

GRADUATE COUNCIL 2001-2002 Annual Report

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The past year was extraordinarily busy for the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council typically met biweekly, with 16 meetings over the course of the Academic Year. The voting membership of the Graduate Council was composed of: Weixin Cheng (F,W), Jim Clifford (Vice Chair), Olof Einarsdottir, Kathy Foley (F), Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Suresh Lodha, Jim McCloskey (F), Paul Nauert (W,S), Martine Schlag, Bruce Schumm, Quentin Williams (Chair), Rob Wilson (W,S) and Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, Frank Talamantes. Meetings were also attended by Bob Hastings of the Graduate Division, Graduate Student Association Representative Lee Ritscher, a LAUC representative (Beth Remak-Honnef) and a member of the Academic Senate Office staff (Laurie Babka). The Chair served as a representative to the system-wide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the Senate Advisory Committee, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Proposal Committee. B. Schumm served as the Graduate Council representative to Academic Planning Council, convened by VPAA Brown. Guests to the Graduate Council in 2001-2002 included Chancellor M.R.C. Greenwood, Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor J. Simpson, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs G. Brown, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies D. Hunter, Assistant Graduate Dean Sandra Pacheco, SVC Interim Director R. Michael Tanner, Special Advisor to the Chancellor Michael Cowan, Center for Teaching Excellence Director Eileen Tanner, and SPEAK Test Administrator Peggy Miles.

1. Graduate Council Organization

The 11-member Graduate Council is organized into subcommittees that met separately throughout the year to manage the ever-increasing workload of the committee. The Council now has a standing subcommittee on Courses, and in 2001-02 two year-long subcommittees: Graduate Quality and Growth, and the 10-year Plans. In addition ad hoc subcommittees were formed for each fellowship award process and external program review. The Council as a whole reviewed each new program proposal and all other policy issues.

2. The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)

The Systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is charged with assessing and recommending whether new graduate programs should be approved. Additionally, all systemwide policies related to graduate education and postdoctoral appointments are vetted through CCGA. During 2001-2002, two proposals from UCSC were assessed and approved by CCGA, and by Systemwide: the Ph.D. program in Electrical Engineering and the Ph.D. program in Education.

Specific topics of policy discussed at CCGA during 2001-2002 included:

- Joint UC/CSU Ed.D. programs
- Augmented funding scales and levels for graduate student researchers and postgraduate researchers
- Minimum compensation limits and good practice rules for postdoctoral scholars
- Comprehensive review of all applications to graduate and professional programs
- Implications of changes in days of instruction and summer instruction for graduate education
- Modifications to the UC copyright policy
- Competitiveness of graduate student support between the UC's and comparison institutions
- Expediting the CCGA review process for new graduate programs

3. Program Reviews

The Graduate Council is involved in all external reviews of departments and organized research units through reviewing and commenting on the draft charges to external review committees, reviewing the external review reports and accompanying materials, and being represented at closure meetings. The Graduate Council also, where appropriate, follows up on substantive graduate issues raised by the external review process. In 2001-2002, the Council participated in closure reviews of Anthropology, History of Consciousness, Literature, Art History and Computer Engineering and Computer Science. The Council also participated in a review of a program (Mathematics) for which we declined to endorse closure, due to shortcomings in the external review. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs has initiated a new assessment of the educational portion of this program. Draft charges were reviewed for Ocean Sciences, Theater Arts, Economics and History.

The Council continued to be dissatisfied with the departmental review process: the level of comments on Graduate programs in external reviews varied from virtually non-existent, to anecdotal, to reasonably substantive. The new template for conducting external reviews developed by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, which will be assessed by GC at the start of the 2002-03 year, will hopefully result in greater uniformity of reviews with respect to graduate programs, and increase GC involvement and input to the external review process.

4. Changes of Status and Degree Requirements

As part of its purview, the Council considered a number of requests for shifts in degree requirements for a range of programs. Due to indications that degree requirements in some programs had perhaps been altered without Graduate Council approval, the Council requested that each department with a graduate program provide a description of their current degree requirements, focusing particularly on changes initiated since their 1993 graduate brochures (the last time GC reviewed requirements for programs). Most departments have since responded, and their responses will be examined by the 2002-03 Graduate Council.

The Council approved a parenthetical notation of Women's Studies to the Psychology Ph.D.

5. Courses Review Subcommittee

A Graduate Course Review Subcommittee was established at the beginning of the academic year, with the charge of examining existing course review policy and generating new policy where appropriate, as well as reviewing requests for new courses and revisions to existing courses as they were proposed during the year. The Courses Subcommittee was composed of GC members Bruce Schumm (chair), Diane Gifford-Gonzalez, Kathy Foley (F), and Rob Wilson (W,S), and Office of Publications and Scheduling staff members John Fay (F) and Margie Claxton (W,S).

