June 18, 2008

REPORT ON GRADUATE EDUCATION AT UC DAVIS

Prepared by the Committee on Academic Planning and Development 2007-2008

BACKGROUND

Graduate education at UCD is organized in the form of a mixture of departmentally based and graduate-group based graduate programs. This organization facilitates interdisciplinary work and generally has served the campus well. Some of the programs are very highly ranked in outside rankings and evaluations. Nevertheless, some strains and endemic problems have surfaced in recent years that need to be fixed to ensure a vibrant future.

Based on a White Paper "Academic Planning for Graduate Education at UC Davis" (September 7, 2005), the Academic Planning and Development Committee (APD) of Graduate Council (GC) studied problem areas of graduate education in Davis over the last two years (05-06 and 06-07), resulting in the report "Enhancing Graduate Education at UC Davis" (Endorsed by GC on July 6, 2006). Specific recommendations were developed in a subsequent report "Recommendations by APD to Overcoming Challenges to Graduate Education at UCD" (see summary in Appendix D). The problems for graduate education at UC Davis that were identified in these reports are, briefly, lack of resources for teaching and administration, lack of cohesiveness, specific problems in staffing of courses, insufficient credit for teaching graduate courses, and space concerns, among others. Some of these problems, such as course staffing, were found to be particularly acute for programs organized in the form of graduate groups.

For the current academic year, APD has been charged by the Academic Senate to address some of these challenges and to prepare a report to Executive Council. The specific charge to APD is outlined in Appendix A ("Charge", a letter by Academic Senate Chair Linda Bisson to APD that is reproduced there). In order to address this charge, APD has conducted a series of meetings in which all aspects of graduate education at UC Davis were reviewed and discussed (see Appendix B "APD Meetings"). The following observations and recommendations are the result of this extensive review.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has become clear in the course of the discussions that led to this report, that a major cause of the existing problems faced by graduate education at UC Davis is the systemic underfunding of graduate programs at UC Davis. In the past, the real costs for graduate programs (such as the implicit but, in reality, heavy costs for instructional resources) have not been fully

factored in. New programs were approved without commitment of the needed resources from the administration. This underfunding was perhaps less visible while the campus was in growth mode but will be much more so in the anticipated steady state mode, especially in view of anticipated growth in graduate enrollment.

While it is expected to take a while to bring funding for existing underfunded programs to the needed level, a major recommendation is that for all new programs the full costs (administrative, student support and instructional) need to be guaranteed in two ways: (1) by program-specific MOUs (memoranda of understanding) that cover all needed administrative, instructional and student support resources to the fullest extent, and (2) including the lead deans as major stakeholders in the programs under their purview as co-signers. The resources required for any new program are substantial and expensive. This needs to become clear to all parties involved and a new program should only be approved if commitments to provide these resources are made and guaranteed. The resources going towards a new program should in no case infringe upon the increases needed for keeping or making current graduate programs viable. Therefore, before new programs are initiated, either new money and resources for making new teaching and administrative commitments must be found, or resources must be obtained from savings derived by closing existing programs. There are no other responsible alternatives.

MOUs to cover the teaching of core courses and required electives, as well as for administrative support, will also need to be phased in for existing graduate groups. A major incentive for departments to sign such MOUs can be provided by the promise of additional FTEs to cover these commitments.

These general observations inform the specific recommendations that follow. Recommendations A-C address the specific charges (Appendix A), concerning *Instruction in Graduate Programs*, the *Lead Dean Model*, and the *Role of Graduate Programs in Faculty Hires*. It emerged that meaningful discussion of the future of graduate education at UC Davis also needs to address the issue of new graduate programs and graduate enrollment growth, as well as general improvements in the administration of graduate programs. These findings led to recommendations D and E.

