



Graduate Council
Elizabeth Watkins, PhD, Chair

Thursday, October 8, 2009
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Room S-30

MINUTES

PRESENT: E. Watkins (Chair), M. Beattie, J. Guydish, R. Raffai, N. Stotts, C. Studholme, E. Yelin, P. Calarco, P. Taylor, J. Hunkapiller, R. Kant, A. Cleaver, F. Chehab, Rick Wylie (guest)

ABSENT: Mary Lynch, Sarah, Nelson, Chris DesJarlais, Daniel Fried, Patricia Babbitt

The Graduate Council was called to order by Chair Watkins on October 8, 2009 at 2:03 p.m. A quorum was present.

The minutes of September 10, 2009 were approved.

Chair's Report – Elizabeth Watkins

Watkins and Cleaver recently attended the Academic Senate Leadership retreat. At that meeting, Farid Chehab made a plea to Chancellor Desmond-Hellman to advocate for graduate students. The Chancellor's reply called for hard data profiling the graduate population, the impact of fee increases, etc. The Chancellor underscored that she needed hard data with which to make her own case on behalf of our students to UCOP and external constituents rather than simply advocating for graduate education in the abstract.

The Graduate Dean recently held a meeting with Graduate Program Directors. The Chancellor attended this meeting as well and indicated that she was interested in quantifying the productivity of graduate programs, but not all programs or students create "products" in the traditional sense—products that can be patented--and this approach to graduate education is potential cause for concern. Still, at this early stage, and without specifics, the Chancellor is clearly supportive of graduate education.

CCGA agrees that they, too, need to generate talking points that underscore the importance of graduate education, original research in all disciplines, and make that case consistently across all UC campuses.

At the most recent CCGA meeting, Watkins observed that participants expressed concern that President Yudof is not prioritizing graduate education. CCGA voted to not support the proposed mid-year fee increases as well as the increases in the coming year. These fee increases directly impact principal investigators.

CCGA identified immediate and long-term detrimental effects to graduate education and the mission of the university. UC is known as a research institution, but one cannot have compelling academic research

without a robust graduate program. CCGA does not believe that legislators in Sacramento fully appreciate this, and President Yudof is not making the case in this regard; the emphasis from UCOP appears to be exclusively on undergraduates. The conversation at CCGA concluded that all of higher education (UC, CSU, Community Colleges) must work together to make it clear that the state needs to support higher education. We cannot resign ourselves to the fact that we have less money. Similarly, some suggested, we might want to reconsider the size of some of our graduate programs.

The Coordinating Committee (all chairs of all the Senate Committees) meets bimonthly and four issues from that meeting are of interest to the Council:

- A symposium on industry/academic collaborations with respect to academic freedom will take place on January 13 in Cole Hall from 1-4pm.
- Courses of Instruction reported that the online system for submitting new courses would be live in the Spring.
- Education Policy is discussing issues of Technology in Teaching; they want to foster more interschool educational opportunities.
- The Committee on Research Proposal to affiliate with the Resource Allocation Program (RAP) was approved; those who seek grants via RAP will want to know that grant evaluations are now centralized.

CCGA

Planning for Doctoral & Professional Education (PDPE) has been reorganized and they are charged with studying sources of granted student support.

There are currently 28,000 graduate students at UC. The goal had previously been to increase to 37,000; it is estimated that going from 28k to 37k would cost \$500 million a year; plans for growth are now likely on hold.

Graduate students are frequently referred to as *costing* the university money, but studies show that a graduate student supported on an RO1 grant, for example, are responsible for about \$75k themselves in terms of contributions they bring to the research. The grants on which they are paid also earn indirect costs—none of which go back to the lab, the program, or the student. Overall they are money *generators* for the university, yet many administrators conceptualize them as an expense.

There is a proposal circulating for all UC campuses to move to a semester system.

There is a task force for online instruction at the system-wide level. Currently there are only two graduate programs online.

A reviewer has been assigned for the Ph.D in Epidemiology and Translational Science and the Masters in Dental Hygiene.

A question has been raised as to whether programs should be reviewed at the system-wide level if the funding is not yet in place.

Vice Chair's Report – Michael Beattie

CCGA news summarized by Elizabeth Watkins above.

