Gunion)
No new actions.
- **Bylaws** (Caswell-Chen)
No new announcements.
- **Courses** (Goodhue)
Chair Goodhue announced that Courses will be meeting in 10 days, and most courses pending are GSM re-naming requests, and that there were fewer than 20 other pending requests. Chair Goodhue also announced that membership on the committee has increased from the sciences disciplines, which will facilitate the more expedient review of those courses.
- **Educational Policy** (Farnham)
Chair Farnham announced that the first EPC meeting occurred on October 1, where the following were assigned to members for their review:
 - Degree requirements revisions: MCIP and Comparative Pathology
 - New proposals: Energy graduate group and Integrated BS/MS Chemistry
- **Program Review** (Buckpitt)
Chair Buckpitt announced that the first PRC meeting occurred on October 14, where the members of PRC expressed concern about the follow-up of Council on their recommendations in the program review reports. Council affirmed that in the Program Review Closure Committee, the responses of the programs to the Council recommendations was closely monitored; past reviews have made significant changes in programs, and occasionally closed or capped admissions based upon the review.

Chair Buckpitt also shared that PRC discussed the proliferation of graduate programs and groups on campus, even in an era of diminishing resources, as was discussed earlier in the meeting. PRC is concerned that the quality of graduate education on campus is being diluted.

Chair Buckpitt also announced that administrative support for the PRC committee is still undetermined at this time, and that the scheduling of reviews is a time-consuming process which is behind schedule. The recruitment process is underway by the Office of Graduate Studies for an assistant. Council expressed that this is a very important part of Council's responsibilities, and that if there is not an appropriate response by the Office of Graduate Studies, Chair Gunion will involve Academic Senate in discussions to house the support position there.

Council also discussed that perhaps a prioritization of reviews could save the committee time and energy; some programs need more attention than others. Council did affirm though that the program review process, and specifically the gathering of information for those, provides an opportunity to get an outside look at a program and benefits the program itself. **It was agreed that an external reviewer need not visit campus personally**, but instead examine the self-review document, and report on the health of a program and its reputation in a written statement to the PRC (the letter being perhaps somewhat more extensive than that currently requested from the external reviewer).
- **Support and Welfare** (Martin)
Chair Martin drew attention to attachment 1.8 on the *Proposed Psychiatric Withdrawal* response to Academic Senate which her committee reviewed, and announced that S&W will be meeting on October 22 for their first meeting. S&W will be reviewing the graduate student travel awards.

CONSENT ITEMS

- A. **Move “Consent Items” to “Discussion/Action”.**
Chair Gunion moved to discussion: Art (Studio) bylaws, Education Ph.D. degree requirements, and the Communication Ph.D. proposal.
- B. **Bylaws Changes. (Caswell-Chen/Wonhof)**
 - a. Art Studio – **moved to discussion**
 - b. DE Translational Research – **approved by consent.**
- C. **Degree Requirement Changes. (Farnham)**
 - a. Education Ph.D. – **moved to discussion.**
- D. Minutes of the September 24, 2008 Graduate Council meeting – **approved by consent.**
- E. Proposed Involuntary Psychiatric Withdrawal: Response to Senate (sent 10/8/08) – **approved by consent.**
- F. Removal of D. Engr and M. Engr degrees from Chemical Engineering & Materials Science – **approved by consent.**

DISCUSSION / ACTION ITEMS

- A. As moved from Consent:
 - **Art (Studio) bylaws**
Council recommended a slight change in wording from “program” to “department” in the membership section.
MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED: Approve the bylaws with the requested change.
 - **Education Ph.D degree requirements**
Council discussed that under Graduate Council’s Qualifying Examination policy, the expectation is that the Qualifying Examination, including the required oral component and any additional written component, will be administered by the committee appointed for that purpose. (The QE policy can be found at: <http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/Doctoral%20Qualifying%20Examinations%204-9-08.pdf>).

The Education requirements provide for the dissertation prospectus to be considered a written component of the QE but evaluated by a different committee. The possible solutions are simple: (1) make the dissertation prospectus a pre-qualifying paper as suggested at one place in the degree requirements, or (2) have the prospectus evaluated by the appointed QE committee.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED: Table decision on approving until revised version is submitted.

 - **Communications Ph.D. proposal**
Council discussed that while the letter of approval from the Library Committee was received, it contained a stated amount of funding necessary to support the new Ph.D. program (which has not been included in approval letters for previous proposals). Council affirmed that it would have preferred to have had a commitment of resources in hand, but did want to get the proposal moving forward without a funding commitment because it has been in stasis too long

not to proceed (two years now). The figure from the Library Committee is in line with the campus commitment to graduate education, and Council is certain the issue can be resolved as this proposal moves through the approval process.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED: **Approve** Communications Ph.D. proposal and transmit to Dean Gibeling and the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellor (CODVC).

