

**Graduate Council**  
**MINUTES**  
**March 21, 2013, 2:00-4:00 p.m., Kerr Hall 307**

**Present:** Bruce Schumm, *Chair*, Bettina Aptheker, Scott Brandt, Leta Miller, Tyrus Miller (DGS), Seth Rubin, Megan Thomas, Su-Hua Wang, Christy Caldwell (Library Rep.), Jim Moore (DGS), Michael Tassio (ASO)

**Absent with notice:** Raphael Kudela, Juan Poblete, Alice Ye (GSA)

**Absent:** Sarah Grace (GSA), Elise Nelson (GSA)

**Consent Agenda**

Members requested changes to the meeting minutes of March 7, 2013.

**Chair Announcements**

Chair Schumm updated members on the graduate growth presentation and discussion at the March 8 senate meeting. Dean Miller presented ideas for funding sources that demonstrated that graduate growth is possible, with the right sort of effort. There was also the beginning of a discussion about ways UCSC might consider growing. Further, faculty questioned the goal of 12%, and whether it is an appropriate goal for UCSC to strive to. Chair Schumm noted that there is much ground for UCSC to cover to prepare faculty, and to generate Senate consensus, in moving forward toward the 12% goal.

Chair Schumm updated members on the recent Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting. Once again, SEC had a spirited discussion about non-resident undergraduate enrollments where members voiced strong concern that too little is being done to accelerate UCSC's progress in attracting these students. The UC Office of the President sets non-resident enrollment goals, and when campuses do not meet them, individual campuses have to cover the budget shortfall with funds from other areas. Dean Miller added that there are clear impacts for graduate growth that increased non-resident undergraduate students can bring UCSC such as additional support for Teaching Assistantships.

Chair Schumm announced that there will be a meeting in April with consultants regarding the UCSC Strategic Academic Plan that he is not able to attend. If available, Vice Chair Scott Brandt will attend in his absence with member Bettina Aptheker as a backup.

**Dean of Graduate Studies Announcements**

Dean Miller announced that his office is about to issue the call for Dissertation Year Fellowships; applications will be due on April 19. Graduate Council reviewers will have roughly one week to review applications. Dean Miller noted that there are less dissertation fellowships and that the very best students from each department or program need to apply. Consistent with previous year, Dean Miller anticipates that some departments will be upset by their outstanding students not being selected for fellowships. Members asked to review the selection process at an upcoming Council meeting.

Dean Miller announced that his office has developed a program for a graduate student intern to apprentice with University Relations. The program is focused on training an intern in fundraising and grant writing to support the Graduate Division. Likewise, the Graduate Division has created a second internship for a graduate student to link current graduate students with UCSC graduate alumni. The Council was excited by both of these positions and complimented Dean Miller on his work.

### **Graduate Student Association Announcements**

No members from the Graduate Student Association were present.

### **Librarian Announcements**

The Library Representative announced that the Library can now assist faculty with obtaining free Digital Object Identifiers (DOI) for their scholarly works. For instance, a DOI can be assigned to a data set, allowing that data set to be discoverable and citable when stored online.

### **Program Statement Changes**

The Council unanimously approved program statement changes in Molecular Cell & Developmental Biology.

The Council also reviewed proposed program statement changes for the Biomolecular Engineering Program. For reasons discussed below, the Council was unable to approve this statement, with its implications about graduate degree requirements, without further clarification from the program.

Section VI of Appendix D of the Senate Manual discusses the nature of Master's capstone requirements, for both Plan I (thesis) and Plan II (comprehensive) Master's programs. The Council is uncertain as to whether the program is for a Plan I or Plan II Master's, but in either case would need more information to ascertain whether the proposed capstone experience satisfies the Academic Senate's standards.