Dean's Report – Patricia Calarco

The Graduate Division offered comments during Faculty Information Week (FIW) on how to supervise trainees. This was the third year of FIW; beyond three years ago there was no introduction to the campus for new faculty. The orientation is offered on different campuses: Parnassus, Laurel Heights, SF General, VA, etc.

The Graduate Division hosted a new student orientation for all incoming students on September 23rd.

For new students in the basic sciences there was a Diversity Workshop organized by the (Minority Graduate Student Organization) MGSO in collaboration with Michael Adams of the Office of Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity and Diversity.

Development

In fulfillment of our development efforts, we have held our first meeting with one of the vice presidents of Genentech to help us form an advisory committee for the Graduate Division. This is intended to give us an external view of ourselves. We are accustomed to a five year stewardship review of a dean who heads a school, but the formation of this advisory committee is intended to help us gauge where we are in terms of other graduate training programs, how we can leverage industry in the area, etc.

On 10/8/09, the Graduate Division hosted a site visit from the ARCS (Achievement Rewards for College Scientists) Foundation. Over the years ARCS has contributed more than \$3 million for graduate education at UCSF. Last year ARCS gave \$180k; this year they gave \$120k, a reduction reflected by the economic climate. The Northern California chapter of ARCS donates to six institutions in Northern California but UCSF receives the most money. This year ARCS funding at UCSF was distributed among 12 fellowships.

Budget

Operating costs for the campus in the course of the last two years have been reduced by 23%. Fees are projected to increase by 30% through 2010. Less than 8% of our campus support comes from the State; we now receive more money from development than from the State of California.

Graduate Division Enrollment

The attached color-coded chart shows enrollment breakdown by program. Fall 2008 enrollment was 1508. Fall 2009 enrollment is 1632. Total campus enrollment is 3203. We do have a number of joint program enrolled students not reflected in these totals. Because our programs are all interdisciplinary most student are unaware that they are, in fact, connected to a school as reflected in this chart.

Report on Postdoctoral Scholars

The Graduate Division recently hosted a two-day Post-Doc boot-camp. Thirty-seven senior graduate students attended; the boot-camp is heavily weighted toward under-represented students. This, the fourth annual boot-camp, is entirely supported by the National Science Foundation and we are in the final year of this support. Unless NSF holds another funding competition this could be the final year of the boot-camp.

We have received ARRA (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) funding for one additional post-doc position on our minority based program held in combination with SFSU (teaching component). We are communicating with PI's about who might be the best candidate for that position.

Bargaining with the union is ongoing.

Postdoctoral Scholars – Christine DesJarlais

Summarized by Patricia Calarco above.

Graduate Students' Association (GSA) Report – Julie Hunkapiller, GSA Representative

In the coming weeks, UCSF students will host a quarterly meeting of graduate student representatives from all the UC campuses. Traditionally, this first meeting identifies one issue that will be addressed throughout the year. This year that issue is creating a universal insurance pool for all UC graduate students. As UCSF is one of the smallest graduate schools our insurance is the highest among all UC campuses, currently more than \$7k each year per student.

“Let’s Have a Fun Time Doing Science” is grass roots program that has taken the form of a three day symposium. Talks are not simply scientific but also somewhat personal (what sparked your interest in science) talks in a more fun and general forum. The PSA partnered with the GSA in funding speakers for the event. The forum started today and will run through Saturday.

The GSA is attending all the graduate student orientation events to introduce itself to new students.

GSA officers are starting a leadership program funded partly by the GSA, ASUC, and Student Academic Affairs. This is a workshop designed to formalize training in leadership skills for GSA officers.

The GSA is looking for space in Mission Bay where students can congregate, socialize, relax, hold meetings, etc. There is a student lounge in Genentech Hall but that space has effectively been claimed by students in the Tetrad program.

Postdoctoral Scholars Association Report – Rishi Kant, PSA Representative

The PSA recently hosted a mentoring dinner; it was well attended and funded by the Graduate Division.

The National Post-doc appreciation day was a big success! It was very well attended by students and their families. The event ran out of food, which had to be replenished. 400-700 people attended this event making it one of the best-attended events at Mission Bay to date.

