

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 5, 2014

Present: Donald Mastronarde (Chair, UCB), Jutta Heckhausen (Vice Chair, UCI), Maite Zubiaurre (UCLA), Kwai Ng (UCSD), Carol Burke (UCI), John Bolander (UCD), Valerie Leppert (UCM-T), Shauna Somerville (UCB), John Kim (UCR), E. Bruce Robertson (UCSB), Bruce Schumm (UCSC), Youngho Seo (UCSF), Hilary Baxter, Pamela Jennings, Mary Gilly (Council Vice Chair), William Jacob (Council Chair), and Todd Giedt (Analyst)

I. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates

BRIEFING: Chair Mastronarde updated the committee on a number of issues:

- UC Path is further delayed;
- Disagreement over the composite benefit rates continues (see below);
- ILTI and UCOE will be merged into one unit, and most future development of online courses will be done on the campus level; and
- President Napolitano is implementing an efficiency review of UCOP.

At the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture & Natural Resources (ACSCANR) meeting, some discussion was devoted to the establishment of graduate opportunities program with UC's Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR). At the February Council meeting, members received updates on the Governor's budget (there is some possibility of the inclusion of one-time monies), the UC Mexico Initiative, and the Transfer Initiative. With respect to the latter, the current initiative focuses on streamlining the transfer function(s). Provost Dorr also briefed Council members on a legislative hearing on academic performance outcomes -- she noted UC reported trends over time, which are positive, but emphasized that there is a gap in four-year graduation rates between PELL grant recipients and non-PELL grant recipients. However, this gap diminishes significantly at the six-year graduation rate level. Chair Mastronarde also reported that there is a possibility of raising undergraduate non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST) for next year, which would result in an additional \$25M from undergraduates only; graduate student NRST would not be raised.

The entire February 18 Academic Planning Council (APC) meeting was devoted to the SSGPDP revisions. The main sticking points are the preamble and the description of SSGPDPs. APC did agree to the following:

- reinstating the 2011 clause that revenue can be applied to core programs and other academic programs;
- rewriting sections A, B, and C;
- changing "ladder-ranked" faculty to "Senate" faculty;
- incorporating all costs, including benefits and retirement, in buyouts of faculty; and
- developing alternative language for "uncommon" conversions (adopting CCGA's proposed language).

APC also discussed the review of conversions of state-supported programs to SSGPDPs at length. APC Members agreed that the initial review of a conversion will be conducted by the local Graduate Council; it has flexibility to determine the academic standing of a program. APC also decided that the

first review of the SSGDP should take place in the fourth year, and campuses may add additional review criteria that do not conflict with the formal policy. The section on financial accessibility will be re-written, and a section on diversity will be added. Finally, the presidential approval cycle of SSGPDP fees was changed to three years. Discussions also continued on the Presidential Open Access Policy.

Vice Chair Heckhausen reported from the COGD meeting that a number of campuses are expecting a five-day TA strike in early March. She also mentioned that the COGD is developing a number of proposals for the April 15 conference on doctoral support, and added that a number of campuses already have in place best practices to mitigate NRST, which includes using a blended rate at UCSD.

DISCUSSION: With respect to the SSPs, one member asked if any tracking mechanisms related to diversity have been established. Chair Mastronarde reported that this has not been discussed explicitly - nor is it in the current draft policy -- but campuses are free to make the policy more strict locally.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Approval of the Minutes from the February 5, 2014 meeting.

ACTION: *Members approved a modified agenda and approved the February 5, 2014 minutes.*

III. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs – Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director; and Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

REPORT: Consultant Jennings reported that the University is currently engaged in AB 1834, which would allow unionization of GSRs on UC campuses through a change in the HERA statute. Next week is Graduate Student Advocacy Day in Sacramento; the President will hold a meeting with Governor Brown, along with two graduate students and some graduate deans. Consultant Baxter reported that Senator Block has introduced a bill that would allow community colleges to award BA degrees (SB 850), which would blur the lines of responsibilities of UC, CSU, and the California community colleges, as outlined by the Master Plan.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if the Graduate Students Association (GSA) has taken a position on AB 1834. It is not known if the GSA officially supports this bill. Members also asked about the possibility of a new CPEC. There is general consensus that there is not sufficient State funding for a new CPEC at this time. With respect to SB 850, it is also not clear if the costs for BA programs at community colleges will be less. There may be certain applied fields which the community colleges can offer that neither the CSU nor UC would offer. Such programs are being offered in other states, a statistic that is often cited by the proponents of this bill. Capacity in nursing programs is bounded by clinical placements in nursing, regardless of whether the programs are offered by CSU or the community colleges.

IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership – Academic Council Chair Bill Jacob and Academic Council Vice Chair Mary Gilly

REPORT: Chair Jacob updated CCGA on composite benefits rates. The Senate has asked for additional data regarding composite benefit rates from OP, but has not received the requested data. April 1 is the deadline by which OP is scheduled to make a final decision on composite benefits, and

this issue will be discussed at the May Regents' meeting. Approximately 80% of summer salaries is research-based; the remaining 20% is linked to summer teaching. According to Chair Jacob's own calculations, a proposed composite benefit rate of 33 or 34% would pull approximately \$17M from graduate student support (via grants). This accounts for about 10-12% of GSR funding from grants. The 2013 Huron estimates looked at both the 11% and 33% composite rate scenarios, and also found a similar amount (~\$17M) between the two scenarios. He added that the Berkeley and Davis campuses have already implemented composite benefit rates; Chair Jacob is trying to get information on the cuts to grants on these campuses.