A. Instruction in Graduate Programs

1. **Amending APM210.** To enable all interested faculty to engage in graduate teaching and to receive full teaching credit for teaching a graduate podium course, APM210 should include the right of faculty to be given the opportunity (at the minimum and possibly averaged over several years) to devote 20% of their regular teaching load to teach graduate podium courses. Furthermore, when teaching is evaluated for the merit and promotion process, such teaching will rank equally with lower and upper division undergraduate instruction. The proposed specific changes in APM210 are inserted in capital letters in Appendix E. It is anticipated that this measure will, in effect, lead to an increase in instructor hours available for graduate instruction, and will strengthen the visibility and

importance of graduate instruction.

2. **Requiring MOUs to staff courses for new graduate programs and encouraging existing programs to seek such MOUs.** For all future proposals for new graduate groups, it would be a requirement that MOUs on teaching resources be included in the proposal. These MOUs will document commitments by suitable departments to provide instructors for all required core and elective courses. Existing graduate programs are encouraged to establish such MOUs wherever feasible. Each MOU may cover the teaching of one podium core/required elective course and could include provisions that the MOU be honored as long as faculty who can teach these courses are in residence. The MOU would be co-signed by the supervising dean of the department. Such MOUs will be valid for one review cycle of the graduate program, and need to be renewed at the time the graduate group is reviewed. These MOUs may be attractive for departments to sign if they lead to additional FTEs (see next item). The MOUs and their effectiveness will be evaluated at scheduled program reviews conducted by the Program Review Committee.

3. **Requesting FTEs to strengthen graduate instruction.** To enhance substantially the pool of teaching resources available to graduate groups, and to ensure that anticipated growth in graduate student enrollment will not unduly impact existing teaching resources, approximately 15-20 new FTEs are requested to be provided by the Provost, explicitly for graduate teaching. These FTEs will be assigned to departments, depending on their commitment to provide instruction for graduate groups, as evidenced by MOUs that commit the department to provide instruction for graduate groups. If a department commits to staffing courses for graduate groups on a level that is equivalent to staffing four graduate podium courses, this will make the department eligible for the allocation of one such FTE. A new department-based graduate program that involves more than four annual podium courses in teaching requirements at the graduate level will also make a department eligible for such a FTE.

To make this practical and attractive, the position description can be specified according to the academic plan of the department, and the new faculty who is hired for such a FTE does not have to be the instructor in charge of the four committed courses, which can be served by other qualified faculty members residing in the department. All new faculty hired on such positions would however be expected to regularly participate in graduate teaching and to contribute to graduate education, as well as engaging in undergraduate teaching.

In order to ensure future compliance, upon the awarding of an FTE based on the departmental commitment to teach four graduate podium courses for graduate groups, a "super-MOU" is established, co-signed by the supervising deans, committing the department to always have four current MOUs in place (while individual MOUs might not be renewed upon their expiration, as specified in item A(2) above).

4. **Cross-Listing of Graduate Courses.** Stabilizing the staffing of new or existing graduate group courses might be facilitated by cross-listing these courses with several departments or programs. It will be understood that the responsibility for staffing these courses

will be shared among the cross-listing units. These units would then become joint stakeholders in the cross-listed course. This is expected to facilitate the staffing of graduate courses offered by graduate groups and to lead to increased collaboration between related units. It may also lead to the formation of program clusters and umbrella structures with associated resource sharing. This also includes a recommendation to the Committee on Courses of Instruction to look favorably upon requests for the cross-listing of graduate courses, with the associated implication of shared responsibility in staffing such courses.

B. Lead Dean Model

1. **Enhancing the support provided by lead deans for graduate programs.** The role of lead deans in supporting the graduate programs for which they serve as lead dean needs to be made more explicit. This means that lead deans need to direct additional resources to graduate education and shoulder a sizable share of the funding of graduate programs. This commitment is best formalized through MOUs that are signed or co-signed by the lead deans. Such MOUs are required for new programs and should be phased in for existing programs. The role of these MOUs is to guarantee administrative support at the level needed for a functional graduate program, and to guarantee staffing of all core courses and required electives; the teaching-related MOUs will be signed by departments and their supervising deans.

