To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Graduate Council met for sixteen regularly scheduled sessions during the 2005-06 term.

I. Agenda

Graduate Course Proposal Requests

Graduate Council authorizes, supervises and regulates all graduate courses except such courses exempted by action of the Regents. During the period between 9/1/2005 and 6/30/2006 Council processed 439 course requests, 38% were requests for new courses, 42% were course modifications, and 20% were course discontinuations.

Reviews of Existing Programs

Graduate Council participated in the Academic Program Review of the following departments and programs: Mechanical Engineering, History of Art and Architecture, Chicana/o Studies, Dramatic Art and Dance, Spanish and Portuguese, the Latin American and Iberian Studies Program, and the Center for Chicana/o Studies. Graduate Council followed up on reviews performed in previous years, for Mathematics, Music, and Computer Science. Council also commented on the Multi-campus Research Unit (MRU) review for the UC Committee on Latino Research and the request for renewal of the Scholarly Exchange Agreement for the Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology. The Graduate Council recommended seven departments and programs for the 2007-08 Academic Program Review.

Approvals for New Programs or Emphases

Graduate Council discussed and took action on several proposals for new programs and emphases during the 2005-06 term. The Global International Studies agreement with Erasmus Mundus, a European higher education program, was approved by the Graduate Council on January 23, 2006 and was forwarded with other Council/Committee comments to the Dean of Social Sciences. Council also discussed the Professional Clear Level II Education Specialist Credential and approved the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education's proposal to enroll students in the Level II Program effective Summer 2006.

An Optional Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Women’s Studies was added to the Ph.D. program in Political Science. Council also reviewed an initial proposal for an Optional Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Emphasis in Translation Studies. A final review of this proposal will take place during the 2006-07 term.

Program Policies

Graduate Council addressed numerous policy issues relating to graduate education this past year: the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education proposal to change the make-up of Joint Ed.D. doctoral committees; a Biomolecular Science and Engineering proposal for change to the advancement to candidacy requirements; and a proposal to change the required minimum score for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) from 80 to 83.

Degree Requirements

Graduate Council took the following action with respect to proposals for changes in graduate degree requirements:

- Approved changes in degree requirements for the M.A. in Global Studies
• Approved a reduction in course load for the Ph.D. in Chicana/o Studies.
• Approved changes in degree requirements for the Ph.D. program in Materials.
• Approved proposed changes to the Music Theory requirements to add a thesis plan for the terminal MA degree and to combine the M.A. and Ph.D. programs.
• Approved changes in the degree requirements for the Ph.D. in Electrical and Computer Engineering.
• Approved the elimination of one course from the linguistics sequence in the Summer Institute in Hispanic Languages and Cultures.
• Approved the addition of one course to the linguistics sequence in the Summer Institute of French and Francophone Studies.

Individual Interdisciplinary Degrees

Graduate Council approves and reviews the progress of all Individual Interdisciplinary Degrees. We received updated information on several degrees in progress and requested a revised proposal from one student who had significantly changed her program from what was originally proposed.

Student Petitions

• Council recommended to the Dean that one disqualification appeal be denied.
• Council approved one petition for reinstatement into a program.

II. Issues and Outcomes

Graduate Council discussed the following campus issues during the 2005-06 term:

The 12-Unit Rule

The requirement that Graduate Students must register for a minimum of 12 units was implemented by the Graduate Council during the 2004-05 term and was developed based on information that departments were being penalized for the number of graduate students enrolled in their program who were taking less than 12 units per quarter. This issue was revisited during the 2005-06 term in consultation with Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas, and the information gathered indicated that no penalties exist for the campus or the departments. The Graduate Council rescinded the 12-unit rule on November 28, 2005. A memorandum was sent to the Graduate Division to notify it of the change. In turn, the Graduate Division notified departments.

