

Revised 6/20/02, addition of item 13.18

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
AGENDA**

**Thursday, June 20, 2002**

**1:00 – 4:00 p.m.**

**Room 203 Mrak**

**AGENDA ITEM**

**ATTACHMENTS**

**ACTION ITEMS**

<b>CCGA letter to UC Academic Council</b> - concerning Graduate and Professional School admissions in response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 178 (Erickson)	13.1
<b>Linguistics</b> – Recommendation to close program review (FitzGerald)	13.2
<b>Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering</b> – Recommendation to close program review (FitzGerald)	13.3

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

<b>APM Section UCD 230 – Proposed revision</b> (Callis)	13.4
<b>Disqualification</b> (Callis, Labavitch, Fitzgerald)	13.5
<b>Evaluation of teaching within graduate programs</b> (Labavitch)	13.6
<b>Filing Fee Policy Statement</b> (Labavitch)	13.7
<b>Mentoring</b> (Labavitch)	13.8
<b>UCD Postdoctoral Scholars Policy and GSR “implementation”</b> (Duffy)	

**CONSENT ITEMS**

<b>Civil and Environmental Engineering – Bylaws</b> (Goldman)	13.9
<b>Medical Informatics – Bylaws</b> (Goldman)	13.10
<b>Community Development – Degree requirement changes</b> (Traill)	13.11
<b>Psychology – Degree requirement changes</b> (Traill)	13.12
<b>Physiology – Proposed name change</b> (Traill)	13.13
<b>Animal Science M.S. and MAM programs – PRC Report transmittal letter</b> (Labavitch)	13.14
<b>Teacher Education Credential Program – PRC Report transmittal letter</b> (Labavitch)	13.15
<b>Plant Protection and Pest Management – PRC Report transmittal letter</b> (Labavitch)	13.16
<b>Biotechnology Designated Emphasis – Affiliation request for Immunology</b> (Traill)	13.18

**INFORMAMATIONAL ITEM**

<b>Criminal Justice Sciences – Letter to proposers</b> (Labavitch)	13.17
--	-------

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Announcements from the Chair (Labavitch)
- Announcements from the Dean (González)
- Announcements from the Associate Deans (FitzGerald, Ramey, Minnis)
- Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Erickson)
- Graduate Student Association (Vallotton)
- Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Peavy)
- Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Rabaud)

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

John M. Labavitch, Chair

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**Thursday, June 20, 2002**

**PRESENT:** J. Callis, T. Dillinger, C. Duffy, K. Erickson, P. FitzGerald, K. Garcia, C. González, A. Knoesen, J. Labavitch, D. Minnis, J. Meeks, T. Peavy, N. Rabaud, E. Sutter, C. Vallotton, L. Webb, L. Wilce, B. Wilson

**ABSENT:** E. Blaine, E. Goldman, A. Hastings, D. Hunt, S. Joseph, M. Marthas, S. Martin, M. Ramey, W. Schleiner, C. Thornber, D. Traill, F. Zalom

**GUESTS:** Nicole Collette, Evelyn Dennis, Joaquin Feliciano, Cathy Jurado

**Introductions and Recognition**

**Introductions included the following:**

- Nicole Rabaud introduced Joaquin Feliciano as next year's Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor. Mr. Feliciano said his project would be a review of campus student affairs resources for graduate students.
- Assistant Dean Lisa Webb introduced Evelyn Dennis, Acting Student Affairs Officer until July 22, 2002. [Ms. Dennis's appointment has been extended an additional six months.]
- Claire Vallotton introduced Nicole Collette, next year's GSA chair.