2. **Requiring MOUs for administrative support.** An MOU guaranteeing all needed administrative and space resources from the lead dean will be required prior to approval for new graduate groups. Existing graduate groups and lead deans are encouraged to establish such MOUs. Like the proposed MOUs for teaching (see A(2)), these MOUs would be generally established for the term of years covered by one review period. Successful phasing in of such MOUs for existing graduate groups will be an item at scheduled program reviews conducted by the Program Review Committee.

C. Role of Graduate Programs in Faculty Hires

1. **Input from graduate programs in faculty hires.** To better tie the needs of graduate education with the hiring of faculty, Graduate Studies should reinstate its past practice of asking graduate programs for annual summaries of their highest priority needs for new faculty. Informally, this information should be shared by the Dean of Graduate Studies with the deans of the schools and colleges to inform their allocations of faculty FTE to hiring departments and to ensure that faculty recruiting plans address the needs of graduate education. Progress in meeting these needs could be reviewed in subsequent years.

   More formally, we recommend that the campus reinstate a coordinating committee, to include the Dean of Graduate Studies, that reviews faculty position requests and advises

the Provost regarding approval. This committee would provide a formal mechanism to ensure that the needs of graduate education are included in faculty hiring.

2. **On the issue of FTEs for graduate groups.** While generally the fraction of FTEs devoted to graduate education needs to increase, we do not endorse the assignment of FTEs to graduate groups. (For further details, see Appendix B, APD Meeting on March 18, 2008).

D. Planning for New Graduate Programs and Increases in Graduate Enrollment

1. **Resources for new programs.** Proposals for new graduate programs are currently required to include an assessment of the resources required to implement the new program. We recommend modifications of the current requirement such that the information provided in such proposals must include more detail. Specifically, the following items should be included in the "resources required" section of a proposal for a new program: (1) new programs must find and specify an administrative home (usually a department or ORU) where the lead dean (home unit) commits to providing the needed administrative support and space to the new program in the form of a written MOU; (2) new programs must provide, in writing, documentation that the proposing committee has investigated the possibility of sharing administrative structures with existing related graduate programs; this documentation must include a written assessment of the sharing possibility from the chairs of those related graduate programs; (3) MOUs to cover the staffing of core courses and required electives, as described in A(2).

   In addition, any new program must have a guarantee that sufficient additional block grant funds will be made available. New block grants must not reduce the current levels of block grant available to existing programs; moreover, since additional block grant funds are urgently needed by these established programs, block grant funds guaranteed to any new program must also not impact increasing the block grant to established programs. This needs to be clearly documented before a new program can be approved.

2. **Increases in graduate enrollment.** At present, graduate education is underfunded at UC Davis. Therefore, increases in graduate enrollment not only need to be fully funded, but also should not negatively impact existing graduate programs. The required funding for increases in graduate enrollment includes: (1) MOUs to fund the associated increases in administrative costs for graduate programs; (2) MOUs to provide resources for course staffing; (3) additional FTEs for departments that teach new graduate courses or sign MOUs to teach existing graduate courses for graduate groups; (4) proportional increases in block grants. Competing research universities routinely waive resident and non-resident tuition for graduate students who are employed as TAs or GSRs, and until equivalent levels of block grant funding are attained, steady increases in block grant per student are necessary. The total annual amount available for block grants thus needs to be indexed not only to increases in graduate enrollment growth, but also to increases in salaries and tuition. Furthermore, additional catch-up increases (to match the funding for graduate students provided by competing research universities) are required.

E. Graduate Group Administration and Support

1. **Encouraging program clusters and umbrella structures.** We encourage resource sharing between graduate groups and related departments. Graduate Council will oversee the implementation of the formation of clusters and umbrella structures of related programs, aiming at more efficient use of available resources, especially regarding needs in teaching, administrative support and space to house students and staff. Resource sharing may also reduce unnecessary duplication. Organizers of new program proposals must actively seek out intellectually related units for this purpose. Existing graduate groups are encouraged to do the same, and demonstrating such efforts will be an item in the scheduled program reviews conducted by the Program Review Committee. A related issue is the necessity of MOUs guaranteeing all needed administrative and space resources from the lead dean, as specified in B(2).

