I. Announcements

a. Graduate Council Chair (Baumgarth) - No announcements

b. Vice Provost and Dean Graduate Studies (Mohapatra) – Not in attendance

c. Graduate Studies Associate Deans (Waterhouse & Delplanque)
   The Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) has received various inquiries regarding establishing new graduate programs. There has been interest in building collaborations of bioethics on campus, it's expected that there will be interest from students for such a program. There have been discussion of potentially establishing a Designated Emphasis or a Graduate Academic Certificate, discussions with the program are expected to continue before a proposal is submitted.

OGS has initiated discussions of finding a new home for Forensic Science, currently administered directly by OGS.

It has been noted that not everyone is familiar with the University of California President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program. The fellowship program was established to encourage Ph.D. recipients to pursue academic careers at the University of California, and to help contribute to faulty diversity. Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Diversity Raquel Aldana has been in contact with OGS to learn more about the program, OGS hopes that this will promote efforts to distribute the information across campus.

d. CCGA – Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Hsu)
   There was discussion regarding the policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations, the discussions was centered on what actions could be taken to better advice the student.

   There is an effort to get the word out about the data network initiative, UC Davis is not currently involved.

   A survey will likely be sent to Graduate Council regarding Self Supporting Degree Programs, the surveys will likely include questions to help understand the oversight and impact on existing state supported programs.

e. GSA – Graduate Student Association (Taggueg)
The main issues for graduate students at this time is bargaining for the new union contract.

f. PSA – Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Abdelfattah) – Not in attendance

g. GSADC – Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Hope) – Not in attendance

II. Consent Calendar

2:25 pm

a. Meeting Summary from February 22, 2018
b. DE in Reproductive Biology GC Transmittal Letter
c. Civil and Environmental Engineering GC Letter (Chris Cappa Recused From Voting)

Motion to approve: unanimously approved.

III. New Business

2:30 pm

a. WASC Special Visit (Baumgarth)

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) will be conducting a special site visit to address assessment, program review, and the 2020 initiative. Based on the feedback provided by the members who attended the last site visit, the focus on the graduate portion was the program review process. It is unclear whether this site visit is a follow-up to that. As part of the assessment WASC will be looking at how data gathered about student learning outcomes are used consistently across all departments to guide improvement. There was discussion as to whether all graduate level courses have learning objectives and it is not clear that this is the case for all graduate programs. The Courses Subcommittee confirmed that the course form for graduate courses does not require learning objectives and not part of current course assessments. The provision of learning objectives depends largely on the program. Professional graduate degrees are often undergoing accreditation, which require such information. For graduate level courses it seems to be up to the faculty to inform students about learning objectives for each course.

b. Administrative Committee (Baumgarth)

2:45 pm

i. Grandfathering Policy (GC200-02)

This policy was revised by the Administrative Committee to clarify some of the language in the policy. There were two major goals for the rewriting of the policy. First, to clarify that it is up to the student to decide whether they want to follow the old or new degree requirements, while the Major Professor and Graduate Advisor should provide information and guidance, but cannot change the choice of the student. Second, to clarify when the student must announce whether to follow the old or new degree requirements. Under the current policy the student has the option to choose, but it’s not clear when the choice needs to be made. GC members recommended that a specific time limit should be set for the student to make a decision. Discussion
ensued due to the problem with the timeline, namely that it depends on exactly when the new degree requirements are approved, versus when they are communicated to the Program. Furthermore, the timeline itself may be different for every program depending on various factors such as required courses, Qualifying Exam (QE), Preliminary Exam (PE), and advancement to candidacy.

It was noted by the members that the policy should be revised to include a separate clause for Master students, since the timeline for Master students would be different than that for Ph.D. students.

GC recommended that the policy be updated to state that from the date the program received the GC approved degree requirements, the student would have two quarters to state their choice. If before that deadline the student chooses to take the QE, PE or Advancement to Candidacy under the old or new degree requirements, this would indicate their choice and cannot be reversed after the exam.