**Recognition included the following:**

- Chair John Labavitch thanked Dr. Thomas Peavy for his service to Graduate Council and said that this was his last year on Council. Dr. Peavy announced that Dr. Carol Thornber will be next year's Postdoctoral Scholar Association Chair and also might be the postdoctoral scholar representative to Council.
- Chair Labavitch thanked everyone, both those who would be continuing on and those who would be leaving Council next year.
- Lee Wilce thanked Kathy Garcia and Kristin Strand for taking notes at the June 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. She also thanked Kathy Garcia for putting together the agenda and preparing the minutes from the June 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and for providing the agenda items for today's meeting.
- On behalf of Graduate Council, Vice Chair Kent Erickson thanked Chair Labavitch for his outstanding leadership. Prof. Erickson said that as chair, Prof. Labavitch has put tremendous effort into Graduate Council this year and keeps the graduate students "at heart." On behalf of the postdoctoral scholars, Dr. Peavy added his thanks to Chair Labavitch.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**CCGA letter to UC Academic Council – concerning Graduate and Professional School admissions in response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 178**

Prof. Kent Erickson, CCGA Representative, presented CCGA Chair Charles Perrin's letter to UC Academic Council Chair Chand Viswanathan, regarding Assembly Concurrent Resolution 178, a bill introduced by Assembly Members Diaz and Firebaugh. Prof. Erickson said that the whole

Academic Council packet that was sent to CCGA was available. CCGA had just one day and one meeting to respond to the packet and the attachment is the letter that was drafted.

Much of the resolution is geared to law schools. CCGA thought that professional schools and graduate schools should not be lumped together, that no graduate program was using just a single criterion for admissions, and that admissions is a very decentralized process. Some professional schools do use test scores and grade point average (GPA) as a basis for their preliminary screening, but not as a total review of an application.

The response letter was sent to the Academic Council. It stated that there was no single criterion used for admissions and described some possible reasons for the recent decline in the number of applications from minorities and low-income students. CCGA had a long discussion regarding the State's budget and UC losing its outreach money.

Prof. Erickson brought this letter to Graduate Council because CCGA agreed that the members would distribute the information to their own divisional Graduate Councils.

Everyone agreed that graduate programs have comprehensive review processes for applications for admission. Assistant Dean Webb was concerned with the tone of CCGA letter. She reported that the Graduate Council Assistant suggested that Graduate Council might wish to draft a cover letter to accompany the CCGA letter. She would like to indicate that the Office of Graduate Studies and the graduate programs have some work to do to recruit minority and low-income students and would like the letter to be written in a more positive tone. Assistant Dean Webb thought that the second paragraph on the second page of the letter included reasons for fewer applications and that those listed are not the only reasons why there has been a decline in these applications.

Associate Dean Paul FitzGerald said that the popular perception is that faculty was not supportive of Proposition 209 and that the faculty members are the people responsible for admissions. Prof. Barry Wilson suggested finding out how graduate programs review applications for admission. He also suggested describing our next steps in these "uncertain budgetary times."

Prof. Erickson said that CCGA had met on Tuesday June 18, 2002 and that he was unable to attend. There may be another later draft of this letter and there may be a different resolution. There has been much posturing about the State budget and lobbying efforts to return to UC money that was taken away from it. Dean Cristina González thought that the faculty was trying to assert its prerogatives, that the faculty is always in charge of admissions, and that the problem with the letter is that it sounds like the faculty does not care, which she did not believe was the case.

Chair Labavitch summarized Council's discussion thus far. Prof. Erickson will call CCGA Chair Charles Perrin to find out whether this "second draft" is the final letter, which was sent to the UC Academic Senate Chair. Council supported Assistant Dean Webb's idea of checking with the graduate programs to find out what they do and the Council has agreed to write a cover letter saying what we (Graduate Council, Graduate Studies, and the graduate programs) are doing or planning to do. Chair Labavitch will ask each program for a one-paragraph description of how admissions are done.

Chair Labavitch also reported that the Support and Welfare Committee has changed its criteria for reviewing fellowship applications. When justification is provided, grade point average (GPA) will be disregarded.

Prof. Erickson would support taking out the third to last paragraph in the CCGA letter.