2. **Improving information flow from graduate programs to Graduate Studies.** Specifically, graduate programs will be required to submit updated membership information at least annually to Graduate Studies. The preferred channel for this communication would be a designated web site. Graduate program faculty will be identified by their UC Davis employee number. Graduate Studies will determine the details of implementation. Other updated information such as recent graduate placement information will also be required from graduate programs on an annual basis. The information repository to be created by Graduate Studies will benefit graduate program administrators, especially at the time of program review, and enable Graduate Studies to provide up-to-date program metrics.

3. **Creating transparent metrics and data repository.** Graduate Studies is requested to set up and maintain a data repository with information about graduate programs. Relevant program metrics will be continuously updated and made available. These metrics will facilitate program review and comparisons between graduate programs, as well as timely snapshots of where a program stands. Such metrics would include number of degrees (Masters and PhD), PhD and Masters awarded per program member, placement of graduates, placement in research universities (all annualized), national rankings (National Research Council etc.), median time to degree for Masters and PhD, completion rate to degree from admission, and detailed time-to-degree information (e.g., Kaplan-Meier survival functions and related statistics), GSRships available that support students in the program, and special program-specific statistics as applicable. The final metrics will be determined by the Dean of Graduate Studies in consultation with Graduate Council.

4. **Strengthening internal program reviews.** To address problems of lack of coherence, lack of leadership and prevalence of inactive members in some graduate programs, we recommend to considerably strengthen the existing internal program reviews. Current internal reviews of membership are often perceived to be ineffective, because there is no incentive to remove inactive members. The efficiency of internal program review should be further emphasized in the program reviews conducted by the Program Review

Committee. Evaluation of membership review would include checking that the members are reviewed every three years, and most importantly, whether the criteria for continued membership review are actually applied. The importance of membership review should also be emphasized in New Chair orientations offered by Graduate Studies.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A: CHARGE

Senate Chair Linda Bisson's letter to the committee:

Academic Planning and Development Subcommittee Re: Campus Academic Planning Effort

As you know the campus is engaging in comprehensive academic planning at the request of the Office of the President, and to provide background information on campus needs to the incoming Provost. This presents an opportunity to address issues that have chronically plagued graduate education on the Davis campus. Our graduate group structure is both our greatest strength and greatest weakness. The graduate group structure is a strength in that it provides for collaborative interaction across the campus, for innovative multidisciplinary and unique programs, and produces a superb cadre of graduate students. However it is a weakness in that many programs are under-supported both in terms of student funding and faculty investment of time, as has been documented in the surveys and reports generated by Academic Planning and Development Subcommittee of Graduate Council (APD).

The Executive Council would like APD to consider three topics of importance: 1) instruction in graduate programs, 2) the efficacy of the lead dean policy and 3) the role of graduate programs in directing new faculty hires.

The Executive Council would like APD to report back to the Executive Council during spring quarter 2008 with a report on these issues. The following elaborates the topic areas to be covered:

1. Instruction in Graduate Programs: Faculty report that there is insufficient incentive to commit to teaching in graduate programs. There are many reasons for this perception. Undergraduate courses take priority for staffing. Graduate education is expected to be done on an overload basis. Graduate education is not sufficiently rewarded. Executive Council would like APD to develop a plan or series of plans to assure graduate instruction is both valued and rewarded. For example, should we move to a system whereby research instruction (299 units) are graded and not S/U as has been done at some of our sister campuses? Should the APM be changed to require excellence in both undergraduate and graduate teaching for advancement? Should graduate instruction be weighted more heavily than it is now given the greater investment of time on the part of the faculty? Should faculty be required to designate a single graduate program for primary membership and commit to teaching in that program with membership in other programs being secondary? Should there be a limit on the number of programs that an individual faculty member can participate in? Rewarding faculty financially for teaching in graduate courses? These are just suggested practices and APD may have already vetted some of these approaches.

