The Graduate Council was called to order by Chair Beattie on September 9, 2010 at 2:35 p.m. A quorum was present.

The minutes of July 1, 2010 were approved.

Chair’s Report – Michael Beattie
None.

Vice Chair’s Report
None.

Dean’s Report – Patricia Calarco
Application data for the past six years show an increase of up to 34%. This is typical; in economic downturns people tend to go back to school or graduate school. Matriculated student data show that prior to this year we were slowly decreasing from 11% to about 8%. In fall 2010 our percent of matriculates is down to under 6%.

The number admitted for basic science programs five years ago was 150. Fast forward to 2010, the number expected to matriculate is 99. This 34% decrease in our enter class for basic sciences does not bode well for the stature and importance of these programs.

This decrease is one reason why we are agitating with the administration for more central campus support for these programs. Currently we have no central support; instead we have irregular allocations from year to year.

Our total average time to degree is 6.76 years; we need to improve this. Faculty mentors need to be educated on, and reminded of, the importance of decreasing time to degree.
We have recently learned that the School of Nursing has been invited to meetings at OP to discuss an online nursing Ph.D. There has been a lot of talk in the media and within UC about creating and expanding online degree offerings. Clearly, this is something that we will want to pay attention to going forward.

**Senate Analyst’s Report**
None.

**Postdoctoral Scholars – Christine DesJarlais**
The post-doc union contract was ratified on 8/11/10 and went into effect on 8/12/10. The coming weeks will consist of training for staff and faculty about the implementation of the contract. All post-docs will receive a one time across the board pay increase. Anyone hired prior 8/31/10 is eligible for this increase. The raise will be 3% for those earning $47k or less and a 1.5% increase for those earning more than $47k. The compensation scale is moving to NIH scale and will be phased in over the next few years. As of June 2011 new appointments will start at the appropriate NIH pay scale.

September 20-24th is National Post-Doc appreciation week.

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

**Postdoctoral Scholars Association Report – Vuk Uskokovic, PSA Representative**
None

**New & Ongoing Business**

**HHMI Fellowship**
The HHMI Fellowship is one of several fellowships administered by the Graduate Division. The fellowship subcommittee will consist of six members, three of which have been named today: R. Raffai, T. Desai, and M. Beattie. The other three members will be named at our next meeting.

National Research Council Report
On September 20th the National Research Council will release its long awaited report "A Data-Based Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs" to institutions; they will release it to the wider public a few days later. In the interim days, we (along with our sister campuses) will be preparing our response to this report and we are already working with Public Affairs on press releases and other appropriate answers to eventual questions from the media and other concerned constituents.

Dean Koda-Kimble, Dean Hawgood, & EVC-P Bluestone (*The following is a general synopsis without individual attribution of the discussion by the Deans and EVC and committee members.*)
The acute decline in enrollment in basic science programs can be attributed to the inability of the programs to support the students financially; the decline is not because students did not select UCSF. Even so, there are also decisions being made by individual programs on how to use the support they have; some programs choose to support students for three years rather than two years. That impacts how many students will be admitted. The time to degree is another issue. We are averaging well over six years for the time-to-degree. This should give any student pause. Why is the time-to-degree so long when it is highly likely that the student will go on to two post-doc appointments after finishing the degree?

Over the years our programs have successfully cobbled money together from a variety of sources. While successful, this has also meant that there has been littlecommonality or no common budget templates to track the flows of money in and out of each program.

We also need to be thinking about what the right size of a given program should be; which programs should we be building and which should be retrenched because science changes. Once a program starts
it is easy to say, “we want to keep growing it” with more faculty and more students but the direction of biomedical science should inform our decisions about program growth such that we are meeting the employment needs of science.

The melding or interdisciplinary nature of some of our programs may also be confusing students and enable our loss of students to peer institutions. For example, students researching our programs will find references to “computational biology” “systems biology” “synthetic biology” “biophysics” “bioinformatics” etc. Visiting prospective students are greeting with a panoply of similar offerings. A lack of clarity is a potential problem that faculty have identified.

Central support for graduate education is a high priority; we understand the problem and are taking appropriate measures (for example: development, assembling alumni databases), but we cannot count on historical patterns to address the problems. The state is not going to be offering more money; the federal government is not going to offer more money, for every training grant that we secure with an 8% overheard, we cannot support the infrastructure that is required to manage some of these programs that are expensive and not organized as efficiently as they might be. The solution will require a combination of thinking about how to become more integrated, efficient, attractive, modern in thinking about graduate education, shortening the time to degree, increasing the diversity of labs that have access to graduate students, and creating opportunities for students in different jobs that they may not otherwise have so they will want to come here, and of course we need to raise more money to support all of our programs.

One creative solution proposed by some faculty to finance the graduate programs: this year or next year UCOP is going to return fees to the campus. It would be of tremendous help to the PIs to return those fees (or some large percentage of them). Unfortunately, as of right now there is no way of knowing what the formula for the funds flow will be for those fees.

Security
Moves to cut back campus shuttle service to and from Mission Bay have caused students and post-docs to feel under pressure. Mission Bay is also marked by some push back with regard to security measures. Some buildings on the campus have locked doors and require the display of campus ID badges or sign-in to enter the buildings and people have complained about this requirement. There is a trade off between having a secure campus and an open campus.

Seminar/Telecasting/Desktop streaming
There is a push for archiving some seminars for later viewing and downloading, but not all speakers are open to this. Some speakers have specifically objected to this because they want to control their data and not allow anyone and everyone to access it at some later time.

Having appropriate telecasting to one or more sites on a campus is one thing, but simply allowing everyone to view presentations from their desktops could potentially undermine the feel of a campus that we all want to cultivate.
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