Draft Academic Plan

Graduate Council was asked to consider the latest iteration of the Draft Academic Plan. While several members voiced overall objection to the proposed campus growth scenario, there was general support for a gradual increase in the ratio of graduate students to 17% of the enrolled students, perhaps even at the expense of undergraduate enrollments. While Graduate Council generally agreed on increasing the ratio of graduate enrollments, the success of the growth scenario was deemed unlikely if the current funding formula for graduate students remains related to undergraduate course credit hours and current and predicted constraints persist on the resources required to support graduate student funding, housing, and faculty recruitment. Council noted that a serious proposal for graduate student enrollment increases must be accompanied by an action plan that includes front-loaded resources. Council drafted a memorandum expressing these concerns to Divisional Chair Yuen, which were included in the Divisional response to Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas’ request for comment.

Teaching Associate Issues
Graduate Council was asked by the Undergraduate Council to consider UCSB’s use of graduate students as the instructor of record in undergraduate courses. The Undergraduate Council was concerned with two issues: the extension of Undergraduate Council oversight to Teaching Associate candidates for lower division courses and the circumstances under which Teaching Associates should be permitted to teach undergraduate courses. For background, the present practice is that the Committee on Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies (CUAPP) reviews candidates for Teaching Associates in upper division courses. CUAPP determines whether the candidate’s teaching qualifications are adequate, and examines the circumstances leading to the request. This level of scrutiny is not applied to lower division courses, as CUAPP does not currently review nominations for Teaching Associates at that level.

Academic Senate Regulations state that a Teaching Associate should be responsible for an upper division course only in extraordinary circumstances, and proposals are expected to indicate what those circumstances are. An increasing number of upper division courses are being taught by Teaching Associates, with justifications from the departments that either the course has been taught by Associates in the past, or that faculty are not available to teach a particular part of the department’s curriculum.

Council noted that the opportunity for graduate students to teach and have substantial responsibility for a course is a pedagogically important experience. Council also agreed that there should be the same Undergraduate Council scrutiny of the use of Associates in lower division as there is for upper division courses. Furthermore, Council agreed that the use of graduate students to teach introductory and general education courses should be approved only in rare circumstances as an exception.

**Proposed Academic Integrity Regulation**

Graduate Council was asked to consider the proposed Senate Regulation on Student Academic Integrity. Council agreed that the paperwork required of faculty during reports of academic dishonesty could be minimized through greater use of technology. Council members also suggested the use of technology to make students more responsible for awareness of the policy. For example, students could be required to read the policy online and agree to it as a condition of registering for classes on GOLD. Council agreed that the role of Teaching Assistants in this process should be included, as many TAs are likely involved in the process of discovering or determining academic dishonesty. Several other minor changes were suggested, which Graduate Council included in a memorandum to the Divisional Chair. The Faculty Legislature approved the proposed Senate Regulation on Student Academic Integrity on March 9, 2006, effective immediately.

**Graduate Student Support**

One of the main items of discussion for the Graduate Council this term was graduate student support. It is becoming increasingly clear that graduate student support at UCSB and throughout the UC system is inadequate. Council discussed this issue during its meetings with campus administrators who noted that graduate student funding is a priority. Many initiatives are either in place or being discussed, such as increased attention to graduate student funding in the Capital Campaign, a proposal to include the funding of at least one graduate student with each endowed chair, and the proposed Memorial to the Regents regarding Non-Resident Tuition. Graduate education, graduate funding, and UC’s competitiveness with regard to graduate student support were also discussed during a visit from Acting Provost and Senior Vice President for University Affairs Rory Hume and the Taskforce for Professional and Doctoral Education.

Acting Dean of the Graduate Division Gale Morrison serves on the Graduate Council as an ex-officio member, and thus Council was able to discuss many of these issues with her throughout the year and learn about Graduate Division’s efforts to determine best practices with regard to
graduate student support. In addition, Acting Dean Morrison consulted the Council’s Committee on Funding and Fellowships regarding funding distribution strategies.

Graduate student support will continue to be a main concern of the Graduate Council in the 2006-07 term and beyond.

Graduate Council discussed the following Systemwide issues during the 2005-06 term:

**Proposed Memorial to the Regents regarding Non-Resident Tuition (NRT)**

Graduate Council considered the Memorial to the Regents of the University of California, initiated by the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. The resolution calls for the Regents to implement a budget for the University that eliminates non-resident tuition for academic graduate students. Council suggested several minor changes to the language of the Memorial. In February the Academic Senate Assembly passed the Memorial. The Memorial went to a full Senate vote in April and passed with 83% of the 4166 voting members in favor. The Memorial and the results of the vote were transmitted to President Dynes and will be brought before the Regents at one of the future meetings.