2. Lead dean Model: Is graduate education well-served by the current lead dean model of sup-

port? Are there other types of support mechanisms that would better serve graduate education at UC Davis such as the suggestion of department homes for each program?

3. Role of Graduate Programs in Faculty Hires: The current practice on campus eliminates any direct input from graduate programs in the request for faculty in specific areas, creation of job descriptions, screening and selection of candidates. The expectation is that whoever is hired will fit the needs of the group or those needs will be modified. How well is this strategy working? What alternatives would be preferable? Would a return to the coordinating committee for faculty hires be helpful? Direct allocation of some faculty positions to Graduate Studies to award to departments to fill critical needs in graduate education? Elimination/redefinition of core courses?

Thank you for addressing these issues. The Executive Council would like to gain a better understanding of the issues in order to make recommendations regarding campus graduate education support and graduate teaching reward systems.

Sincerely, Linda F. Bisson
Professor of Viticulture and Enology
Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF APD MEETINGS AND DISCUSSIONS 07-08

APD Meeting on Dec 4, 2007

The main item was a presentation by Senate Chair Linda Bisson, elaborating on the charge to APD and discussion of the big picture. Many ideas were presented and briefly discussed. This was followed by a sustained period of brainstorming and no-holds barred collection of new ideas.

APD Meeting on Jan. 30, 2008

Meeting started with procedural discussions. The following draft items found some degree of support among the members present.

(i) Graduate programs should be more firmly anchored in an administrative home (department or ORU) which agrees to sign a MOU guaranteeing administrative and space support, possibly also guarantees to staff teaching, which might involve several departments. This will require in some cases to identify how the hosting unit (which makes a commitment) can benefit. One kind of incentive would be funding available to the graduate group such as funding for TAships.

(ii) APM could be changed to emphasize the need for a graduate teaching portfolio for promotion of all faculty. APM210 is in Appendix E (with the suggested changes included in caps).

If the requirement for demonstrating effectiveness in graduate teaching is strengthened, Chairs and Deans would be obliged to enable faculty to demonstrate high quality graduate teaching on a regular basis.

(iii) Current system of internal membership reviews of graduate program members is not effective, as there is no incentive to discontinue inactive members.

(iv) Financial support of graduate programs could be differentiated according to quality, to be determined by reviews and additional quality criteria, with the aim to reward and promote excellence in graduate training and research.

(v) The problems faced by some graduate groups may not be uniformly present across programs or colleges; therefore college-specific solutions may be an effective way to address such problems (example is assignment of graduate teaching by department chairs).

APD Meeting on Feb. 7, 2008

(i) The proposal of amending APD to include stronger language about the inclusion of graduate teaching in the evaluation of teaching in the personnel process was strongly endorsed. In addition, it was agreed that APD should be amended to give faculty the right devote at a specified fraction of their teaching load to teaching courses at the graduate level. A fraction of 25% was considered reasonable.

(ii) A further reaching proposal was made to empower faculty to self-determine where they teach 25% of their teaching load if taught in the form of graduate courses, and if desired to sign their own MOUs with a graduate program of their choice.

(iii) An ad hoc subcommittee of APD will look further into the above proposals and their feasibility and phrase them in adequate form.

(iv) There was support for establishing two types of membership in graduate programs, primary and secondary. Details about responsibilities and rights of primary (full or regular) and secondary (associate or adjoint) members need to be further discussed. The general idea is that regular membership would require full engagement and willingness to take on responsibility for regular teaching and leadership in the graduate program.

(v) There was support for a cap on the total number of graduate programs and for more frequently exercising the closure of ill-performing graduate programs with clouded perspective. A cap could be implemented in such a way that approving new programs would need to be firmly coupled with closing or merging existing ones. Support for the differentiation in the funding of graduate programs (see previous APD meeting) was reaffirmed, the idea being to allocate relatively more block grant and other funds to top performing groups. This more competitive approach would help to build additional high quality programs and augment the number of top performing graduate programs at UC Davis. It would also enhance the impact

of program review. Such a change in the allocation system could be complemented by Program Improvement Grants to rescue worthwhile programs, while at the same time closure of graduate programs should be facilitated. Details to be discussed further.

