Graduate Council Minutes
April 19, 2012

The Graduate Council met on Thursday, April 19, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. in 307 Kerr Hall.

Present: Bruce Schumm, Chair, Bettina Aptheker, Jorge Hankamer, Kimberly Jannarone, Raphael Kudela, Alkis Polyzotis, Donald Smith, Megan Thomas, Erik Green (GSA), Alice Ye (GSA), Tyrus Miller (DGS), Jim Moore (DGS), Michael Tassio (ASO)

Absent: Scott Brandt, Carol Shennan, Christy Caldwell (LAUC)

Consent Agenda
The minutes from April 5, 2012, were approved with one minor correction.

Chair Announcements
Curricular review has been discussed at a recent Senate meeting and there is growing ad-hoc participation between departments on campus. Chair Schumm invited Council members to raise issues. One member noted that there are some institutional obstacles to offering courses with graduate and undergraduate students that might need to be reconsidered. Another member noted that programs need to use their resources effectively but that the differences between graduate and undergraduate curriculum need to be recognized. The course approval forms require that graduate and undergraduate courses be nominally different, yet many undergraduates can take graduate courses as independent studies with the instructor’s permission. Council members agreed to continue to develop an awareness of mezzanine courses on campus and to be prepared to return to this issue at a future meeting if the issue is felt to merit further discussion.

Chair Schumm updated Council members on a meeting he had with two Computer Science faculty members regarding a proposal they are working on for a professional MS degree in computer games. The proposal is still being drafted but they request consideration for approval from Graduate Council this quarter. One of the Graduate Student Representatives voiced concern that graduate students are not being consulted with by faculty proposing new programs, and that it is not clear why there is a need to offer Professional Degree programs in addition to Masters. This raised a number of questions about whether or not there is a need to consult with students, or whether students are even the right group to consult with given that professional programs are geared towards professionals working in the industry, particularly for programs being mounted at the Silicon Valley Center largely via new faculty hires.

Chair Schumm and a sub-committee of members from Graduate Council put together a one page invitation to Associate Vice Chancellor Sue Matthew inviting her to consult on issues related to Family Student Housing, and more generally, on housing for advanced students. AVC Matthews will consult with GC on May 31.

DGS Announcements
A Graduate Research Symposium will be held on May 11 in the University Center. All Council members are invited to attend. Past years’ symposiums have been outstanding and featured
graduate students from a diverse range fields. Members are also welcome to participate as judges.

Preliminary figures on graduate admissions have recently become available and final numbers will soon be in. For the past two years, UCSC has seen slight declines in the number of admitted and accepted students. This is likely due to a combination of factors including the following: the rising cost of graduate education, its perceived value, budgetary concerns within departments, and the ability of private universities to make more attractive offers as their endowments recover. A Council member questioned whether or not UC leadership is closer to reaching an agreement for rebenching, and how this might positively impact graduate level education. Chair Schumm reported that rebenching has not been discussed at recent SEC meetings but that UC campuses with low graduate student enrollments would likely benefit by receiving more funding intended to increase enrollments.

**GSA Announcements**

Elections for new GSA leadership will be held on May 3. The current GSA President, Eric Green, is a semi-finalist for the UC Board of Regents, and has bowed out of running for re-election. One of the referenda students will be voting on is to increase student fees to provide additional funding for travel grants. If the referendum does not pass, graduate student travel grant funding will necessarily be reduced.

Graduate students have raised concerns that some faculty are not following through on allegations of violations of academic integrity raised by teaching assistants. Based on reports from graduate students, some faculty are unaware of the protocol and others are unwilling to follow it. The GSA has met with the Chancellor and the CP/EVC to discuss this matter and they are thinking about productive ways to better educate faculty on academic integrity. Dean Miller recommended that College Provosts be included in these discussions.

**Library Announcements**

There were no announcements.

**Pre-Consultation – CP/EVC Galloway**

Council members discussed topics for their consultation with CP/EVC Galloway on May 17, including the following:

- Graduate Program Growth, Funding, and Sponsored Projects
- Projected Cost Increases to Graduate Student Fees
- Non-Resident Graduate Student Tuition
- Silicon Valley Center
- Interdisciplinary Curriculum and Programs
- The GSA Housing Initiative
- Increasing Diversity amongst Graduate Students