**Independent Course Responsibility for Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Scholars**

The Office of the President noted early in the 2005-06 term that the current Academic Personnel Manual (APM) definition of Teaching Assistant responsibilities did not reflect reality. The level of course responsibility given to graduate students varies throughout the UC campuses. UCOP staff suggested that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) review the issue.

Graduate Council was asked to consider a CCGA document that discussed independent course responsibility for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars. The committees jointly proposed a review of independent course responsibility for all lower and upper division courses, requiring a UC faculty member to serve as an instructor of record for all courses taught by graduate students, and they proposed two categories of graduate student instructors (GSIs). The first is the Teaching Assistant, which is the traditional teaching role for most graduate students. The second is a Teaching Fellow, who, mentored by the instructor of record, would have responsibility for a substantial part of the course. Council wished to see additional language specifying what level of supervision would be required for both the Teaching Assistant and Teaching Fellow roles. A joint CCGA-UCEP document was forwarded to Academic Senate chair John Oakley; Council expects that a revised draft will circulate for review in the fall.

**Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles**

University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) was notified that the University lacked clear principles with regard to student freedom of scholarly inquiry. UCAF agreed to investigate the issue, and so a joint Senate – Administration systemwide workgroup was formed.

Graduate Council was asked to consider the workgroup’s draft student freedom of scholarly inquiry principles. It is stated that academic freedom is given to University of California faculty by virtue of their membership in the professoriate. Therefore, student freedom of inquiry is derived from and protected by the academic freedom of the faculty. The document states that students should be granted academic freedom as appropriate for their level in the educational process; however, they are responsible for learning the content of any course in which they are enrolled.

After considerable discussion, the Graduate Council decided not to endorse the document as written, believing that it lacks the substance needed to adequately address such complex issues. Council members were unable to reach a consensus with respect to the language with which the issues could be properly addressed. Some council members would have preferred a separate
document concerning the question of academic freedom for graduate students in teaching roles. They also voiced concern that the document infers that students have subordinate rights, which are, in principle, natural to the role of a student but not without complication. It was also pointed out that the language of the UCAF document does not include specific reference to protection for students against faculty misconduct. Several Council members would like the document to state more explicitly that faculty objection to student inquiry should be based upon reason, not faculty opinion. Council drafted a memorandum expressing these concerns to Divisional Chair Yuen, which were included in the Divisional response memorandum to the Academic Council. Academic Council will review the Divisional responses at a future meeting and in due course draft a revised document, which will be re-distributed to the Divisions for review and comment.

III. Committees

Committee on Graduate Student Affairs

The Committee on Graduate Student Affairs (CGSA) met twice as a committee, and six times in conjunction with the Teaching Assistant Training Committee, a joint committee with members from the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.

The Committee on Graduate Student Affairs reviewed a number of graduate student petitions and made recommendations to either the Graduate Council or the chair of the Graduate Council about the disposition of those petitions.

The committee was charged with meeting with the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee to review proposals for increases in student housing rent and other organizational issues related to the Department of Housing and Residential Services. Such a meeting did not take place due to scheduling difficulties. However, the chair of the CGSA represented the Graduate Council on the Student Housing Advisory Committee as it considered these and other issues. The Student Housing Advisory Committee approved a recommendation to limit increases in graduate student housing rent to the projected pay increases of graduate student employees.

The members of CGSA participated in all meetings of the Teaching Assistant Training Committee, which reviewed campus policies about TA Training, conducted a survey of all departments to ascertain what kind of TA training was taking place, reviewed TA training practices on campus, and began to formulate a campus policy for future TA training. The GSAC submitted a proposal to the Graduate Council in late spring, which called for increased funding for the TA Orientation each fall. Council approved the proposal. In addition, the TA Training Committee reviewed the online TA-training materials used by UC Berkeley and recommended that they be adapted for use at UCSB by Fall 2007. The TA Training Committee will continue to meet in Fall 2006 to finalize its proposed standards for TA training and determine a process by which these standards can be implemented and monitored.

