Graduate Council
Michael Beattie, PhD, Chair

Thursday, May 12, 2011
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Room S-118

MINUTES


ABSENT: Patricia Babbitt, Rebecca Kaplan, Ed Murphy, Dorothy Porter, Sandya Venugopal

The Graduate Council was called to order by Chair Beattie on May 12, 2011 at 2:35 p.m. A quorum was present.

The minutes of March 10, 2011 were approved.

Chair’s Report – Michael Beattie
The CCGA and the Provost’s office have issued guidelines for new self-supporting programs. In brief, CCGA is asking each campus Graduate Council to come up with a policy for reviewing self-supporting programs. They have issued a series of guidelines that they want to see adhered to before they will review new programs. These guidelines include an explanation of the effects of the new self-supporting program on existing graduate programs. In addition, they would like to have the campus planning and budget Senate committee review and sign off on the proposed business model to ensure that campus resources will not be strained by the new program.

Vice Chair’s Report
None.

Dean’s Report – Patricia Calarco
The second annual Graduate Research Day was held in Sacramento on 5/11/11; all ten graduate deans brought two students from their campus (Alana Lerner from Biomedical Sciences and Adam Mendelsohn from Bioengneering) to meet with Assembly members and their staff to impress upon them the value of graduate education and support for UC. A story of our two students currently appears on the campus website ucsf.edu. The deans have concluded that this annual visit to Sacramento is worth continuing; the pay off is in the persistence. We have received positive feedback from a former Assembly staffer, who is now a UCOP Government Relations employee about how these visits resonate in Sacramento over time.

We recently shared with the Provost an outline of the responsibilities of the Graduate Division (attached) in anticipation of a search for the new Graduate Dean. Over the past 15-20 years most graduate deans have come from within the UC system in part because our ability to be effective rests largely on whom we know, how well we understand our campus, where are the funding sources, whom can we talk to, etc. to
advance the agenda of graduate education. The Provost has invited a subset of the graduate program directors to a meeting on the future direction of the Graduate Division.

Our campus has now published a new Alumni Directory; it is the first publication coming out of UDAR. The publication collects current information on alumni of graduate programs. It helps students connect with fellow students. It is organized by year of degree. This publication will serve as the basis for mailings, fundraising efforts, an invitation list for a campus-wide reunion (April 20-21, 2012), and other communications with alumni.

**Senate Analyst’s Report**
None.

**Postdoctoral Scholars – Christine DesJarlais**
We continue to inform post-doc administrators about compensation issues; you may recall that the compensation Article had a phase in period for newly appointed post-docs.

The NRSA scale was announced on 4/25/11; it amounts to a 2% increase at each level.

**Graduate Students’ Association (GSA) Report – Rebecca Kaplan, GSA Representative**
None.

**Postdoctoral Scholars Association Report – Sandya Venugopal, PSA Representative**
None.

**New & Ongoing Business**

**Biophysics Program Review**
For this review, and future reviews, we will want to clarify for the review committee the role of the liaison. The review committee sought to eject the Graduate Council liaison from some of the proceedings. The outside panel may perceive us as *part* of the program rather than as a *reviewer* of the program. Our external reviewers appear to be guided by the review format for training grants where anyone remotely connected to the university is not part of the review process.

A number of concerns were raised in the report and recommendations are offered, but on the whole this is a very positive review. Strengths of the program include the Bootcamp to immerse students of diverse backgrounds into biophysics and the Team Challenges which assign a project to a group of students, for example to build a spectrometer, etc.

**Advanced Training in Translational Research and Discovery Certificate proposal**
The UC Compendium (735) identifies two kinds of Certificates. One is a Graduate Academic Certificate that has the official seal of the University of California and is reviewed through UCOP. The other “small certificate” is one that is within the campus; it does not have the official seal of the university and is issued by department and programs. The latter are reviewed and approved only by the local Graduate Council. This proposal conforms more closely to the latter standard. A Graduate Academic Certificate program requires two semesters or three quarters of full time instruction. If the course content for a proposed program is imbedded in a Ph.D. program (as is the case here) then we would only approve it as a “small certificate.” The proposed students for this program are enrolled Ph.D. students engage in specialized training. A Designated Emphasis would appear to be a more suitable option than attempting to expand this proposal to a full Certificate, which would require a more robust curriculum.

**UCSF Post baccalaureate Program Certificate proposal**
The purpose of this program is to assist disadvantaged students prepare for successful matriculation into health professions. The program will offer study skills, assessment and development courses in
preparation for the MCAT, PCAT, and the DAT. The students in this program will not be enrolled in another degree program at UCSF so this would be a freestanding Certificate. Data show that the existing program since 2005 in both the medical school and the dental (without the Certificate) has been successful. The Certificate would increase student participation in campus life including access to financial aid, student health, library services, etc.

Following a discussion the merits of the proposal, the Council will invite the authors to a future meeting to consider how this proposal might evolve.

**Designated Emphasis for MS vs. PhD**
Our current DE policy was crafted with PhD programs in mind; Global Health Sciences, which offers the MS, is poised to seek a DE in Women’s Health and would like guidance from the Council as to how this request might be received.

If it is feasible to take additional courses concentrated on Women’s Health (or some other area) then this is something the Council would consider, but it is not clear how one could do this given the current calendar year curriculum without displacing the existing core courses that comprise the MS program. In particular, the Council would like to know what differentiates the DE from the core program offering and how an emphasis might be offered in the academic time allotted.

**New Degree Program Chart**
The attached chart displays a list of new degree programs and where each new program is in the review pipeline. This chart also prompts us to consider the potential limit or capacity for our campus with regard to new programs. Is there a limit? If so, what is it? If we have no limit that too is fine, but we should *decide* that is the case rather than have new programs open without considering the question of capacity and resources.

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