After an examination of existing course review policy, the Subcommittee developed and documented a substantially revised policy designed to facilitate efficient review under well-established guidelines, and to formalize record-keeping while minimizing paperwork. In addition, the Subcommittee added several criteria to the 'Supplemental Sheet' of issues to be addressed by proponents of new or substantially revised courses. A number of issues critical for assessment of new graduate classes are included explicitly on the new Graduate Course Approval Supplemental Sheet, including a request to clearly differentiate between the content of new graduate classes and extant undergraduate courses, in accord with UC Academic Senate Regulation 762. This new policy was adopted by vote of the Graduate Council.

Finally, the Subcommittee reviewed roughly 100 new or substantially revised course offerings, sending between 5 and 10% of these back to their proponents for refinement or clarification.

6. New Graduate Program Proposal Reviews

The Graduate Council is the final on-campus approval body for new graduate degree proposals before they are advanced to the Systemwide level. The Council examines proposals in considerable detail, with the foreknowledge that quite intense scrutiny is given to new graduate degree proposals at the Systemwide level, and that dealing with as many issues as possible on campus accelerates the consideration of the proposal at the Systemwide level (and indeed, excellent proposals enhance the campus' reputation). The Council typically focuses on issues of viability (are the necessary resources available from the coupled financial, infrastructure and personnel viewpoints to mount the program?), the demand and need for the program, the structure of the program in terms of curriculum and requirements, the means of graduate student support, and the relationship of the program to others on the campus.

To expedite handling of new graduate proposals, an agreement was reached with CPB that the Graduate Council would assess whether proposals were revised in accord with CPB's comments on the original proposal draft. This shift eliminates having to put revised program proposals on both GC's and CPB's agendas. Either GC or CPB can request that CPB vet the revised proposal, if deemed necessary.

The Council reviewed and approved a proposal for graduate degree programs in Bioinformatics, which was transmitted to CCGA for review. The Council reviewed and commented on proposals for graduate degree programs in Digital Arts and New Media (DANM), and in Social Documentation.

The Council imposed deadlines for receipt of draft copies of proposals for Ph.D. degrees in Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology, and Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: the initiation of separate degrees had been an integral part of their proposal to fission the former Biology department, and CCGA had approved parenthetical notations on Biology degrees on an interim basis pending receipt of proposals for separate degrees. Draft copies of the proposals were received by the deadline.

7. Academic Senate Bylaws and Regulations and Graduate Council Internal Policies

In conjunction with its recently expanded membership, the Graduate Council instituted a Recusal Policy for members with conflicts of interest on issues or program reviews brought in front of the Graduate Council.

Graduate Policy regulations are being moved to a policy appendix in the Academic Senate Manual, and will be readily accessible on-line.

The Graduate Council voted to record the votes of the GSA representatives on appropriate issues within the Minutes of meetings: comparable changes have been enacted at the Systemwide level for CCGA. Of course, only the votes of Senate members officially on the committee will be used to approve or reject motions.

Under its plenary authority the 2000-01 Graduate Council drafted and approved a revised policy for Graduate Council review of graduate programs (formerly SCD Regulation 22.1) and the 2001-02 Council reaffirmed it and added the two final sentences. The complete policy now reads:

All graduate programs approved by the Graduate Council shall be subject to detailed review by the Graduate Council at intervals no greater than six years. In normal cases, for programs associated with a single department, reviews may be conducted in concert with the departmental reviews. At least once every six years, at the time of departmental reviews if appropriate, the reviews will include evaluations of the graduate programs by external committees. The external review committee may be identical to the departmental one. Other reviews may be conducted, with or without an external review committee of one or more members as needed, in cases deemed appropriate by the Graduate Council. Such intermediate reviews are advisable for

new programs and other programs needing a greater than normal level of monitoring. After a graduate program review is completed, including follow-up reports, the Graduate Council shall recommend, based on the issues raised in the review reports and the level of compliance with recommended changes, a date by which the next review should take place for programs that are approved for continuation. A review shall take place no later than that recommended date, but may take place sooner if the Graduate Council deems one to be necessary. The review process shall be coordinated by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Graduate Studies Division. The Graduate Council shall exercise oversight of all aspects of the graduate portion of the review process, including approval of the charge and external review committee and the nature of the site visit, the closure meeting, and follow-up reports. The Graduate Council expects a programmatic review within six years of the prior review. If a review within this period is not completed, suspension of graduate admissions is warranted unless the Council is successfully petitioned.