The undergraduate admissions procedure is much less flexible than that for graduate students. Dean González added that the process is more complex at the graduate level since there needs to be a match between faculty and student interests. Prof. Erickson added there are always diverse criteria at the graduate level.

Prof. Erickson and Chair Labavitch will communicate with CCGA Chair Perrin, Assistant Dean Webb and Dean González.

Prof. Judy Callis pointed out that when admission is denied, GREs are just one of many criteria (reasons for denial) that are listed on the “Graduate Studies Admissions Memorandum” form. Ms. Cathy Jurado provided the Chair with a copy of the form. Assistant Dean Webb thought that because Graduate Studies has a list of criteria, its graduate programs are already in compliance with ACR 178.

[In August, Prof. Erickson reported that the CCGA letter was modified before it was mailed. A paragraph was removed since funds for outreach had been restored in the budget for UC.]

### **Linguistics and Mechanical & Aeronautical Engineering – Recommendation to close program review**

Associate Dean Paul FitzGerald has concluded that these two graduate programs have implemented the PRC Report recommendations regarding problems that were under their control. He indicated that both Linguistics and Mechanical & Aeronautical Engineering (MAE) responded substantially to the recommendations.

Several Council members thought that MAE’s responses to the PRC recommendations were minimal and dismissive of the review process. Associate Dean FitzGerald reported that he had requested a second follow-up response from MAE and that it was more specific than their first one. He also said that the program does include faculty from other departments outside MAE. A Council member suggested that MAE’s bylaws be checked to see whether the graduate program had in fact included a student representative on its Executive Committee as they said they had.

### **Linguistics**

Prof. Erickson moved to approve the closure of the review of the Linguistics graduate program. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous.

### **Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering**

Prof. Erickson moved to approve the closure of the review of the graduate program in Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering, Prof. Jack Meeks seconded the motion. There was some further discussion. The motion was passed. The Chair said that he would follow up on whether the program’s bylaws state that there will be a graduate student on the MAE Executive Committee.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **APM Section UCD 230 – Proposed revision**

Assistant Dean Charles Duffy asked Graduate Council to look at APM Section UCD-230 – Appointments to Visiting Postgraduate Research ( )—Postdoctoral Positions. The old section was last approved in 1983. Prof. Callis reported that APD’s suggested changes were inserted into the old version, as shown in Attachment 13.4. The Section includes a brief description of the Visiting Postdoctoral (Title Code 3370) and several referrals to other APM and PPM sections for a definition and for benefits.

Assistant Dean Duffy said that this flexible title code allows faculty to pay postdoctoral scholars a salary that is far above the normal PGR salary scale, for example, \$63,000 to a School of Medicine postdoc, someone who had an M.D. degree, had done his residency, and was in ophthalmology. The title code is a way for departments to create their own “compensation plan” for postdocs. Dr. Peavy wanted to know how this section interrelates with the UCD Postdoctoral Scholars Policy. He also asked about section 230-24 regarding approval authority -- specifically about whether departments already file Postdoctoral Training Program and Compensation Plans and whether they will be denied the ability to hire individuals into this title code if they do not have this filed with Graduate Studies. Assistant Dean Duffy responded that this section of the policy has been in place, since the last revision of the policy and that programs are filing Training and Compensation Plans for Graduate Studies' approval. Assistant Dean Duffy also noted that it might be appropriate for Graduate Studies to review older plans to make sure that salaries have kept current.

A question was raised regarding Section 230-17 and whether the five-year limit on appointments included time on other campuses. Assistant Dean Duffy said that this was a real gray area. The policy just says 5 years here. After that time an employee has to be vested in the UC retirement plan. UCOP’s sense is 5 years everywhere in the world. The problem for us is taxes and retirement. It is up to UCOP to police this. All UC campuses use the same payroll system so it would show up if an individual’s other postdoctoral scholar time were at another UC campus.

