
I. Announcements 10:00 am

a. Graduate Council Chair (Baumgarth)

There will be a number of town hall meetings for faculty and students, regarding strategic planning. Everyone is highly encouraged to attend. The Chancellor has requested community input to the strategic planning process. Dateline published a story with the link to the website where comments can be provided. Everyone is encouraged to provide input via this link.

An email has been sent to Academic Senate Chair Rachael Goodhue to ask for an update on the outcome of the budget model review.

b. Vice Provost and Dean Graduate Studies (Mohapatra)

Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA) and the Provost are currently discussing the budget, more to come.

Addressing the graduate group issues in order for them to be more manageable, while still keeping the interdisciplinary aspect, should be a high priority for Graduate Council this year.

A new staff member has been hired in Graduate Studies to facilitate digital communications for the graduate programs and graduate groups. The new staff member will be helping the programs with digital communications. The new staff member will be reporting to Elizabeth Lambert, any requests should be submitted through her for digital communications services.

Addressing the issues with online graduate programs should also be a priority for Graduate Council. There is currently no clear understanding of what the process for approving online graduate programs should be.

There seems to be confusion on the process for dismissals and disqualifications. The Office of Graduate Studies processes disqualifications, while dismissals are addressed by Student Judicial Affairs. Regarding disqualification, professional schools have suggested that Graduate Council is very academic and may not have a clear understanding of the needs of the professional schools, there needs to be clear communication regarding professional school disqualifications cases. Student Judicial Affairs addresses student conduct. Final decisions on issues addressed by Student Judicial Affairs are made by the Associate Vice Chancellor. The
final decision on these matters is made by the Associate Vice Chancellor, who is not a faculty member. Faculty members and deans have expressed concerns with the final decision on these matters not being made by a faculty member, particularly with the student conduct issues that are tied to academics. Graduate Council members felt the process currently in place involves the necessary faculty input, and the committee members were not concerned with an administrator making the final decision on matters related to student conduct.

c. Graduate Studies Associate Deans (Waterhouse & Delplanque)
Currently up to date with all of the program review responses from the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Provost.

d. CCGA – Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Hsu)
The graduate student population has been growing by about 1,200 across campuses, UC Davis has been identified as one of the campuses where growth was seen.

There is an update to the payroll happening system-wide, there was question as to whether students would be included in the update.

There seems to be a push for reviewing SSDP Programs, given that there has been a lot of growth CCGA is looking at doing this more consistently system-wide.

Online programs were also discussed at the last meeting. There was mention of a whistleblower option for faculty to report any improper action they may perceive. CCGA is working on ideas for how to develop online programs and the role that outside vendors might play.

e. GSA – Graduate Student Association (Taggug)
Efforts are currently focused on TA bargaining for spring quarter. There were 68 applications received for the Travel Awards, the number of applications was higher last year. The Representative Assembly recently approved resolutions related to housing units for students and low income housing. There will be a tax workshop that students are encouraged to attend if they need assistance with filing their taxes.

There was an issue brought up by a student in the Neuroscience Graduate Program. The student seems to be taxed on tuition for this program.

**Action item:** Roy Taggueg to follow up with Nicole Baumgarth with more information regarding the Neuroscience Graduate Group issue.

f. PSA – Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Abdelfattah)
g. GSADC – Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Hope)
Grad Slam registration closes Jan 19th, and faculty are still needed to participate as judges. The position for the Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (GSADC) is now open, please refer students to the application posted on the Graduate Studies website.

II. Consent Calendar 10:20 am
   a. Meeting Summary from December 14, 2017
   b. Integrative Genetics and Genomics Transmittal Letter
   c. DE in Critical Theory Transmittal Letter
   d. DE in Biotechnology Transmittal Letter
   e. Chemical Engineering – letter to ensure PhD students receive opportunity to conduct research

   **Motion to approve:** Unanimously approved.

III. New Business

   a. Educational Policy Committee (Cappa) 10:25 am
      i. Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL) Program Proposal for Dissolution of Partnership
         The Educational Policy Committee recommends a class I review by CCGA for the CANDEL proposal for Dissolution of Partnership. The program would like to remove the partnership with Sonoma State, everything will remain the same in terms of the academic content.
         There was an issue with the time to degree for the CANDEL program that was brought up during their graduate program review. This could be pointed out in the GC transmittal letter.