As the Council reads the statement, the capstone requirement is intended to be satisfied by successful completion of a single five-credit course: either BME 296 or BME 297. This course includes research in the laboratory, followed by a written report. If this is to satisfy the capstone requirement of a Plan I Master's (i.e., act as a thesis), the Council asks the program to explain in more depth with respect to how such an activity can rise to the standards of a Master's thesis. In general, albeit at a level below that of a doctoral thesis, Master's theses are expected to present the result of original research, providing motivation, a summary of analysis, and a conclusion that synthesizes the results and discusses their implications and possible further work that might be undertaken to carry the line of inquiry forward. In addition, theses are generally not the product of a sole course overseen by a single instructor of record. Instead, theses tend to be the product of a more open-ended process of inquiry, and are both shaped and approved by a committee of more than a single faculty member. Alternatively, if completion of BME 296 or BME 297 is to satisfy the capstone requirement of a Plan II Master's, the Council asks the program to describe how the experience provides a sufficiently comprehensive assessment of overall mastery of the graduate curriculum.

In reviewing the program's requirements, the Council also asks that the program remain aware of the course requirements for Plan I and Plan II Master's, which are outlined in Appendix D. In particular, no lower division course may count towards graduate program credit, and research classes may not count towards the fulfillment of Plan II Master's requirements.

### **Mid-Cycle Review Reports**

The Council discussed the recommendation that the Applied Mathematics and Statistics (AMS) program be allowed to go eight years, rather than the nominal six, between external reviews. At the end of the discussion, the three members of the Council voted to recommend the longer review period, two the shorter, and two abstained. No member of the Council felt particularly strongly about either option. There was a general consensus that a compromise to a seven-year interval might be appropriate, although no vote was taken on that proposal.

The discussion began with Chair Schumm noting the tradeoff between the value of external input and the distraction and effort of undertaking a self-study and carrying out the review. Those favoring the shorter (six-year) interval felt that AMS, while a new department, is nonetheless undergoing a transition, with the center of gravity of the interests of department faculty potentially shifting somewhat as key faculty (Lee, Mangel) depart or become leading administrators. Particularly in light of the department's aspirations to develop a new M.S. degree, those favoring the shorter interval saw great value in timely advice from outside experts.

Those favoring the longer interval felt that no pressing issues were raised by the external review and mid-cycle feedback, and that, given the amount of work necessary to mount the review, the most beneficial path would be to allow the program to continue to address the staffing, curricular, and aspirational goals that had been identified without the near-term interference of a self-study conducted in 2014-2015, followed by a review in 2015-2016. Again, though, no member of the Council argued strongly in favor of eight-year interval. There was a concern voiced, and noted by the Council, that the granting of an eight-year interval might fuel expectations on the part of this and other departments that eight years has become the new standard. We wish to emphasize that the Council still considers the six-year interval to be the norm, and the eight-year interval an exception to be considered on a case-by-case basis, and on to be granted when a strong case for the delay may be made.

### **Graduate Growth**

Members began by discussing the issue of using Master's programs to fund Ph.D. students. Dean Miller stated that particular disciplines are very interested in Master's programs, and that others are exploring them. Master's programs should be thought of as different from Ph.D. or undergraduate programs; whereas placement and the footprint of UCSC are very important for Ph.D. programs, Master's programs—particularly professional Master's—address the question of workforce and industry needs. In specific instances in the Silicon Valley program, the Dean continued, there needs to be careful crafting of programs that are consistent with the employment market needs and UCSC goals. A member from Engineering noted that leadership in the Baskin School of Engineering believes offering professional Master's programs is a service to California. Further, they expect that students will have funding for tuition from their employers, or that they will have their own funding and the reasonable expectation that they will gain earning potential consistent with the cost of their training.

A member questioned whether new proposals for Master's programs should be academic or professional. Dean Miller responded by noting that he has spoken with faculty across campus, and that our moral commitments to undergraduate education, research, and the academic prestige of our Ph.D. students are clear. On the other hand, he continued, the motivation for working closely with Master's students is less clear. Stony Brook University, once similarly Ph.D.-oriented as UCSC, instituted Master's programs driven by local strategic planning. Stony Brook created an elective incentive structure for faculty that rewards the department with flexible funds should they increase Master's enrollments. A member noted that this would, in her department, dramatically change the way faculty think about Master's applicants, some of which who are excellent but to whom they currently do not offer admission to because there is no funding for them. Another member cautioned that much consideration needs to be given to ensure that there will not be negative impacts for undergraduate and Ph.D. programs. Dean Miller responded by noting that for departments with capacity, an incentive program would be very attractive; programs not currently at capacity might be able to grow vigorously for a short periods of times.