(vi) The issue of further data analysis for identifying predictors of graduate program problems was discussed and there were differing opinions about the value of such an analysis. It was decided to postpone such an analysis for now.

APD Meeting on March 18, 2008

All ideas on the list of 25 distinct ideas were discussed, and they were grouped in categories and reorganized.

Two important issues (i) and (ii) were discussed in detail and disposed of:

(i) Whether FTEs should be allocated to Graduate Groups, following the example of the FTEs that were assigned by the Provost to the proposed Graduate Group in Environmental Policy and Management (EPM).

APD opted not to endorse such allocation of FTEs. (An informal vote was taken which was 3 for and 8 against such allocation). The reasons to not endorse such hires that were mentioned included that the initiative hires were not fully endorsed by many faculty and graduate program hires could suffer from the same problem; finding a departmental home has occasionally been difficult for initiative hires, as has been to find a sufficiently broad pool of top applicants; appearance of a "top-down process"; difficulty to establish criteria for need and priority for such FTEs; precedence of graduate group FTEs for EPM comes across as a politicized process and does not bode well for future such hires.

(ii) How to manage the FTEs for EPM. Option 1 of Dean Gibeling's recommended options (Appendix C) was endorsed.

(iii) A general issue that was briefly discussed but requires further deliberation is how to best accommodate the anticipated substantial growth in the number of graduate students.

APD Meeting on March 19, 2008

The items in categories *Information about Membership* and *Courses and Teaching* in the APD report version of March 18 were discussed in detail and decided. Further finalizing and updating of some of these items is anticipated.

APD Meeting on March 20, 2008

A discussion item was how to make departments honor MOUs covering teaching commitments, which may expire after a while, yet may generate a FTE for the department. This led to a

modification of the FTE recommendation in Section A(3).

All items in Sections A and B have now been discussed and it is a matter of fine-tuning the write-up. Any suggestions and improvements are welcome.

APD Meeting on March 21, 2008

A. The recommendations in Sections C and D were discussed in detail. Major topics of the discussion involved:

(i) Rewarding excellence by differential funding of graduate programs based on quality metrics and program reviews, what kind of metrics to use (see (iii)). It was suggested to complement this by an emergency program recovery funding mechanism or program improvement fund.

(ii) Installing a cap on the number of graduate programs, forcing weak programs to close or merge as a condition for the approval of new programs. Criteria to close weak graduate programs were discussed, such as unsuccessful reviews, small number of students, inadequate faculty resources for teaching and leadership. Another discussion item was how to improve the program review process.

(iii) The need for a central information repository to improve transparency regarding important program metrics was discussed: This should include exact and up-to-date information regarding program faculty and students, degrees conferred, placement of graduates, survival of students in the program towards reaching the intended degree once admitted, and related information on attrition and graduation rates, median time to degree etc.; furthermore, PhD and Masters degrees conferred per faculty and year.

(iv) Restructuring of the membership of graduate programs into full or primary and associate (adjunct or secondary) members, with full members committed to regularly teach and assume leadership positions for the program, and the possibility of a cap on the number of memberships a faculty can hold in graduate programs. Reinforcing and strengthening membership review.

(v) Lack of adequate funding for graduate education as a root cause of the identified problems.

B. Some further details on these discussions are as follows:

Cap on total number of graduate programs; closure of programs. APD discussed the notion of stabilizing the overall number of graduate programs, especially if there is a lack of funds to fund new programs fully, for example by capping the number of graduate programs. While APD did not endorse a strict cap on the number of graduate programs, APD insists that there should be no new programs and no increase in graduate enrollment unless such an increase is accompanied by sufficient funding and allocation of resources. "Sufficient funding" would include higher levels of administrative, instructional, and block grant funding than has been previously foreseen for the establishment of new programs. Consequently, if there is a lack of available new funding or

resources, the only way to establish new graduate programs or graduate enrollment increases is to shut down, downsize or merge existing ones. Related questions: What is the ideal number of programs? Which criteria should be used systematically to close, merge, or downsize existing programs in order to free funding for desirable expansion? How can we identify dysfunctional programs? Closure of graduate programs has rarely happened in the past. A related proposal is to strengthen the first (probationary) review of any new graduate program, to be conducted after 5 years.