For the full report of the Committee on Graduate Student Affairs, please see Appendix A.

Committee on Program Review

The Committee on Program Review met four times during the 2005-06 academic year. A significant portion of the Committee’s work was conducted via e-mail.

The primary work of the Committee on Program Review in 2005-06 was to design and implement review procedures and tools for the optional interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases. Academic Senate legislation requires that all formal academic programs be reviewed periodically for quality and appropriateness. While the conduct of reviews for degree programs has been delegated to the Program Review Panel, the reviews of optional interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases are conducted by the Graduate Council. Optional interdisciplinary emphases have not been reviewed in the past, but the Graduate Council decided two years ago to rectify this matter and chose for review three emphases with the earliest establishment dates. The three chosen were Human
Development, Cognitive Science, and Language, Interaction and Social Organization. Council decided that these programs would be reviewed in 2005-06. The Committee distributed a set of self-review questions to each of the emphases in late November, with a response deadline of March 24, 2006.

After reviewing the responses from Human Development and Cognitive Science, the Committee decided to draft questionnaires for all students and faculty participating in the emphases, in addition to the self-review performed by the programs. The content of the questionnaires was endorsed by the Committee, approved by the full Council at the end of Spring 2006, and will be used starting with the 2006-07 reviews. The Committee also added a section to the self-review requesting a narrative self-assessment concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the emphasis under review. Future reviews will also have an assessment of the program by external reviewers in the field. The external reviews will include an evaluation of the program’s core courses, something for which the Graduate Council may not have the expertise. Due to cost constraints, the external reviewers will review and respond to the documentation but not travel to UCSB.

The Committee on Program Review recommended to Council that the optional interdisciplinary emphasis in Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences be reviewed in 2006-07. As the Committee did not receive a response from Language, Interaction and Social Organization, the review of that emphasis has been postponed until the 2006-07 academic year. For the full report of the Committee on Program Review, please see Appendix B.

Committee on Funding and Fellowships

The Committee on Funding and Fellowships held one two-hour meeting, conducting most of its business by e-mail. The main topics of discussion for the subcommittee were issues related to the Department Mentorship Awards and the Outstanding Graduate Mentor Awards. In addition, Acting Graduate Dean Morrison consulted with the subcommittee on certain issues regarding graduate student funding.

This was the second year in which Departmental Mentorship Awards were given and the first year in which applications were due in the fall. This allowed the awards (recruiting scholarships) to be given to departments in time for use in spring recruiting. The following issues were considered by the subcommittee and approved by the full Council for use during the 2006-07 term:

- Council was asked whether departments should be able to win the award for two consecutive years. As no such restriction had been stated in the announcement of 05-06 awards, it was clear that winners from 04-05 would be eligible for the 05-06 awards. However, Council voted that in the future departments may not win two years in a row. Council also recommended that the award selection committee for a given year be composed of members of winning departments from the previous year to avoid conflicts of interest.

- Council was asked whether Interdisciplinary groups were eligible to apply. Council voted that any recognized group with a graduate program is permitted to apply.

- The award selection committee raised several concerns about the award process. First, the number of applications was rather small (8), even smaller than the previous year (9) – though this may be due to the fact that two of last year’s winning departments did not feel it appropriate to apply again immediately. Second, there was a general concern that the application procedure was cumbersome, with documentation being requested for too many types of policies and procedures which were not appropriate for all departments. Thus, there was a tendency to reward form over quality in the award process. In response to these concerns, the subcommittee drafted new application procedures and a new call for proposals to be sent to departments this fall.
Council was also asked whether applications from previous years could be made available to current applicants. In the end, we hope to have dealt with this issue through the re-design of the application procedure. The primary document in the new system is a departmental statement which, for the winning departments, will be posted on the web. These documents will be available to provide suggestions and serve as guides for any department wishing to improve its own mentorship practices. Departments may also submit other documents with the expectation that they will not be made public.