The PSA is organizing volunteers to participate in a conference to be held at UC Berkeley where post-docs will present their research projects.

The PSA is trying to advertise the Individual Development Plan; many post-docs are unaware that this exists.

New Business

Graduate Council Roster

Senate Bylaws stipulate that the Council should have 13 members; we currently have 12. Bylaws also indicated we should have two physicians on the Council; we currently do not. Following deliberations, the Council voted on a motion to accept the Graduate Council as it is currently populated through 2009-10. The motion passed unanimously.

Following deliberations, the Council voted on a motion to change the Academic Senate bylaws governing the Graduate Council to remove the requirement of having two physicians on the Council. The motion passed 8 to 1.

Nursing Program Review – Ed Yelin

The program is considered a star training program among Ph.D. programs in nursing. One issue that emerged had to do with Moore fellows. The Moore fellows program began in 2003 and will conclude in 2011. The program was designed to address the scarcity of nursing faculty in Northern California. The program has been a victim of its own success; all available fellow slots have been filled and the program has had to liberalize the placement criteria to allow some of the graduates to go elsewhere.

Most students expressed satisfaction with the program; faculty were happy with the quality of the students and their graduates most of whom work in academe.

One difficult recruitment issue the program faces has to do with cost of living in the Bay Area; students tend to be older and somewhat established financially--as opposed to coming right out of a master’s in

nursing program because they typically could not afford to live in the area. Many of the matriculates are mid-career professionals.

The review suggested a greater effort is needed to recruit faculty from across the country rather than locally or within California. This is a challenge faced by virtually all programs. The high cost of housing continues to be a hurdle in recruiting junior faculty. The result is that the program has a history of hiring a number of its own graduates who are established in the Bay Area (or California) and who happen to be more majority than minority. The gap between early salaries for nurses and assistant professors in nursing is such that graduates are drawn to practice rather than academe. Still, national reputations are, in part, earned and maintained by recruiting accomplished faculty from other parts of the country; senior faculty are easier to recruit from other parts of the country (Boston, NYC, etc.) because they tend to have housing equity and are used to the cost of living associated with a major city. Recruiting junior faculty from outside the area is much more challenging. Indeed, in this sense the goals/concerns articulated in the review are at odds with the reality of the recruitment dynamic

The report suggests more effort is needed to place graduates more broadly—particularly beyond California. Nationally, it is considered a good thing to send graduates all over the country, but this view is a vestige of a time when mainly male faculty had nonworking spouses who would easily relocate. It is no longer feasible to live in most cities in the country on one professional salary. The ability of established graduates with spouses and families to easily relocate is simply not what it once was.

The report recognizes that there is a shortage of junior faculty in the program. Because they represent the future of program faculty this is a serious concern that needs to be addressed.

Tracking data on the attrition rate for students was lacking. This issue was raised in the previous report and it remains unresolved; the program must move to follow and document the attrition rate of students and their profiles.

The review calls for enhancing the diversity of faculty in terms of ethnicity and scholarly preparation. While a true and legitimate concern, this is a standard issue for all programs at UCSF and probably at all graduate schools; the Nursing program's statistics in this regard are admirable and the program is mindful of this ongoing concern.

Overall this was a very positive review.

Program Review Chart

The attached chart documents the status of all academic program reviews since 2004. Conclusion of the Bioengineering review is three years overdue! The program was reviewed on May 4-5, 2006 and a letter from the Council was sent to the program director on 9/12/06. The program's written response remains delinquent. An email from E. Watkins to Sarah Nelson and Tejal Desai was sent on 10/11/09.

On the heels of their individual reviews, we have sent letters to PSPG and Tetrad and await their responses. We expect to receive and address their responses by the end of the calendar year.

Robert Raffai has agreed to serve as liaison for the upcoming BMS review.

Nancy Stotts has agreed to serve as the liaison for the upcoming Physical Therapy review.

Fellowship subcommittee

Committee volunteers include: Sarah Nelson, Rob Raffai, Colin Studholme, Liz Watkins, Ed Yelin

Old Business

None.

Chair Watkins adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Peter Taylor, Assistant Dean, Graduate Division
peter.taylor@ucsf.edu; 415-502-3224

Senate Analyst: Alison Cleaver
alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu; 415-476-3808