B. Forensic Science Bylaws

Council had questioned in the meeting of September 24 whether a non-faculty professional from the community should be a member of the Educational Policy Committee, discussing academic and educational plans. After considering that the field of Forensic Science has so few Ph.D. faculty, Council agreed that revising the bylaws to include a “non-voting” member on that committee was allowable.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED: **Approve** bylaws with the requested language revisions.

c. Consolidation of the Graduate Groups in Biochemistry & Molecular Biology and Cell and Developmental Biology (BMB/CDB)

Council reviewed comments from Chair of CDB, JoAnne Engebrecht which opined that any kind of program review of BMB and CDB would be a hindrance to the consolidation process. She was especially concerned about the difficulty and time consumption associated with the faculty and student meetings. Council was presented two alternative options, and compromised during the meeting to allow BMB and CDB to get on with the business of creating their consolidated program (degree requirements, etc.) without an extensive program review. EPC chair Peggy Farnham proposed a compromised approach in which the ad hoc committee overseeing the consolidation would meet with faculty and students of both programs **once the consolidation proposal had been prepared**. In this way, comments would reflect knowledge of the exact nature of the consolidation. The alternative of requesting letters from faculty and students in the programs earlier in the process (in order to gain assurance that the consolidation committee took their concerns into account) was deemed less desirable since the details of the actual consolidation would not be available. Additional “self-review-like” information will be requested in the consolidation guidelines. Assuming that the information gleaned by the EPC as it oversees the consolidation confirms that the consolidated group is likely to operate well and that no significant problems emerge as a result of the faculty and student meetings that occur after the consolidation proposal is completed, the consolidated program will be reviewed again in seven years time. Consolidation guidelines will be finalized by EPC and distributed to the consolidation committee with a deadline of February 2009 to complete the proposal (target date for admissions into the consolidated program is Fall 2009). The hope would be to have the faculty and student meetings within a month of receiving the complete proposal.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED: **Approve** the compromise reached, and allow EPC to construct guidelines and processes to review this proposal. Final guidelines will be sent out to council by email as a consent item.

D. Academic Senate Responses to Academic Plans

Council members were assigned a plan to review and then present at a Council meeting; these presentations occurred during this meeting, and the next meeting of November 19. Reviewers will then prepare a draft response for the Chair after taking into consideration Council comments. These responses will be circulated by email as consent items. Council members were asked to consider the following questions in their review:

- a) What kind of balance is there between the needs/plans of departments as opposed to needs/plans of graduate groups. (e.g. are future FTE plans taking into account the needs of graduate groups as well as departments?)
- b) What are the plans for graduate student enrollment? (e.g. will they be planning an increase to the roughly 20% level that is kind of a target for the near future?)
- c) Are they proposing any new graduate programs? Keep in mind that we are trying to avoid proliferation in the number of graduate programs and groups. If they are proposing new graduate programs, whether a new department, new graduate group or new graduate program, will the new entity take under its wings some existing program/group (i.e. is there some corresponding consolidation)? Are they planning consolidation of existing groups (something we would like to support)?
- d) In light of the above, how reasonable are the FTE requests associated with such new programs, and, in particular, do they support graduate education and take into account the needs of graduate groups as opposed to departments? Or perhaps, FTE requests are so heavily weighted towards existing or new graduate groups that department needs will not be met. Is there an appropriate balance?
- e) If they plan new research initiatives/directions, will these new initiatives/directions support graduate education as opposed to being just pure research? (e.g. will they allow an increase in the number of graduate student course offerings?) Will such new research initiatives/directions be within existing departments/groups/programs or will they require (maybe not immediately, but ultimately) the formation of new departments/groups (not good without matching consolidations)? If the new research initiative/directions require new FTE, will these new FTE be used in part to support existing departments/graduate groups and is there an appropriate balance between departments and groups?

- **Graduate School of Management (GSM) (Goodhue)**

Chair Gunion noted that the MBA is a professional master's degree, and only partially falls under the oversight of the Graduate Council. In principle, Graduate Council is responsible for review and approval of the MBA curriculum, but it has rarely been asked to review it. Further, Graduate Council was not involved in approving the relatively new San Ramon Working Professional MBA program. Graduate Council will need to define its role with respect to the MBA program as it thinks about oversight of professional school curricula (see *also the CCGA report noted above*). Chair Gunion also noted that the plan calls for five new FTE, that they have three campuses that they admit to separately, and that GSM also has an external review agency.

It was also noted that the five FTE are all to expand the Bay Area and Sacramento Working Professionals program and a possible collaborative program with the School of Nursing (TBD), but that that the FTE allocations would come from the Office of the Provost. Council questioned whether they would support a plan that would not address graduate education or undergraduate education on the Davis campus. Page 148 contains reference to strategic partnerships, and that seems to be the extent of the campus participation. Council affirmed that in this time of diminishing resources, it did not think it wise to supply FTE to a non-academic program. Graduate Council is mindful that it has a responsibility to oversee graduate education and is concerned with the current lack of communication between GSM and Council on this.