Differential funding of graduate programs. Support could be higher for programs that demonstrate excellence in various metrics. This would create a more competitive environment for internal support dollars. Differential funding decisions would need to be based on transparent criteria (e.g., a point system based on the metrics in D(2) and perhaps in addition rating the program reviews by independent observers) to allocate funding differentially. This differential funding could be complemented by a program improvement fund to help rescue "desirable" programs that do not perform well. However, closure of programs that do less well would be an expected consequence.

Additional administrative funds for graduate groups. It was discussed that graduate groups might benefit from a substantial augmentation of group operative funds, where these additional funds would be less restricted and could be used for any of the following: buy-out of an instructor to teach a graduate course; paying for a TA position that will be donated to a department in exchange for an instructor; administrative and staff expenses; summer salary for the group chair; augmentation of the block grant. Such extra funding should however not come at the expense of the block grant funds which are already too low, and therefore likely would have to be provided by the lead deans.

On Designated Emphases. APD discussion focussed on keeping the structure of Designated Emphases simple as there are administrative and resource costs (at a minimum, faculty time) associated with them. Double emphases should be ruled out, and the review of proposals for Designated Emphases should take into account the funding and resource situation of the participating graduate programs and whether there is sufficient funding for all aspects of the proposed Emphasis. Therefore, proposals for new designated emphases would need to provide details about the staffing of relevant courses and how administrative costs will be covered.

APPENDIX C: INPUT FROM DEAN GIBELING ON THE ISSUE OF FTEs FOR GRADUATE GROUPS

I have committed to working with APD to develop a proposed mechanism to couple faculty FTE with graduate groups. The test case is the proposed Environmental Policy and Management program that is now under CCGA review. That program carries 4 FTE that were committed by Provost Hinshaw. It is likely that a successful mechanism developed for EPM would serve as a model to be used with other graduate groups. As I have thought about this issue, I have

identified 3 basic schemes that might be considered as follows:

1) A faculty position is made available to one or more departments that work to fill the position with someone who has expertise that is needed by the graduate group. Whichever department makes the hire would sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) promising that the department would provide an agreed upon number of courses to the graduate group each year in exchange for getting an "extra" FTE. These courses could be taught by any capable person from the department. The hired faculty member would teach undergraduate courses in the department as well to ensure that he/she has a balanced teaching load.

2) A variation on #1 would be for the hiring department and the graduate group to sign a MOU specifying that the specific faculty member that was hired would teach a courses or courses for the graduate group. This approach was tried several years ago with the IAD program, although there weren't any formal MOU's. While it worked in the beginning, eventually faculty interests changed in a direction that was away from the interests of the graduate group. Further, at least one department simply said they needed the faculty member to teach within the department and essentially cancelled the deal because there was no mechanism to hold it together.

3) The graduate group is allocated faculty salary funds, which it can then shop around to interested departments. While this could lead to a hire that is used as in #1 or #2, an alternative would be that the group simply uses the money to buy courses from departments at a standard rate. This approach would not necessarily create FTE positions, hence it would probably not lead to hiring the right people that are needed by the graduate group unless a department collected enough fractional funding. The term over which the courses are purchased could be 1 or more years.

I'm sure that the members of APD can identify other options.