8a. Graduate Student Issues: Rules

The Graduate Council changed the policy for participation in public academic ceremonies (e.g., graduation—former SCD Regulation 21.1). Specifically, students for whom both their advisor (in consultation with other committee members) and their departmental Graduate Representative are willing to sign that they will finish all degree requirements with reasonable certainty by June 30th will be allowed to participate in the spring graduation event. This allows students who, for example, have spring classes that are required for their degree to participate in the spring graduation ceremony.

The Graduate Council discussed in detail, but declined to alter, the existing policy of not granting credit-by-petition to graduate students.

The Graduate Council changed the process by which English proficiency of TA's is assessed. An interview evaluation procedure, generally modeled after a protocol used at UCSB, was endorsed. This interview procedure replaces the SPEAK test that was previously used, and will be administered by Lecturer Peggy Miles.

8b. Graduate Student Issues: Infrastructure

The Graduate Council gave its official endorsement to the idea of establishing a Graduate College at UCSC, specifically endorsing and offering its support in carrying out the recommendations of the "Report of the Task Force for a Graduate College and Graduate Life." These recommendations include establishing a Graduate College "as soon as possible." The next step in this process is the preparation of a formal proposal to Systemwide to establish a Graduate College.

The Graduate Council reviewed the budgets and collection statistics for the libraries of the different UC campuses. The UCSC library has the smallest collection among the UC's, and the smallest annual collections budget. The budget has prevented UCSC from subscribing to several important electronic databases: the size of collection (as well as its continuing shrinkage relative to other UC's) certainly impacts the ease, and potentially the caliber, of graduate student research on the campus. Moreover, the current collections budget does not appear promising for UCSC's library attaining Association of Research Libraries (ARL) status, a critical part of the prospective goal of the campus ultimately attaining AAU status. The Graduate Council formally requested that EVC Simpson consider a substantial, ongoing augmentation to the Library Collections Budget: our explicit, aspiration is simply to improve the library's collections. Indeed, since the UCSC Library has the smallest collections budget and collection in the system, our library collection is the most inadequate in terms of meeting the scholarly needs of its faculty and students.

The Graduate Council requested, with the concurrence of the Graduate Division, that graduate student course enrollments be counted for allocation of TA resources. The present campus policy uses only undergraduate

enrollments to calculate TA allocations. Therefore, programs that have graduate classes of sufficient size or scope that they require TA resources must, at present, either (1) effectively tax their undergraduate-based TA allocation to staff graduate classes; (2) redirect other resources to staff their graduate classes; or (3) not staff their graduate classes at a pedagogically appropriate level. We formally requested that CPEVC Simpson alter this policy: no response has been received as yet.

The discussion of how TA resources are allocated to the departments by the divisions was initiated. The Graduate Dean is planning to draft a position paper on TA allocations, which will serve as a more informed basis for GC discussion.

The Graduate Council requested and received information on the allocation of Registration Fees on the campus from Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels. Of the 8.7 million dollar annual budget, a minimum of between 1.25 and 1.4 million dollars is allocated to solely undergraduate purposes. For comparison, 11 thousand dollars is allocated to solely graduate purposes. This level of distribution, in which graduate-focused causes receive less than 1% of the amount of money of purely undergraduate-oriented activities has persisted for at least the past three years, and perhaps much longer. The distribution is clearly not in accord with a population-proportional distribution of registration fees. Rather, it appears to reflect the absolute and considerable majority of undergraduates on the student committee in charge of allocating fees. The Chancellor has ultimate authority over the allocation of these resources, and the Graduate Council thus requested that she as soon as possible allocate an amount of student fees proportional to the percentage of graduate students on the campus (presently about 145 thousand dollars per annum) to graduate student purposes. In the short run, this amount can help support a graduate-student dedicated career counselor and mental health counselor, two particularly pressing needs articulated by the Graduate Student Association (GSA) representative and Graduate Dean for the graduate student population. This move, and continued proportionate funding in the future, would begin to rectify this long-term inequity.

The Graduate Council also formally expressed its objection to the proposal (ultimately tabled) to institute 24-hour parking fees: beyond the major concerns about the added expense and inconvenience for graduate students, the timing of this proposal, precisely coincident with graduate student recruitment season, was regarded as exceptionally inopportune.

9. Postdoctoral Education at UCSC

The welfare of postdoctoral scholars is a topic that lies under the purview of the Graduate Council. Unlike most other UC's, no postdoctoral scholar association appears to exist on campus (or none that has been discovered by, or made itself known to, the Graduate Council): accordingly, there is no postdoctoral scholar representation at Graduate Council meetings. With no petitions from postdoctoral scholars, no action related to postdoctoral scholars was taken by the Graduate Council this year. This is an area that will continue to be examined and assessed by the Graduate Council, particularly as Systemwide committees are proposing good practice policies for postdoctoral scholars (minimum compensations, maximum durations of appointments, improved mentorship procedures).