Chair Schumm will collect these into a draft letter to the Provost, to be reviewed at the next meeting.
Silicon Valley Academic Plan
Council reviewed the draft Strategic Academic Plan for the Silicon Valley Center (SVC) and agreed that UCSC may enjoy significant growth in its graduate enrollment numbers by developing a number of new professional Master's programs with relatively high enrollments, and a Silicon Valley location might possibly make the most sense for this. Council looks forward to seeing concrete plans to mount specific programs, including faculty hiring and curriculum plans, letters of support from interested industrial leaders, and discussions of how these programs will be tied to activity on campus, as appropriate. For now, however, members thought the plan seemed largely focused on enumerating specific programmatic areas, albeit with insufficient detail, that made it difficult for non-experts to critically evaluate. In fact, one member who had seen prior documents on plans for the SVC felt that much of the detail had been excised in producing this document; if so, the Council wonders why that was done, since specific ideas about timelines, expected staffing and administrative resources, budget projections, elaboration of priority among the many programs described, effects on existing graduate campus units and programs, use of buildings and spaces, etc., would be very helpful in presenting a clearer picture of how the SVC would meet the challenges of inception.

Members raised the following concerns:
1. Financial support for graduate students in academically-oriented programs needs to be carefully thought through. Since there is not a large undergraduate enterprise envisioned in the plan, supporting graduate students earlier in their studies (when they typically would receive support from employment as teaching assistants) may have to be thought through with some degree of finesse. The level of the document we read, however, is far away from the level of detail that would have incorporated a discussion of this issue.

2. There is a concern that the development of predominantly graduate programs at a remote site may lead to an inadvertent separation into two tiers of faculty: one primarily associated with the SVC that teaches largely in the graduate curriculum, and the other, primarily associated with the main campus, that teaches across the broader curriculum. All faculty are expected to teach at multiple course levels, and there is no suggestion in the document for how this might be accomplished for SV-centered faculty.

3. The document is rather mute about the extensive existing interrelationships between the campus and Silicon Valley. Rather than cite a number of speculative relationships that may develop, it might prove more convincing to cite existing relationships as a touch-point, or at least as examples, relating to the further development of ties between the campus and Silicon Valley institutions.

In this last vein, a member of the Council with a degree of expertise in the areas covered in the document made the following detailed observations:
- Page 4: "These and other companies have used the internet in novel ways to create markets, re-imagine supply chain management, and more generally integrate greater connectedness into business operations." The statement refers to "Google, Amazon, and Facebook," but it is not clear that Google or Facebook deal with supply chain management.
• Page 11: "[T]he person carrying a gun in a CCT-monitored crowd" is brought up as an example of bio-imaging. Is this really an example of a technology enabled by research in bio-imaging?

• Page 11: Cisco, Google, Apple, and Yahoo! Research are listed as companies relevant with bioelectronics/bio-imaging. It is unclear how these companies have a stake in this sector, or at least to an extent that they can be listed convincingly as supporters/sponsors of this initiative.

Policy Revisions
Council reviewed two policies that they recently revised to address member concerns: Graduate Degree Annotations (Designated Emphasis), and Appeals of Academic Judgments. The discussion of Graduate Degree Annotations raised questions about whether or not programs should be permitted to offer Designated Emphases within their programs (e.g., Computer Engineering offering a DE in Robotics). Members agreed that programs should be concentrations on fields within their program but not Designated Emphases. Both policy revisions were approved and will be forwarded to the appropriate people for review and implementation.

Mid-Cycle Review – Film and Digital Media
Council unanimously approved a six year mid-cycle review for Film and Digital Media. In discussing the proposal, members raised a few concerns:

• The program requires students to demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language but includes computer languages in the list of options. Members noted that some formats that might be considered “computer languages” require far less rigor to learn than spoken languages, and that the means of assessing proficiency of the many possible languages is not clear.

• Several F&DM appointments have been largely redirected to DANM. This is a delicate moment in the maturation of F&DM and their faculty base needs to be preserved. Further external reviews should ensure that F&DM in particular, and the Arts in general, are able to effectively host the growing spectrum of graduate degree programs.

• Funding for the implementation of F&DM was approved and then cut, yet the program is still being implemented.

UCSC Climate Study Faculty Survey
Council reviewed the draft Climate Study Faculty Survey and had one recommendation pertaining to graduate education. On page 14, question 2 assesses faculty satisfaction with the quality of the graduate program offered by their department. Because not all faculty are in departments that have graduate programs, members recommended that “NA” be added to the list of response options.

Senate Manual Revision – Late Grade Changes due to Clerical Error
Council reviewed Santa Cruz Regulation (SCR) 13.1.3C authorizing the Registrar to change a final grade upon the request of an instructor, provided that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change, and that the change is submitted within one year from the close of the quarter for which the original grade was submitted. The current regulation does not permit a final
grade to be changed due to a clerical or procedural error when the request is in excess of one year from the close of the quarter for which the original grade was submitted. Members agreed to submit legislation amending the regulation by allowing grade changes in excess of one year and delegating the authority to approve requests to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Schumm, Chair
Graduate Council