After the selection process for the Outstanding Graduate Mentor Awards came to a close, the selection committee and several Academic Senate staff members submitted recommendations to the Council for revisions to the application procedures. The Committee was charged with considering both sets of recommendations and proposing revisions to the application procedures. The Committee drafted a new set of award guidelines and made several changes to the application procedures, including:

- To allow colleagues and both current and former students to nominate a faculty member. The Committee anticipates that the change will increase the number of nominations, which, for the 2005-06 term, was very small.
- To condense the “Qualities and Characteristics of Mentoring Excellence,” included in the application procedures. The reasoning behind the modification is that the coordinators of last year’s dossiers felt obligated to address each quality and characteristic without expressing the unique traits of candidates with respect to their excellence in mentoring.
- To assemble basic facts about the applicant in a standardized form via a “fact sheet.” It was noted that since the draft fact sheet explicitly asks for information about mentoring outside of UCSB, this may require approval by the faculty legislature. The Committee feels strongly that we are making awards to advisors based on their overall mentoring success and that mentoring outside of UCSB may well be a part of that success. However, by separating data about mentorship within and outside of UCSB (in separate columns on the fact sheet), we leave it to future award selection committees to decide on a case-by-case basis how to weigh the internal and external data.

The changes were discussed by the full Council at the last meeting of the term and will now go to the Council on Faculty Issues and Awards for consideration in the fall. For the full report of the Committee on Funding and Fellowships, please see Appendix C.

IV. Council Representation

Representatives from the Graduate Council served on the following campus committees:

- Central Fellowship Committees for recruitment and continuing students
- Selection committee for the Student Commencement Speaker
- Selection committee for the Lancaster Dissertation awards

V. Coordination with Administration

Graduate Council met with several members of the Administration during the 2005-06 term, including the Executive Vice Chancellor, the Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Science, the Dean of the College of Engineering, the Dean of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, and the Executive Director of Housing and Residential Services.

VI. Carry-Over Issues

During the 2006-07 term, Council plans to continue work on the following issues:
• Independent course responsibility for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars will continue to be an issue for the Council during the 2006-07 term, as we expect that the revised document from CCGA and UCEP will be distributed to the divisions for review and comment, eventually to be implemented by each campus.

• Through the use of the Master Course Approval (MCA) system and through review of various departmental proposals, it was discovered that several departments use course numbering that does not confirm to the Academic Senate classification of courses. Council hopes to distribute a memorandum to the campus in the fall, reiterating the course classification policy and asking departments to renumber courses that are currently classified incorrectly.

• Council will continue to follow the non-resident tuition issue.

• Council looks forward to reviewing the revised draft of the UCSB Academic Plan.

• Graduate student support will always remain a priority to the Council, although it is ever more apparent in these times of fiscal strain.

Members:
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Mary Brenner (Chair of CGSA)
Mary Furner
Cynthia Kaplan
Nelson Lichtenstein
Donald Marolf (Chair of GF&F)
John Mohr
Daniel Montello
Mihai Putinar
Robert Renehan
Curtis Roads
Kenneth Rose
Stuart Sweeney
Lamia Youseff (GSA Representative)
Gale Morrison (Ex Officio)
Mary McMahon (Consultant)
Jon Ramsey (Consultant)
Claudia Chapman (Consultant)
Omer Egecioglu (Vice Chair and Chair of PRC)
Harvey Sharrer (Chair and Representative to CCGA)
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GRADUATE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
GRADUATE COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT 2005-2006

Members: Mary Betsy Brenner (Chair), Lamia Youseff (GSA representative), Stuart Sweeney (Winter, Spring), Kenneth Rose (Fall)

Number of Meetings:
2 times as the Graduate Student Affairs Committee
6 times in conjunction with the Teaching Assistant Training Committee

The Graduate Student Affairs Committee (GSAC) dealt with three main topics in the 2005-2006 academic year.

a) Student Petitions: The GSAC reviewed a number of graduate student petitions and made recommendations to either the Graduate Council or the chair of the Graduate Council about the disposition of those petitions.

