UC RIVERSIDE | Academic Senate

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

May 8, 2018

Executive Council comment regarding the proposed revisions to Regulation GR1.6: Professional Development Requirement for Graduate Students

Dear Senate Colleagues:

I am communicating Executive Council's discussion of Graduate Council's proposal to change the professional development regulation. Executive Council held its discussion during its May 7, 2018 meeting and was satisfied with the revisions that were made in response to the initial consultation. It supports the proposal.

Sincerely yours,

Dylan Rodríguez
Chair of the Riverside Division

Graduate Council

March 16, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
        Riverside Division

From: Christiane Weirauch, Chair
        Graduate Council

Re: Proposed revisions to Regulation GR1.6 Professional Development Requirement
        for Graduate Students – second round

Based on feedback provided by various Senate committees, the Graduate Council has revised the proposed revisions to Regulation GR1.6. Attached, please find the revised version of the Regulation as well as an explanation of the revisions based on the feedback provided. Please reroute this to committees for review and approval.

GR1.6 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENT FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

CURRENT	PROPOSED
~~In addition to the specific degree requirements listed below, professional development training is a requirement of for the M.A., M.S., M.F.A. and Ph.D. degrees. Each degree program determines the format, content, and extent of its training. A program may provide all of its training independently, or it may partner with other programs or utilize services provided by other campus units or professional organizations. Training must be for unit credit and may be delivered as a single course or as portions of multiple courses.~~	Professional development training is required for all MS, MA, MFA, MPP, and Ph.D. programs. Such training is ideally designed to help students achieve mastery of some core competencies including communication (e.g., writing and publishing, presentation skills, networking); academic development (e.g., skill building in teaching and mentoring, grant writing); leadership and professionalism (e.g., abilities in research/scholarship, professional ethics, and inclusiveness); and career development (e.g., strategies for success in graduate school and the profession, maintaining work/life balance, time management, and career and job market guidance). This list is not meant to be exhaustive or prescriptive, but rather to reflect the range of skills our students need to be successful. Each program determines the format, content, and extent of its training in order to make it specific to, and appropriate for, the discipline. Training must be for unit credit and may be delivered as a single course or as portions of multiple courses. The courses must be listed in the catalogue and clearly noted as serving to meet the professional development requirement.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SECTION IN THE CATALOG, PAGE 62

CURRENT	PROPOSED
Professional development training is required for all MS, MA, MFA and Ph.D. programs. Training typically includes elements of research and professional ethics, grant and professional writing, strategies for success in graduate school and the profession, pedagogy, public speaking, career and job market guidance, and other relevant topics to help students become successful professionals. Each program determines the format, content, and extent of its training in order to make it specific to, and appropriate for, the discipline. A program may provide all of its training independently, or it may partner with other programs, or utilize services provided by other campus units or professional organizations.

Training must be for unit credit and may be delivered as a single course or as portions of multiple courses. | Professional development training is required for all MS, MA, MFA, MPP, and Ph.D. programs. Such training is ideally designed to help students achieve mastery of some core competencies including communication (e.g., writing and publishing, presentation skills, networking); academic development (e.g., skill building in teaching and mentoring, grant writing); leadership and professionalism (e.g., abilities in research/scholarship, professional ethics, and inclusiveness); and career development (e.g., strategies for success in graduate school and the profession, maintaining work/life balance, time management, and career and job market guidance). This list is not meant to be exhaustive or prescriptive, but rather to reflect the range of skills our students need to be successful.

Each program determines the format, content, and extent of its training in order to make it specific to, and appropriate for, the discipline. Training must be for unit credit and may be delivered as a single course or as portions of multiple courses. The courses must be listed in the catalogue and clearly noted as serving to meet the professional development requirement. |

Justification: Six years after the professional development (PD) requirement for graduate students was approved by the Graduate Council (GC), compliance among programs still seems to be inconsistent and of varying quality. GC has taken steps to remedy this problem, namely, approval of the amended questionnaire for program reviews and modification of the guidelines for program review self-study reports, both of which aim to probe whether students are indeed receiving any PD training.

In the same spirit, the committee is proposing to change the text both in the Graduate Division Regulation GR 1.6 and in the Professional Development section in the catalog (Page 62). The proposed text puts PD training into the widely accepted "core competency" framework. We believe this text expresses what is expected of programs more clearly, and the core competency framework facilitates the design of PD training the programs will provide.

Approved by Graduate Council: March 15, 2018
The Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction finds the wording
to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: December 4, 2017
Reviewed by Executive Council: May 7, 2018

From:	Ertem Tuncel <ertem@ece.ucr.edu>
Sent:	Wednesday, February 07, 2018 10:35 AM
To:	Sarah Miller
Subject:	Re: Status of Regulation change - Professional Development
Attachments:	Professional development regulation change proposal - final.docx

Hi Sarah,

I am commenting between the lines below, and attaching a revised version addressing the easy stuff.