         **Action Item:** Chris Cappa will write the GC transmittal letter.

         **Motion to approve recommendation for a Class I review:** unanimously approved.

   b. Program Review Closure Committee (Temple Lang) 10:45 am
      i. Nutritional Biology
         The program has made a lot of changes since the last review. Student recruitment was an issue for the program, the program recruited primarily UC Davis students. There were issues with diversity and recruitment of underrepresented students. The program responded that there would look to start advertising nationally, and have added a diversity statement to their website.

         There was an issue with curriculum delivery and concern that there were too few 250 level courses. The curriculum issue was not as serious as initially pointed out in the review. The program responded that the issue with the 250 courses had to do with students not being aware of the course offerings. The program responded by stating...
that the students would be informed of course offering through the program guide and the program website. The program is also considering an online course to assist students in making up for deficiencies and improving their overall readiness. The program did not respond to the recommendation from the reviewers to establish and entrance proficiency exam. The program is also in the process of revamping the 290 courses, the program is focusing on peer reviews, while the recommendation was to focus on critical coverage of current issues.

There was an issue with the graduate funding and the allocation of 25% TA-ships. The program is putting together a committee to address this issue. The response provided by the program did not fully address the issue with TA-ships.

Dean Dillard proactively responded and has committed to finding more funding for the program administration and advertising.

PRCC recommended to close the review but ask for a follow up to respond more specifically to the issues.

Discussions ensued and GC considered that by no closing the review more pressure would be put on the program to act more decisively on the recommendations. PRCC members agreed and will change PRCC report accordingly.

It is recommended that the following be included in the letter to the program:

- Regarding TA-ships, it could be argued that if they only have 25% to support graduate students, then maybe the program should consider not taking in so many graduate students as this is not a good way to allocate funding.
- GC is concerned with the lack of significant response as outlined in the PRCC report. GC should determine whether the next review should be conducted earlier, based on the follow up responses received from the program.

**Motion to provide the Nutrition Biology Graduate Group with a PRCC report that recommends not closing the review and request a follow up report to be submitted by end of May. Without a response from the program, GC will consider and early program review:** unanimously approved.

**Action Item:** GC transmittal letter and PRCC report to be placed on the consent calendar for the next meeting.

c. **Request for Consultation**

   i. **Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations**

   
   Proposal outlines requirement for making content of all dissertations available online.

   Concern was expressed that any information students may receive from individuals as
part of an interview process in support of a dissertation becomes widely available online. Students will need to take this into consideration. Given the current policies that grant 2-year delays simply by “ticking a box”, while up to 5-year delays of publication require GC approval, the policy will likely affect the humanities very differently than the sciences, as a 2 year timeline for science is usually adequate. For the humanities, however, there is concern that this could affect publishing offers for students. Already, however, dissertations are currently available in ProQuest and this has not usually stopped publishers from offering publishing contracts. GC was concerned with the lack of information given to students regarding the embargo policy. It was pointed out that student’s do not seem to have the information they need to determine whether an embargo should be requested. It was recommended that this information be included in the student handbook, the exit meeting documents, and the Graduate Studies website. It was also suggested that this is something that faculty mentors should be discussing with the students. It was recommended that the Office of Graduate Studies reach out to the graduate programs reminding them of this information. Students were also concerned with the fact that, when an embargo is approved, there is no follow up notice to remind the student that the embargo is about to expire.

Graduate studies will need to consider how this will be communicated to the students if it is approved system-wide.

GSA representatives noted that students discussed this issue at the last Representative Assembly meeting and were asked to provide additional comments by 6pm today.

**Action Item:** Nicole Baumgarth will write the GC response, which will be posted on the whiteboard for further comments.