Prof. Meeks added that this policy stops a faculty member from moving a person from a non-student PGR to a postdoctoral scholar title – whatever the title code. To clear up ambiguity, he suggested inserting “including non-student PGR.”

Prof. Meeks added that this section has practical funding implications. For example, NSF does not like to support Staff Research Associates. Assistant Dean Duffy indicated that IRS would become involved if a postdoctoral scholar’s service were past 5 years in title codes that are not invested in retirement. At that point the university might have a problem with IRS.

Chair Labavitch asked Assistant Dean Duffy about Prof. Alan Hastings’ email regarding the revised APM section. Assistant Dean Duffy said it was a misunderstanding of the policy and that he had already responded to Prof. Hastings to clarify the situation.

Prof. André Knoesen moved to approve the revised APM Section UCD-230. Prof. Erickson seconded the motion and the vote in favor was unanimous.

### **Disqualification**

This disqualification issue arose out of a discussion in the Administration Committee, regarding a student’s second failure of his qualifying examination. According to a 1977 policy, a second failure

on the QE results in disqualification from further graduate study at UCD. This means that a student is not eligible to apply for the program's Master's degree or for another Ph.D. degree program.

Prof. Callis said that APD identified two types of situations that arise after disqualification and dealt with them separately. One is the ability to engage in study in a different program after disqualification, and the other is the ability to obtain a Master's degree in the same program after failure of the Ph.D. qualifying examination. The discussion began regarding study in another program. The APD members were not in favor of students never having the option of future scholarship at UCD, and made a recommendation that students be allowed to apply and be admitted for study in a program after disqualification in another program. However, they thought if a student were allowed to apply for further graduate study at UCD, an essential component would be that students must fully disclose their disqualification and the reasons for this disqualification. If they did not disclose the disqualification, they could not be admitted to another program or would be terminated if already admitted. APD thought that the individual programs, not a central Graduate Studies or Graduate Council committee, should make the decision whether to consider admitting such a student and that they should have access to all information regarding previous attempted degrees.

Regarding the suggestion to add questions to the admissions application, Assistant Dean Webb said that the graduate application already requires applicants to list all previous degrees and graduate work. Assistant Dean Duffy indicated that since 1993 this information is already available in BANNER and that adding questions to the Web-based application would be costly.

Prof. Callis redirected the discussion to whether Council would allow disqualified students these options and if so, the path to implement this policy.

Prof. Meeks pointed out that there are documented examples of students failing the QE and going into another program. Dean González agreed that there has been uneven implementation of the original policy, which does not allow further graduate study at UCD. Associate Dean FitzGerald reported that there are three other UC campuses that have the same policy that we currently have. Chair Labavitch pointed out that although the policy has been in existence a long time, apparently faculty and students are not generally aware of it.

Associate Dean Emeritus Douglas Minnis added that historically, Graduate Studies has helped students move into other programs, especially when the programs themselves had their own problems that impacted the students.

Prof. Jeffery Gibeling, the Chair of the Davis Divisional Academic Senate, wrote a letter to Chair Labavitch in support of retaining the current disqualification policy. Prof. Callis went through the points in Prof. Gibeling's letter. Chair Labavitch said a lot of consideration is given before a disqualification takes place. Associate Dean FitzGerald added that failure on a second attempt at the Ph.D. Qualifying Examination results in a recommendation to the Dean for disqualification. Prof. Callis reported that her committee thought it would be appropriate for individual programs to decide whether to admit previously disqualified students, but full disclosure of the disqualification was essential. Currently, different admissions standards exist in different programs. Assistant Dean Duffy commented on Prof. Gibeling's points 4 and 5, regarding different standards in different programs and persistent students. He thought that faculty who are on one graduate group's

admissions committee might be on another group's as well, and he expressed concern about the possibility of a major legal question.