- **College of Biological Sciences (CBS) (O'Donnell)**

The CBS Academic Plan indicates that graduate student support is a priority for development activities, but CBS has recently reduced its development program in response to financial challenges. The plan also suggests that additional

training grants are needed, although there is no indication of what is needed to strengthen that effort. The ideas represented on p. 161 regarding goals, opportunities and challenges for graduate programs are well-known to Graduate Council: lack of funding, nonresident tuition costs and difficulty of staffing courses. Council (and a written comment from Dean Gibeling) stated that the latter was somewhat surprising given that all graduate education in CBS is offered entirely through graduate groups, and it should be possible for the lead dean to encourage greater cooperation between departments and graduate groups.

It was also noted that the emphasis in the plan was on good start-up packages for faculty, but Council felt it was equally important to have healthy graduate programs to attract both faculty and staff. It is also noted in the plan that all CBS graduate groups would like to increase their enrollments by 50% and increase fellowships without focus on how to do either of those initiatives. A new program was suggested in Bioinformatics. Also, it's noted that they request the return of a small portion of graduate chair stipend, and Council discussed whether a stipend is appropriate at all in this time of diminishing resources.

Council was concerned that as stated on pp. 172-173, the plan discusses a change in approach to graduate teaching from lectures to seminars and journal clubs. Council felt this could be counterproductive, in that financial credit for teaching may be reduced and additional resources may be needed for small courses. Council affirmed that moving to seminars was inadvisable. In his written statement on this, Dean Gibeling had similar concerns.

Council also discussed that more support for writing training grants is necessary as it is pushed for graduate groups to get training grants to support students. Council questioned whether Deans should get together and find this support; Council expressed that there may be a position in the Office of Research in support of someone who collaborates with Graduate Studies on training grants. [**Follow up note:** There is a staff analyst in the Office of Graduate Studies who can assist faculty with training grants. Helen Fraiser, hfracier@ucdavis.edu]

Also questioned was how many students from CBS groups are working in labs outside of CBS, e.g. the Medical School, which should perhaps provide some financial support in return. Information on hand suggested that the Medical School was getting something of a "free ride" in that the campus was training their students but was not getting an appropriate amount of money from the SOM in support of this training. We hope that Dean Gibeling will either confirm or correct council on this understanding.

- **Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies (HArCS) (Nincic)**
The Dean and faculty in HArCS have spent considerable time over the past two years engaged in an academic planning process. Graduate education is a central element of that process, and Dean Owens has consistently articulated the importance of increasing involvement of HArCS faculty in graduate education. The creation of several new graduate groups (see pp. 214-216) that span and link existing departments is being planned. Increased graduate student support is critical to the success of the HArCS plans, as is the development of a new model for allocating TA positions. In addition, several program-level plans express interest in developing a BA/MA program, presumably with the MA students paying the full cost of their education, resulting in increased block grant allocations to support doctoral students. HArCS is in communication with OGS on these plans. Currently, just 10% of

their students are graduate students.

It was noted that HArCS has a different model in that most of its graduate education takes place in interdisciplinary graduate groups, and not in departments. Council was concerned with the small enrollments in most of the HArCS groups and that any FTE added will address the needs of a very small group of students. New programs in the proposal stage do not seem to consolidate or absorb existing programs. Again, this relates to earlier discussions of proliferating small graduate groups. Council questioned why some of the groups were not located in departments (i.e. Religious Studies, Theatre and Dance, etc.); and Council also wondered why the new proposal in Religion and Society could not be a track in Religious Studies. Council acknowledge the disciplines encompassed in HArCS are rapidly changing at a pace perhaps other divisions do not, which could be why groups are formed outside of established departments.

It was noted the following programs made a good case for the addition of FTE's that would benefit graduate education: Spanish and Linguistics; English; Native American Studies—Hemispheric Studies; African and African American Studies—specialization in Blacks in Europe; Religious Studies—Jewish Studies; and the MFA program (which could grow to 40 students). This is a large claim for additional resources.

Overall, Council was quite concerned that the new graduate groups contained in the HarCS plan represented significant graduate group proliferation and was surprised to not see any explicit material about these new groups absorbing some of the old ones. Council decided to delay a detailed response until the next meeting at which it is requested that Dean Gibeling offer his rationale for supporting new proposals in HArCS. Following the November meeting a response to Academic Senate will be drafted.

E. Reference only— Qualifying Exam: changes to policy (4-9-08)

<http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/Doctoral%20Qualifying%20Examinations%204-9-08.pdf>

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.