> SPP Exec Committee – One concern we have is why the MPP program, as well as the MBA program, are not included in the regulation? Speaking on behalf of the MPP program, our students would likely benefit from the regulation being applied to our program as well. A second, and more minor issue, is that among the litany of items listed to describe what the content might consist of and focus on, including "time management" might be useful as well.

I have no problem adding MPP. I agree with time management as well, and I think the best place to fit that is as an example to the core competency of "career development". I made the changes accordingly.

> Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity - Overall the committee approves of the proposed language, but encourages programs pay mind to inclusiveness when determining what appropriate professional development training is for the discipline.

"and inclusiveness" has been added to the first paragraph where leadership and professionalism is discussed.

> Academic Freedom - The Committee on Academic Freedom considered the proposed regulation change to GR1.6 and did not find any academic freedom issues. However, the committee offers a friendly amendment to the following sentence: "The courses must be listed in the catalogue and clearly noted as ~~the course~~ serving to meet the professional development requirement."

I also agree with this and made the changes.

> CHASS Exec Committee - The committee also noted that some non-compliant programs may benefit from guidance regarding the typical content of such courses, perhaps via a repository of representative syllabi from compliant programs. Aside from this suggestion, the committee had no objections to the revised regulation.

I completely agree and we should team up with the Grad Council to help programs implement their Professional Development, and a repository of representative syllabi is an excellent idea in that direction. But clearly, we cannot address that in this text.

> Planning & Budget - P&B discussed the proposed regulation change and felt that the changes do not seem to modify the requirement but may involve additional faculty time and commitment that should include teaching credit. The committee generally supported the proposal.

Faculty do get credit when they teach a professional development course. And again, I don't think this text is the place to address faculty load. Update: The GC has drafted a memo to all Deans that reminds them that faculty should be receiving credit for teaching these courses.

> Rules & Jurisdiction - Although these changes do not violate the code of the Academic Senate, the Committee has the following suggestions: Provide a briefer and more concise version of what has been stated; keeping the first paragraph as is, and to concentrate on the second paragraph and just add on the suggested sentence about the need for a course listing in the catalogue.

I propose to remove the second sentence "A program may … or professional organizations." I made that change in the attached document as well.

Thanks,
Ertem

December 14, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
                Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: John Levin, Chair
                Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Proposed Regulation Change to GR1.6 from Graduate Council

The Committee on Academic Freedom considered the proposed regulation change to GR1.6 and did not find any academic freedom issues. However, the committee offers a friendly amendment to the following sentence:

"The courses must be listed in the catalogue and clearly noted as ~~the course~~ serving to meet the professional development requirement."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES   RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

December 07, 2017

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
             Academic Senate

FROM: Kate Sweeny, Chair
             CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Proposed Regulation Change to GR1.6

The CHASS Executive Committee discussed the Proposed Regulation Change to GR1.6 at the regular
meeting on November 29, 2017. The committee appreciated the effort to clarify expectations for the
content of the required professional development training for graduate students. However, the committee
also noted that some non-compliant programs may benefit from guidance regarding the typical content of
such courses, perhaps via a repository of representative syllabi from compliant programs. Aside from
this suggestion, the committee had no objections to the revised regulation.

Kate Sweeny, Chair

CHASS Executive Committee

January 3, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez
                Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Suveen Mathaudhu, Chair
                Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity

Re: Proposed Regulation Change to GR1.6 from Graduate Council

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity considered the proposed regulation change to RG1.6 at its December 7th meeting. Overall the committee approves of the proposed language, but encourages programs pay mind to inclusiveness when determining what appropriate professional development training is for the discipline.

PLANNING & BUDGET

December 12, 2017

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
               Riverside Division

From: Christian Shelton, Chair
               Committee on Planning and Budget

RE: Regulation Review: Proposed Regulation Change to GR1.6 from Graduate
               Council

P&B discussed the proposed regulation change and felt that the changes do not seem to modify the requirement but may involve additional faculty time and commitment that should include teaching credit. The committee generally supported the proposal.

December 4, 2017

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
                  Riverside Division

From: Kambiz Vafai
                  Chair, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: 17-18. [Campus Review] Regulation Review: Proposed Regulation
                  Change to GR1.6 from Graduate Council

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the proposed changes to Regulation GR1.6 from Graduate Council.

Although these changes do not violate the code of the Academic Senate, the Committee has the following suggestions: Provide a briefer and more concise version of what has been stated; keeping the first paragraph as is, and to concentrate on the second paragraph and just add on the suggested sentence about the need for a course listing in the catalogue.

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Kurt Schwabe, Chair
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: Proposed Regulation Change to GR1.6 from Graduate Council

Date: December 20, 2017

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy is in support of more clarity surrounding the expectations and understanding of Graduate Division Regulation GR 1.6 and in the Professional Development section in the catalog. One concern we have is why the MPP program, as well as the MBA program, are not included in the regulation? Speaking on behalf of the MPP program, our students would likely benefit from the regulation being applied to our program as well. A second, and more minor issue, is that among the litany of items listed to describe what the content might consist of and focus on, including "time management" might be useful as well.