10. Graduate Enrollment and Graduate Student Support

The Graduate Council approves and can recommend the awarding of fellowships and graduate scholarships. The Graduate Council extensively discussed different formulations for the allocation of fellowship block grants awarded to different programs by the Division of Graduate Studies. The Graduate Council voted to approve a block allocation formulation for use in 2002-2003 (and beyond) based upon a 1.5 to 1 ratio of block funding for Ph.D. students relative to Masters' students, with no distinction being made between pre- and post-qualifying Ph.D. students. Enrollments for block allocation calculation will be determined from a 3-year average of the 2 previous years' enrollments in a program, plus one projected year. The three programs on

campus that commonly move students between their M.S. and Ph.D. programs will be monitored by Graduate Division to assess whether there is significant moving of students between programs based solely on the changed funding ratio. If such motion occurs, next year's Graduate Council will examine formulae designed to take into account such shifts. Block allocations for the proposed Ed.D., M.F.A. and D.M.A. degrees were tabled until these degrees are on-line.

The Council endorsed, with slight revisions, the CPB Resolution committing UCSC to a target of at least 15% graduate enrollment at build-out.

The Council selected winners of the Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award, Cota-Robles/Diversity Fellowships and Superfellowships, and President's Dissertation-Year Fellowships.

11. Other Graduate Issues

The Council assessed and commented on the draft vision plan for the Silicon Valley Center: a substantial graduate presence is envisioned at SVC. The Council endorsed the plan provided that: 1) existing (and prospective) graduate programs at UCSC are not negatively impacted, from either a financial or staffing standpoint, by the development of the SVC; 2) that UCSC (through its Academic Senate) maintains full academic control of graduate education at SVC throughout the development of this entity (and perhaps in perpetuity); and 3) sufficient resources are available so that a set of truly world-class research enterprises can be launched at SVC. The Council was particularly concerned that a second-tier, or evanescent financial commitment by UC (and specifically UCSC) to developing SVC could produce an entity that would fall far short of the current vision, and prospectively not be worth doing.

The Graduate Council also commented on the VPAA's draft "Guidelines for Establishment and Disestablishment of Academic Programs and Departments," with the primary concerns being to ensure that Graduate Council is consulted in all instances of discontinuance of graduate programs, and not solely those that are non-resource neutral and to ensure that Academic Senate committees are consulted in all instances of changes to the charters of programs.

The disposition of Natural Sciences 296 "Speaking and Teaching in the U.S. Classroom" was discussed. The Graduate Council agreed that such a course, oriented towards familiarizing international graduate students with the U.S. classroom environment, is most naturally inter-divisional, and would be appropriate to transfer to Graduate Division if the Graduate Division had course-offering authority. However, after considerable study by V.P.A.A. Brown's office, it was determined that approval for the Graduate Division to offer courses is absent at the Systemwide level. The Graduate Council thus viewed this course as ultimately being most appropriately subsumed under a Graduate College.

12. Graduate Groups

Graduate Groups are a means for generating interdisciplinary and/or non-departmental graduate programs. Although used extensively at some of the other UC's, UCSC presently has no Graduate Groups, nor any guidelines for their genesis, funding, assessment or academic regulations. Instead, UCSC has used the Interdisciplinary Degree Program (I.D.P.'s) designation. The Graduate Council provided preliminary input to Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Talamantes on his drafts of Graduate Group Guidelines: further input will be made in the coming academic year. The current draft Graduate Group Guidelines deal principally with the degree requirements, academic regulations and structures of Graduate Groups: a vital portion of what is required to generate a fully approved framework for generating Graduate Groups at UCSC. A memorandum of understanding relating to the funding and genesis of inter-divisional Graduate Groups, subscribed to by the Divisional Deans, remains a critical outstanding portion of the Graduate Group approval

process. The Council will attempt to facilitate the production of such a memorandum of understanding in the coming academic year.

13. Issues Carrying Forward to 2002-2003

- Vetting and advising on the extant working document on procedures for establishing and running Graduate Groups
- Helping to instigate and ultimately evaluate a formal proposal to establish a Graduate College
- Assessing new policies for conducting program external reviews
- Assisting with the assessment process for possible professional schools at UCSC
- Examine the manner by which TAs are allocated by Deans to departments
- Overall review of departments' degree requirements

Respectfully submitted:

GRADUATE COUNCIL

Weixin Cheng

Olof Einarsdottir

Kathy Foley, F

Diane Gifford-Gonzalez

Suresh Lodha

Jim McCloskey, F

Paul Nauert, WS

Martine Schlag

Bruce Schumm

Rob Wilson, WS

Jim Clifford

Graduate Dean Frank Talamantes, *ex-officio*

Quentin Williams, Chair

GSA Representative

Lee Ritscher

LAUC Representative

Beth Remak-Honnef

September 27, 2002