b) Graduate Student Housing: The GSAC was charged with meeting with the Undergraduate Student Affairs Committee to review proposals for increases in student housing rent and other organizational issues related to the Department of Housing and Residential Services. Such a meeting did not take place due to scheduling difficulties and cancellation of a scheduled meeting. However, the chair of the GSAC represented the Graduate Council on the Student Housing Advisory Committee as it considered these and other issues. The Student Housing Advisory Committee approved a recommendation to limit increases in graduate student housing rent to the projected pay increases of graduate student employees. Thus one of the major concerns of the Graduate Council about student housing was addressed.

c) Teaching Assistant Training: The members of the GSAC participated in all meetings of the Teaching Assistant Training Committee, a joint committee with members of the Undergraduate Council. This committee reviewed campus policies about TA Training, did a survey of all departments to ascertain what kind of TA training was taking place, reviewed the current TA training offered by Instructional Development, reviewed how certain departments carry out TA training, and began to formulate a campus policy for future TA training. The GSAC proposed a motion to the Graduate Council that was accepted. This motion called for increased funding for TA Orientation each fall. In addition, the TA Training Committee reviewed the on-line TA Training materials used by UC, Berkeley and recommended that they be adapted for use at UCSB by Fall 2007. The TA Training Committee will continue to meet in Fall 2006 to finalize its proposed standards for TA Training and to determine a process by which these standards could be implemented and monitored.
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COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM REVIEW
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Members: Omer Egecioglu (Chair), Mary Furner, Daniel Montello, Mihai Putinar, Robert Renehan (Spring), Lamia Youseff (GSA Representative)

The Committee on Program Review met four times during the 2005-06 academic year. A significant portion of the Committee’s work was conducted via email.

The primary work of the Committee on Program Review in 2005-06 was to design and implement review procedures and tools for the optional interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases. Academic Senate legislation and policy requires that all formal academic programs be reviewed periodically for quality and appropriateness. While the conduct of reviews for degree programs has been delegated to the Program Review Panel, the Graduate Council conducts the reviews of optional interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases. Optional interdisciplinary emphases have not been reviewed in the past and the Graduate Council decided two years ago to rectify this matter by choosing the three emphases that have the earliest establishment dates for review in this academic year. As Human Development, Cognitive Science, and Language, Interaction, and Social Organization have the earliest establishment dates, Council felt that these programs were appropriate for the 2005-06 review.

The Committee first developed a set of self-review questions for the emphases. The first section of the questionnaire contains questions for the chair/leadership of the emphasis in consultation with all affiliated faculty, regarding topics such as faculty and leadership, graduate students, curriculum, and administrative support. The second section contains questions for the graduate advisers of all participating departments in consultation with individual mentors and affiliated faculty to assess the value of the emphasis for their departments' students. The review questions were sent out to Human Development, Cognitive Science, and Language, Interaction, and Social Organization in late November, with a response deadline of March 24, 2006.

After reviewing the responses from Human Development and Cognitive Science, the Committee decided to draft questionnaires for all students and faculty participating in the emphases, in addition to the self-review performed by departments. The content of the questionnaires were endorsed by the Committee, approved by the full Council at the end of Spring 2006, and will be used starting with the 2006-07 reviews.

The Committee also added a section to the self-review requesting a narrative self-assessment concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the emphasis under review. The Committee agreed to remove the set of questions for the participating departments’ graduate advisors, due to the lack of information graduate advisors seem to have about these programs. Also included in future reviews will be an assessment by external reviewers, as it was decided that the Graduate Council has insufficient basis to evaluate the content of the programs’ core courses. Due to cost constraints, it was proposed that the reviews be conducted online instead of requesting that the reviewers travel to UCSB.

The Committee on Program Review recommended to Council that the optional interdisciplinary emphasis in Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences be reviewed in 2006-07. As the Committee did not receive a response from Language, Interaction, and Social Organization, the review of that emphasis has been postponed until the 2006-07 academic year.

For carryover to the 2006-07 academic year, the Committee on Program Review will continue to refine the review procedures and tools for the optional interdisciplinary Ph.D. emphases. The Committee also plans to develop a similar review process for the summer language institutes.
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Fellowship and Funding Subcommittee
2005-06 Annual Report
Chair: Don Marolf

Members: Donald Marolf (Chair), Mary Furner, John Mohr, Lamia Youseff (GSA Representative)

The main issues considered by the subcommittee this year concerned the Departmental Mentorship Awards and the Outstanding Graduate Mentor Awards. These issues are each described under their own heading below. In addition, Graduate Dean Morrison consulted with the subcommittee on certain issues regarding graduate student funding. The subcommittee held only one two-hour meeting, and conducted most of its business by e-mail.