Prof. Wilson said that since the Dean's office certifies disqualification, it could stop re-applications from students who should not be admitted into another program. Dean González thought that the purpose of the current policy was to screen out difficult students, and she expressed the need to be fair to all students.

Chair Labavitch summarized the discussion thus far, adding that Prof. Gibeling has some points to be considered. The current policy has simplicity but may not be fair. The new policy is not quite as simple.

Council discussed the Master's degree and whether it would be viewed as a consolation prize for the Ph.D. for those who fail their QE. Prof. Meeks said that APD's intent for the policy was not to demean the Master's degree. The QE committee would make the judgment of whether the student has demonstrated an appropriate level of mastery for the Master's degree. Associate Dean FitzGerald thought the two degrees ought to be kept separate since the Master's is not necessarily a subset of the Ph.D. Ms. Jurado said that when a student fails the QE, the committee typically makes a recommendation that the student has passed at the Master's level or should be allowed to complete the Master's degree. Chair Labavitch suggested adding some wording to the QE Report or in the notification regarding the failure, to the effect that "if appropriate to your program, the student is eligible to apply for the Master's degree." Chair Labavitch will work with Prof. Callis on a communication to the graduate programs. Prof. Callis pointed out that an official procedure already exists. When a student fails the QE, the QE Report form goes to the Associate Dean for Students Melvin Ramey, and he writes a letter to the student. Chair González pointed out that "dismissal" is for misconduct and "disqualification" is for academic reasons.

Associate Dean FitzGerald made the motion to approve APD's recommendations, to allow disqualified students to apply for admissions to other UCD graduate programs or to other degree objectives within the same graduate program. Prof. Knoesen seconded the motion, and the vote in favor was unanimous.

There was a short break in the meeting.

### **CONSENT ITEMS – Removed from the Consent List**

Due to lack of time, Chair Labavitch removed several items from the consent list. Council will be requested to review these items and respond via email, with any revisions or approve them as presented.

- **DE in Biotechnology—Affiliation request for Immunology.** This item was added to the agenda today and some members may not have had a chance to read it.

Council members will be given some additional time to respond to the following three PRC Report transmittal letters.

- **Animal Science M.S. and MAM programs – PRC Report transmittal letter**
- **Teacher Education Credential Program – PRC Report transmittal letter**
- **Plant Protection and Pest Management – PRC Report transmittal letter**

## **CONSENT ITEMS**

The remaining Consent Items were approved. Chair Labavitch will write the graduate program chairs notifying them of Graduate Council's approval of the following four items.

- **Civil and Environmental Engineering – Bylaws**
- **Medical Informatics – Bylaws**
- **Community Development – Degree requirement changes**
- **Psychology – Degree requirement changes**

Chair Labavitch will write the Chancellor to request his approval of the following item.

- **Physiology – Proposed name change**

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)**

### **Evaluation of teaching within graduate programs**

Chair Labavitch decided to move this item to the end of the agenda. There was not enough time for it and it was carried over.

### **Filing Fee Policy Statement**

Chair John Labavitch developed this draft filing fee policy statement after Assistant Dean Duffy's research into filing fee status systemwide. The statement includes some background provided by Coordinator Patricia Romero from UCOP. Apparently, the presumed one-quarter limit is not part of the regulations governing filing fee status although the Regents anticipated that students would make use of the status for only one academic term. There are limitations on student use of UC facilities while on filing fee status, and the campus does not receive any State funds for students on filing fee status. Graduate Council has discussed the one-term limit on several occasions this year.

Chair Labavitch summarized the policy statement. There are legal and liability issues. The policy focuses on the student's original request and extension of filing fee status. It does not try to alter other stipulations. The draft statement includes background, a preamble, and the policy. The primary reason for the policy is to implement a best practices approach to keep students progressing toward completion of their graduate degree program within normative time. In the new policy, more people are involved in the process, including the major professor and graduate program chair. Extensions must include benchmarks to be met by the student and an agreement between the student and major professor that is also signed by the graduate program chair. Requests for further extensions must include a statement of progress, signed by all three. Extensions beyond the program's normative time to degree would not be approved.

