

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
AGENDA  
Wednesday, June 5, 2002  
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon  
Room 203 Mrak**

| <b>AGENDA ITEM</b>   | <b>ATTACHMENTS</b> |
|--|--------------------|
| <b><u>ACTION ITEMS</u></b>   |                    |
| <b>Civil and Environmental Engineering – Bylaws.</b> Guest: Bruce Kutter (10:00 a.m.)<br>Reference: “ <b>Bylaws Guidelines for Graduate Programs</b> ”       | 12.1               |
| <b>Mentoring Guidelines – GSA research and revisions.</b> Guests: Jennifer Taylor and Maura Grady<br>(10:30 a.m.) Reference: “ <b>Mentoring Guidelines</b> ” | 12.2               |
| <b>Linguistics</b> – Recommendation to close program review (FitzGerald)   | 12.3               |
| <b>Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering</b> – Recommendation to close program review (FitzGerald)   | 12.4               |
| <b><u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u></b>   |                    |
| <b>Disqualification, policy</b> (Labavitch and Fitzgerald)   |                    |
| <b>Filing Fee, policy implementation</b> (Labavitch and Rabaud)  |                    |
| <b>UCD Postdoctoral Scholars Policy and GSR “implementation”</b> (Duffy)   |                    |
| <b><u>CONSENT ITEMS</u></b>  |                    |
| <b>Minutes from April 15, 2002</b>   | 12.5               |
| <b>Minutes from May 13, 2002</b>   | 12.6               |
| <b>Biomedical Engineering - Changes to Degree Requirements</b> (Traill)  | 12.7               |
| <b>DE in Biotechnology affiliation requests for Chemistry, Ag &amp; Environmental Chemistry and<br/>Biomedical Engineering</b> (Traill)                      | 12.8               |
| <b>Civil and Environmental Engineering</b> – Changes to handbook (Traill)  | 12.9               |
| <b><u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b>  |                    |
| 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)   |                    |
| <b><u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u></b>   |                    |
| Academic Planning and Development (Callis)   |                    |
| Administrative (Labavitch)   |                    |
| Courses & Bylaws (Goldman)   |                    |
| Educational Policy (Traill)  |                    |
| Program Review (Knoesen)   |                    |
| Support and Welfare (Schleiner)  |                    |

John M. Labavitch, Chair

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**June 5, 2002**

**PRESENT:** J. Callis, T. Dillinger, C. Duffy, K. Erickson, P. FitzGerald, K. Garcia, E. Goldman, C. González, D. Hunt, S. Joseph, A. Knoesen, J. Labavitch, D. Minnis, N. Rabaud, W. Schleiner, E. Sutter, D. Traill, C. Vallotton, L. Webb

**ABSENT:** E. Blaine, A. Hastings, M. Marthas, S. Martin, J. Meeks, T. Peavy, M. Ramey, C. Thornber, L. Wilce, B. Wilson, F. Zalom

**GUESTS:** Bruce Kutter, Jay Lund, Maura Grady, Jennifer Taylor, Cathy Jurado

**Introduction**

Chair John Labavitch called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. Chair Labavitch recognized Professor Schleiner for his service on Graduate Council for four years. Professor Schleiner will be leaving for a UCD Fellowship in Washington DC – Shakespeare in DC for undergraduate and graduate students.

**CONSENT ITEMS**

Chair Labavitch asked whether Council wished to move any of the items off the consent list. Professor Traill removed one item from the consent list: The Civil and Environmental Engineering handbook changes. All other consent items were approved.

- **Biomedical Engineering – Changes to Degree Requirements**
- **DE in Biotechnology affiliation requests for Chemistry, Agricultural & Environmental Chemistry and Biomedical Engineering**
- **Minutes for the April 15, 2002:** Profs. Callis and Knoesen provided minor corrections.
- **Minutes for the May 13, 2002 meeting:** Profs. Callis and Knoesen provided minor corrections.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Civil and Environmental Engineering - Bylaws**

Chair Labavitch introduced Professor Bruce Kutter, current CEE Graduate Program Committee (GPC) Chair and Professor Jay Lund, incoming GPC Chair. The CEEGP is a departmentally-based graduate program; the membership is made up from faculty in and outside the department. The CEEGP bylaws were reviewed by Professor Goldman. Questions arose regarding how members of the graduate program are reviewed (departmentally-based faculty vs. outside faculty). Professor Goldman stated that Graduate Council's principle is that programs should not have second-class citizens. Professor Kutter was asked to present his program's justification on how the program faculty members are reviewed.

The draft CEE bylaws stated that the membership review process treats Department faculty differently than faculty from outside the Department. Professor Kutter presented the following points:

1. Periodic review of Academic Senate and Adjunct Professors in the Department to evaluate their qualifications for retention of membership in the program is
  - a. redundant with normal faculty merit review process;
  - b. an extra administrative burden;
  - c. potentially divisive; and,
  - d. may interfere with academic freedom.
2. Adjunct Faculty in the department is appointed for 6-year terms and their re-appointments are evaluated by the departmental faculty based on criteria similar to those described in article II.4 of the program's bylaws. Thus there is no need for the program to review adjunct faculty in CEE.
3. Faculty from outside the CEE Department are not subject to merit review in the department, and their interests may, over time, drift away from CEE, and therefore, there is justification for the administrative burden of periodic program review of CEEGP members who are not in the department.