APPENDIX D: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PREVIOUS APD REPORTS (extracts)

Numbers from Survey

Non-departmentally-based programs faced larger problems in involving faculty in their programs for teaching and administration of the groups compared to departmentally-based programs (39% versus 20%). This might explain at least in part the even larger problems related to vision/cohesiveness of the graduate groups (56% versus 25%) and in core course curriculum problems (65% versus 49%). A larger subset of non-departmental-based programs also cited lack of credit for graduate education as a problem (20% versus 9%), whereas the opposite was true for problems related to undergraduate teaching loads of faculty (7% versus 14%). Non-departmental-based programs also more frequently mentioned problems related to lack of technical and/or administrative support staff (26% versus 11%). Problems that occurred with

higher frequency for departmental-based programs than for non departmental-based groups in the summary reviews were related to facility (space) concerns (42% versus 22%) and TA-ship assignments (24% versus 5%). The difference likely has to do with the fact that most non-departmental groups have neither dedicated facilities nor TA-ships.

Recommendations from Final Report

1) Graduate Studies Dean and Graduate Council should engage relevant Deans and Chairs to: Take stock of existing graduate course offerings taught by their faculty and take ownership by providing a Memorandum of Understanding to a graduate program.

2) The Provost and other appropriate authorities should move to increase the weight given to graduate education in the faculty hiring process. Include Graduate Studies Dean in the process of determining faculty allocations through the Provosts office. Include one member on each faculty recruitment search committee who is charged to represent the needs of the impacted graduate groups.

3) Graduate Council and the Graduate Studies Dean should continue to seek ways to support the formation of umbrella structures for graduate programs Graduate Council should ensure continued by-in by faculty and develop strategies to ensure execution of this process. A relevant subcommittee should be charged with developing guidelines for implementing and overseeing this process Graduate Studies Dean to work with Deans of Colleges and Schools to centralize administrative support for individual graduate programs. Ideally this is done by program connectivity and their potential to form larger units.

APPENDIX E: PROPOSED CHANGES IN APM210

Proposed insertions are in caps.

d. Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) University and public service. In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. The review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive.

As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria

with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards. *Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.* Insistence upon this standards for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge. Consideration should be given to changes in emphasis and interest that may occur in an academic career. The candidate may submit for the review file a presentation of his or her activity in all four areas.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Teaching, research, professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students or new faculty members are to be encouraged and given recognition in the teaching or service categories of academic personnel actions.

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards in judging the candidate, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered.

1. **Teaching** – Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate's command of the subject; ABILITY TO PRESENT SUBJECT MATERIAL AT DIFFERING LEVELS FROM LOWER-DIVISION TO GRADUATE; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups. TO DEMONSTRATE THE FULL RANGE OF INSTRUCTION ABILITIES, AND TO AID EVALUATION OF TEACHING AT ALL LEVELS, FACULTY MUST HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH 20% OF THEIR COURSE LOAD AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL. The committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total

performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based. In those exceptional cases when no such evidence is available, the candidate's potentialities as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that a redacted copy of its report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of his or her teaching and of the basis for that evaluation. It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, AND GRADUATE LEVELS OF INSTRUCTION. More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file. Among significant types of evidence of teaching effectiveness are the following: (a) opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the candidate's field, particularly if based on class visitations, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate, or on the performance of students in courses taught by the candidate that are prerequisite to those of the informant; (b) opinions of students; (c) opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University; (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate and of those attracted to the campus by the candidate's repute as a teacher; and (e) development of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction.

All cases for advancement and promotion normally will include: (a) evaluations and comments solicited from students for most, if not all, courses taught since the candidate's last review; (b) a quarter-by-quarter or semester-by-semester enumeration of the number and types of courses and tutorials taught since the candidate's last review; (c) their level; (d) their enrollments; (e) the percentage of students represented by student course evaluations for each course; (f) brief explanations for abnormal course loads; (g) identification of any new courses taught or of old courses when there was substantial reorganization of approach or content; (h) notice of any awards or formal mentions for distinguished teaching; (i) when the faculty member under review wishes, a self evaluation of his or her teaching; and (j) evaluation by other faculty members of teaching effectiveness. When any of the information specified in this paragraph is not provided, the department chair will include an explanation for that omission in the candidate's dossier. If such information is not included with the letter of recommendation and its absence is not adequately accounted for, it is the review committee chair's responsibility to request it through the Chancellor.