Council's discussion included what students are allowed to do while on filing fee status, whether they may be conducting research elsewhere, whether students on filing fee may be hired as a PGR, the difference between filing fee and PELP (Planned Educational Leave Program) and whether students can re-register. Ms. Rabaud lauded the policy but was concerned about the fourth point regarding normative time. It was clarified that the "comprehensive exam" referred to in the policy is the Master's degree Plan II capstone event, the "comprehensive exam." Assistant Dean Duffy pointed out Graduate Council has a policy for Ph.D. students, limiting the number of quarters after advancement to candidacy. Prof. Ellen Sutter indicated that some enrolled students are beyond normative time.

Chair Labavitch asked Council whether it was supportive of the policy except for the last point regarding normative time. There was further discussion of the filing fee extensions and how

long a student actually might be allowed to be on filing fee status. Associate Dean Emeritus Minnis suggested putting the emphasis on the justification of extending filing fee status instead of the actual length of time. Chair Labavitch said that Graduate Studies staff workload is another consideration. Associate Dean Minnis did not think filing fee status was justified for those working at another institution.

Chair Labavitch suggested adding something to item 3, regarding a clear justification for why benchmarks were not met. He thought 3 quarters might be an appropriate total limit for filing fee status. However, he suggested consulting the Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies programs since it appears that their students often take more time to complete their dissertations. Ms. Rabaud made a new suggestion to require the whole dissertation committee to meet and discuss the student's progress. Prof. Sutter thought the student should be part of this meeting. Conference calls could be used for anyone out of the area. Assistant Dean Webb suggested distinguishing what circumstances are not appropriate for filing fee status. She and Chair Labavitch suggested that full time work would not be a justifiable reason but health reasons would be.

Chair Labavitch will ask Dean Langland to poll her graduate programs regarding length of time on filing fee status and will rewrite the draft policy and send it via email to Council for its further review.

### **Mentoring**

Chair John Labavitch presented a draft policy document on mentoring that is a follow-up to Council's discussion with Jennifer Taylor and Maura Grady, GSA Mentoring Guidelines Committee members, at Council's last meeting on June 5, 2002. The document described possible actions of the Office of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Council. Council discussed incentives for good mentoring. Prof. Meeks raised the problem of graduate groups having a mentoring program when their students are scattered all over campus.

Chair Labavitch said that the students brought up issues and problems that currently exist. The draft policy document would give faculty members a way to tell their colleagues if they are doing a bad job of mentoring students. Chair Labavitch said that he would send out a request to the graduate program chairs to convert the Graduate Council "Mentoring Guidelines" into guidelines or another mentoring program that works for their own program. Chair Labavitch will also speak with the Support and Welfare Committee about this issue and policy.

### **UCD Postdoctoral Scholars Policy and GSR "implementation"**

This item was carried over due to lack of time. [Assistant Dean Duffy talked to Dr. Peavy after the meeting.]

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Due to lack of time, the only announcements were those of the Graduate Studies Dean.

### **Announcements from the Dean**

Dean Cristina González thanked everyone for participating in the June 13<sup>th</sup> Graduate Studies Commencement Ceremony. She thought that it has been a great academic year. She thanked

Chair Labavitch for his work as Graduate Council Chair. She particularly praised his dedication to graduate students and understanding of their needs, as well as his sense of fairness.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

#### **Criminal Justice Sciences – Letter to proposers**

Council's initial review of the proposal for the new UCD-CSU, Fresno Joint Doctorate in Criminal Justice Sciences took place at the May 13, 2002 meeting. A copy of the draft letter to the CJS program proposers was included for Council's information.

### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no subcommittee reports due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

lsw – Graduate Studies