**Action Item:** Policy will be updated based on the suggested revisions and be brought back to GC for discussion.

c. **Welfare Graduate Student Support** Subcommittee (Arnett) 3:00 pm
   i. Graduate Student Support Committee Data

   The Chair of the Committee reported on the analysis of data on graduate fellowship allocation by various factors, including Program, Gender, Resident-status, among others. One of the items that stood out from the data was that a lower proportion of non-citizens have received fellowship awards, compared to their percentage of the graduate student population. Discussion centered around whether the success rate might be lower for those individuals, as the students have less help from mentors with writing of their statement of purpose. The better a student is mentored the more likely they are to receive it. It was also pointed out that most graduate fellowships are not open to international students. It was unclear whether the data were normalized to count only those awards open to all students.

   The data analysis had a number of limitations, which may limit the conclusions that can be drawn from it. Nonetheless, they provide a first impression on the distribution and it seemed that fellowship allocation by gender followed overall enrollment data.

   Not included in the data was the applicant pool by ethnicity and how many fellowships are awarded to incoming vs. continuing students. It was noted that it might be useful to share the data with the Graduate Group Chairs. GC thanked Chair Arnett for requesting this information from the OGS. It is hoped that a more full analysis of the data could be provided in the future.

d. **Program Review Committee (Menard-Warwick)** 3:20 pm
   i. DE in Stem and Progenitor Cells
The Professor Menard-Warwick informed GC that the program, in existence since 2010, has graduated only 2 students, and currently has 1 student enrolled. The DE seemed to have been developed based on the Training Grant and in fact, the DE has the same requirements as those for the training grant. There was little indication that faculty were actively involved in the DE. Based on this information and the apparent lack of interest in the DE by the students, PRC recommends to Sunset the DE, effective immediately. GC members agreed with this recommendation.

Motion to approve the PRC report and to sunset the DE: unanimously approved.

e. PRCC Membership Pilot Program Extension for 2018-19 (Baumgarth) 3:35 pm

Recommend to continue with the pilot for 2018-19
GC agreed to continue with the PRCC membership as proposed for 2018-19.

The subcommittee on Program Review Closure shall consist of:

a) A past Chair of GC
b) A past Chair of PRC
c) A past Vice-Chair of PRC
d) The Graduate Dean or Dean’s designee
e) 3 members of the GC to the PRCC. This is the number of GC members without appointments as Chairs to GC subcommittees based on current membership. One of those 3 would become Chair of PRCC.

Motion to extend the pilot program to 2018-19: unanimously approved.

f. Draft Policy for Online Programs (Baumgarth) 3:45 pm

The draft policy presented was created due to the need for a policy that describes what is required to create an online program. The draft policy is restricted to Master’s programs only, it excludes terminal Master’s (MFA) degree programs. It was noted that MBA’s can do a PhD, so the policy should explicitly state that this is for Professional programs.

The proposal currently being considered by GC from the Graduate School of Management does not include a name change to differentiate the proposed online program from the on-campus program. Discussion among GC members centered on whether this should be required given that the online program appears to be a new program, and that there should be a way to differentiate them. However, this might not be an absolute requirement. An example cited was the MS degree. Here (depending on the Program) students might be given the option to choose between an MS track I or an MS track II. However, independent of that choice, the awarded degree is simply a MS in the Program of study. Members recommended that something similar be considered to be included in the proposal.
GC members recommended that more detailed guidance be provided for the writers of future proposals. It was noted that this information could be included on a separate guidelines documents that would extend the current guidelines document for new programs.

Recommendations for consideration:

- Role of vendors: what is included in the financial contracts? Profit sharing? Kickbacks?
- SSDP review process: will this be different?
- Extent to which students will be offered the same support as on-campus students, and how it will impact any state-supported programs.
- Student monitoring. Are there certain demographics of students that might enroll but are less likely to succeed?
- Give guidance on course evaluations. Who sees the course evaluations?
- Start thinking about how course evaluations could be incorporated into the program review process, given that any ad-hoc committee will have difficulties in accessing the enrolled students, given their likely large geographic dispersion.

GC members are encouraged to email Judi or Nicole with any additional feedback.

**Action Item:** Draft policy will be updated based on the feedback and be brought back for discussion.