Another member applauded the Dean for his creative thinking to grow graduate programs through an incentive program, but voiced concern that UCSC needs to think boldly about capacity in department. Historical numbers, he continued, may no longer be relevant. Dean Miller responded by noting that his office is also thinking about this, and the possibility of starting with baseline historical numbers that can be phased out over a period of time.

A member questioned whether the Dean envisions a mix of professional and academic Master's programs, and stated that faculty might be interested in academic Master's that are not necessarily consistent with industry needs. Dean Miller responded by stating that there are a full range of options for academic and professional Master's programs at UCSC and that many departments have capacity to add Master's students. Another member noted that in the Sciences, when lab space is required, bringing on more Master's students without funding might be very expensive and unattractive to faculty. Dean Miller noted that he has experienced an extraordinary range of thinking about funding for additional Master's students in the sciences.

The Council moved on to the topic of the 12% goal for Ph.D. growth. A member questioned the relationship between Master's students and the goal, and Dean Miller responded by stating that Master's students are not included in the 12%, but that increasing the number of Master's students might make the goal more achievable.

Chair Schumm noted that the rebenching funds came with a clear statement from UCOP that UCSC should strive to reach the goal. While a study by CCGA suggested that the UC faculty, as a whole, are very good at producing Ph.D.s, individual campuses that have relatively small Ph.D. enrollments nonetheless might further advantage the system by increasing their Ph.D. enrollments. Chair Schumm stated that, to him, the question remains open as to whether the campus, system, and State would be more advantage by a sole focus on the 12% goal, or whether a more open interpretation of rebenching as a mandate to increase graduate enrollments through a broader range of opportunities might be justifiable.

A member stated that there are a plethora of issues that need to be considered such as the tradeoffs of growing graduate programs while shrinking or maintaining undergraduate programs, capacity to house students on campus, and whether or not the 12% goal is negotiable.

The Council will return to these conversations at the next meeting.

#### **Faculty Recruitment Requests for 2013-14**

Members discussed the divisional faculty recruitment requests, and their need to review these from perspective of graduate education and growth. Chair Schumm stated that members have seen this in call from EVC, and how Dean's addressed it. The Council can comment on these individually, how they relate to one another, or as a whole.

A member recommended that the Council offer support or critical evaluation of recruitments that are connected to graduate growth, noting that some recommendations clearly would support graduate growth while others would not. Another member questioned the authority of the Council to question judgments of the deans. While yet another questioned how the Council can with any certainty comment on how hires might impact graduate growth.

A member noted that UCSC has had so many faculty losses over the years due to budget cuts, retirements, separations, etc., that UCSC is not now in a period of growth, but of recovery. In the Humanities, for instance, some departments have been all but abandoned by faculty, and that hires are merely to fill enormous gaps. Further, the member continued, considerations for a diverse faculty were not clearly incorporated into many of the divisional responses, and that campus goals such as gaining Hispanic Serving Institute status were completely absent. Another member noted that some deans are clearly trying to target hires to strategically strengthen particular fields, while others are focused on filling gaps.

Dean Miller noted that in looking at the recruitment requests from the perspective of graduate growth, all the Council can really do is make assumptions about what new faculty might do for growth. Further, recruitments always say that faculty will strengthen graduate programs, but that if these positions are truly being funded by rebenching funds, having clear guidelines for how faculty hires can promote growth might be needed.

Chair Schumm stated that he found the documents to be extremely educational, in that all of the deans have particular sets of concerns that they are attempting to address with no apparent collaboration. Further, the deans were generally not as explicit in stating how many FTE will be needed to address dire needs that were created during budget reduction years, nor in how, beyond this they might use rebenching funds to support graduate growth. Moreover, only one dean expressed a vision of how rebenching funds could be used for a creative initiative to spur graduate growth. Several council members acknowledged that there seems to be a disconnect between how the deans are planning recruitments, and major campus planning for graduate growth. Members will return to this topic at their next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.