Professor Labavitch expressed concern about a sunset clause on membership of outside members, making those faculty members second-class citizens with the members being reviewed every 2-3 years. The problem is not that there is a program review of some members but not of others, the problem is that the bylaws specify that members from outside of the program are automatically dropped prior to re-review and must reapply again for membership. The default decision of termination from the program whether performance has been acceptable or not makes this unacceptable. It was asked why membership status cannot be determined within the program during a periodic review of service, rather than separating members from the program and then requiring a full fledged application again.

Professor Sutter stated that it is more work after six years to reinstate a faculty member and that the review process does not need to be as detailed as the one conducted for department faculty merit reviews. She suggested a criteria-based checklist and review.

Professor Kutter stated that currently the CEEGP has only one member from outside the department and would be willing to soften automatic termination.

The overall consensus of Council was that a graduate program's bylaws can propose a review of outside members that department members are not subjected to, but the bylaws cannot indicate that outsiders are automatically dropped at the time of review so that they must reapply if they wish to continue.

### **Mentoring Guidelines – GSA research and revisions:**

Chair Labavitch referred to Attachment 12.2 – Mentoring Guidelines (approved by Graduate Council in 1999). Jennifer Taylor and Maura Grady, GSA Mentoring Guidelines Committee members, thanked Graduate Council for proposing and implementing the guidelines. Other UC campuses do not have anything close to what UCD has developed. They felt that the problem was not in developing the guidelines but in the implementation of them, citing the following problems:

- Little or no incentive to faculty to serve as mentors
- No “oversight” or mentor training
- No evaluations by the mentees
- Mentoring tied to funding can cause problems if relationships go bad or faculty moves

It was asked “How should the Council proceed?” and “How can we make this an important issue?” Discussion by Council members followed.

Council members mentioned other issues associated with mentoring: Mentoring of Junior Faculty, mentoring associated with tenure, how to manage a lab, cultural problems across all levels.

Professor Labavitch said that Graduate Council would work with Graduate Studies on the graduate portion of orientation for new faculty to include the mentoring guidelines. Dean González stated that the administration is thinking about the up-coming new faculty orientation and department chair orientation now. Chair Labavitch will also talk with Vice Provost Horowitz on ways to get a faculty member’s mentoring record considered at the time of merit or promotion review. No matter what is done, it has to be a multi-faceted approach to the problem.

Professor Erickson stated that mentoring “quality” is often focused on one individual. Successful programs like some in the Biosciences incorporate faculty other than the major professor in the mentoring of each student. Retreats, work-in progress seminars, and research seminars by outside faculty provide an opportunity for other faculty to interact with students and to provide mentoring. In addition, an oversight committee could be established (possibly the program’s executive committee) to evaluate the students to ensure appropriate progress in their programs. This could work for graduate groups but may be harder to accomplish for departmentally-based programs.

Chair Labavitch asked Professor Knoesen and Kathy Garcia how mentoring was addressed in the graduate program review process. They reported that the questionnaires were recently revised and that mentoring is addressed in the questionnaires and during the review meetings. During the fall of 2002, Professor Knoesen will recommend to the PRC that the PRC should request the program’s mentoring guidelines as part of the program’s self-review packet.

Further discussion by Council noted that mentoring should be considered as service when faculty members are up for merit review. It was noted that in personnel actions, mentoring falls under teaching. There is no formal way graduate teaching is included in the personnel packets.

**Linguistics and Mechanical & Aeronautical Engineering – recommendation to close program reviews:** Time did not permit discussion of these two items. These items will be carried over to the June 20 meeting.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Disqualification policy:**

Chair Labavitch initiated the discussion regarding UCD's policy for graduate students who fail their oral exam. Staff were not able to find a uniform, system-wide policy on the Office of the President's website pertaining to disqualification. UCD's policy automatically bars a disqualified student from further graduate study in any UCD graduate program. Discussions in the Administrative Committee indicate the need to evaluate the UCD policy with regard to whether a student who fails the Ph.D. qualifying exam can complete an MS/MA degree program or apply to another Ph.D. program.

Associate Dean FitzGerald reported that only three UC campuses have a disqualification policy. Chair Labavitch asked Professor Callis if APD would meet on this item and address it at the next meeting. The discussion will be continued at the June 20 meeting.

### **Filing Fee – Policy Implementation:**

Chair Labavitch initiated discussion regarding UCD's enforcement of a rumored UCOP system-wide one-quarter limit on filing fee status. GSA Chair Claire Vallotton reported that her discussions with Graduate Student Association Chairs at five other UC campuses showed significant variance with respect to enforcement. At one campus, filing fee could be extended until normative time was met; at another, it was fairly easy to extend. GSADC Nicole Rabaud presented preliminary data on her study of graduate student attrition at UCD. The data showed that 33% of the students who had left doctoral programs were either on extended filing fee (for more than a year) or had fallen out of status after being on filing fee status for a period of time. As a whole, attrition from UCD graduate programs appears to be fairly low, but may reveal itself to be related to longer times to degree completion and the possibility of extending filing fee status. Anecdotally, the College of Engineering successfully initiated a fairly strict two-quarter filing fee limit a few years ago. Too many of their students went on filing fee before all research requirements had been completed and also students on filing fee are not considered as registered students.

Chair Labavitch will attempt to determine the source of the idea that filing fee status is to be "legally" limited to one quarter.

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

Time did not permit discussion of this item. It will be carried over to the June 20 meeting.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements due to lack of time.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no subcommittee reports due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned.

kg/ks – Graduate Studies