Departmental Mentorship Awards

This was the second year in which Departmental Mentorship Awards were given, and the first year in which applications were due in the fall. This allowed the awards (recruiting scholarships) to be given to departments in time for use in Spring recruiting. The following issues arose and were considered by the subcommittee:

1. It was asked whether departments should be able to win two years in a row. This issue was resolved in consultation with the full Graduate Council. As no such restriction had been stated in the announcement of 05-06 awards, it was clear that winners from 04-05 would be eligible for the 05-06 awards. The issue thus concerned only future awards. Council voted that departments may not win two years in a row. This then generated the recommendation that the award selection committee for a given year be composed of members of winning departments from the previous year to avoid conflicts of interest.

2. It was asked whether Interdisciplinary groups were eligible to apply. Again, this was resolved in consultation with the full Graduate Council. Council voted that any recognized group with a graduate program is allowed to apply.

3. The award selection committee raised several concerns about the award process. First, the number of applications was rather small (8), even smaller than the previous year (9) – though this may be due to the fact that two of last year’s winning departments did not feel it appropriate to apply again immediately. Second, there was a general concern that the application procedure was cumbersome, with documentation being requested for too many types of policies and procedures which were not necessarily even beneficial to graduate students in all departments. Thus, there was a tendency to reward form over quality in the award process. In response to these concerns (and others), the subcommittee drafted new application procedures and a new call for proposals to be sent to departments this fall.

4. Finally, it was asked whether applications from previous years could be made available to current applicants. In the end, we hope to have dealt with this issue through the re-design of the application procedure. The primary document in the new system is a departmental statement which, for the winning departments, will be posted on the web in a public location. These documents will be available to provide suggestions and serve as guides for any department wishing to improve its own mentorship practices. In making award decisions, we encourage future award committees to consider the degree in which an applicant department’s statement is useful in this regard. Departments may also submit other documents with the expectation that they will not be made public.

As a final comment, while this subcommittee fully supports the above decisions and is pleased with the new award procedures, it wishes to state its belief that the mentorship awards are still in the “beta-testing phase” and that further adjustment of the rules and procedures may well be needed in the future.
Outstanding Graduate Mentor Awards

These awards also suffered from having a very small number of applicants. Again, the award committee was concerned that the application procedure was too cumbersome, though they were also concerned with getting enough (and sufficiently accurate and unbiased) information to make an informed decision.

The subcommittee drafted a new set of award guidelines in the form of
1. An award announcement
2. An application checklist and fact sheet
Future applications will request the checklist and fact sheet from Graduate Affairs, and it will guide them through the application procedure.

The main changes in the application procedure were:
1. To allow colleagues and current and former student to nominate a faculty member. We hope that this increases the number of applications. There is some concern that allowing current student to nominate their advisors may generate conflicts of interest (e.g., pressure on students to make such nominations), but it was felt that a) the students are in the best position to know which advisors should be nominated and b) this would increase the number of nominations. Of course, this decision should be reconsidered if problems arise in future years.
2. To streamline the application process, and to avoid asking applicants to show that they have performed a large number of specific tasks. Instead, the nominated individual is now asked to supply a 3-page statement of mentoring philosophy, subject to only a few guidelines.
3. To assemble some basic facts in a standardized form via the “fact sheet.” It was noted that the draft fact sheet explicitly asks for information about mentoring outside of UCSB, and that this may require approval by the faculty legislature. The subcommittee feels strongly that we are making an award to an advisor based on their overall mentoring success and that mentoring outside of UCSB may well be a part of that success. However, by separating data about mentorship within and outside of UCSB (in separate columns on the fact sheet), we leave it to future award selection committees to decide on a case by case basis how to weigh the internal and external data.

Again, we wish to emphasize that we believe this award to still be in the “beta-test phase.” Further changes may well be needed in the future.