DISCUSSION: One member commented that overhead rates are tightly prescribed. This additional tax on benefits is not part of that overhead, but in addition to it. A key question will be whether the funding agencies will consider this tax arbitrary, and how it will impact future negotiations with the funding agencies. Summer salary is currently not covered compensation under UCRP. One member opined that -- in essence -- the University is trying to get the federal government to fund nine-month salaries through this mechanism of composite benefits.

V. RFP for Actions for Improved Doctoral Support for the All UC Doctoral Education Support conference – Chair Mastronarde and Vice Chair Jutta Heckhausen

ISSUE: The Taskforce on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS) has made three recommendations to alleviate NRST: 1) waive NRST for Ph.D. students; 2) increase the number of years NRST is waived for international doctoral students; and 3) reduce the cost differential due to NRST over time by forgoing future increases in tuition on international academic doctoral students. Given that the first recommendation could potentially leave money on the table, CCGA members rejected it out-of-hand.

DISCUSSION: Right now, NRST monies come back to the campuses, which then decide how to apply it. Some members commented that the accounting for this could be complicated. Campuses could devise some way to eliminate the disincentive(s) to accept international students into their programs. Some members expressed a need for a systemwide mandate that all NRST monies go back to the departments from which they emanated. At Davis, NRST will be eliminated for second-year and third-year doctoral students; support for this will come from continued growth at the campus. Other members spoke about an entrenchment of funds, which may make it difficult to reallocate funds to departments, even if there is a systemwide mandate. Members were also interested to know what NRST is currently being used for, and articulated their fear that a new financial model could essentially rob programs of current allocations. Other members commented that its use probably varies by campus. The recommendation was made to expand on CAGSS point 1.B, and extend it by two years, which would bring NRST in line with that experienced by most out-of-state undergraduate students. However, the mechanics of how this is done will be important. Recycling funds would not leave money on the table or capture all revenues. While the accounting would be complicated, it is not insurmountable. Some campuses already do this. One member mentioned that issue of attracting the best international students is one of CCGA's fundamental concerns. This is a competitive weakness, which must be addressed. The principle that must be maintained is to attain parity with out-of-state students.

Members also discussed the possibility eliminating the systemwide time limits on GSI employment, which is currently set at 18 quarters or 6 years (which is also related to the "Doc.2A" issue). Members mentioned that this requirement is sometimes used to regulate time-to-degree. One option is simply to change the limit to the accepted normative time for a particular degree. However, there are options to

keep the normative time shorter. Members recommended tying this limit to normative time unless there is some legal reason to keep it at 18 quarters.

CCGA considered the fact that UC's net stipends are approximately \$2,000 less than those offered by its comparator institutions, although the specific amounts vary by discipline. Members agreed to include a proposal that would address this issue. The committee remarked that additional fact-finding needs to be done. It cannot be a "one size fits all" approach. Members mentioned that the entire landscape of graduate student recruitment has changed with the emergence of social media; graduate applicants often know the offers made by other institutions. In addition, Ivy League institutions are guaranteeing adequate support for a full five years. There are also some examples in which some small departments do not make any offers at all in years when funding is particularly low.

Members briefly considered the issue of alternative career paths and the role of mentoring for doctoral students. It was noted that some faculty members stigmatize alternative career paths for Ph.D. students. However, industry representatives cite intensive research skills, ability to write, and intellectual flexibility and interdisciplinary breadth as desirable skills in employees.

ACTION: *CCGA agreed to submit proposals on the following:*

- *Increase the number of years NRST is waived for international doctoral students (CAGSS Recommendation 1.B.);*
- *Do not charge NRST to research grants (CAGSS Recommendation 2);*
- *Either allocate additional resources for net stipends (or reallocate existing resources) for academic doctoral student support (CAGSS Recommendation 4);*
- *Generate a proposal on alternative career paths for Ph.D. students.*
- *Move toward treating international students the same as out of state students.*

These items will be drafted and circulated for comment.

VI. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

- A. Proposal for a New Graduate Program from UC San Diego at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography: Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) Degree in Climate Science and Policy (CSP) -- Co-Lead Reviewers Maite Zubiaurre (UCLA) and Shauna Somerville (UCB)**

REPORT: The lead reviewers reminded members that this program builds upon the already successful model of a program in conservation. Concerns were expressed regarding incoming students from the workforce who might founder in courses that typically cater to academic graduate students; the proposers came back that a math boot camp has been highly successful in bringing similar students up-to-speed in other programs. Another point was whether there was enough breadth in the curriculum with respect to topics in climate science. The proposers responded that their balance of depth and breadth were appropriate. They did not want to surrender additional depth to establish better understanding. They believe that using guest speakers would give students more breadth in climate science topics.

DISCUSSION: A number of proposals have suggested mixing different types of students, and seem to have done this successfully. This program proposes a similar approach. Members noted that it is the quality of the courses that is important; if students have the necessary support, this approach should be fine.

ACTION: *Members voted to approve unanimously (with one abstention) the UCSD MAS in Climate Science and Policy.*

B. Proposal for a Professional Master of Public Policy degree in the School of Public Policy at UC Riverside -- Lead Reviewers Kwai Ng (UCSD)

REPORT: In September 2008, the Regents voted to approve a School of Public Policy at Riverside. However, this school was put on hold until 2012; a founding dean was hired in 2013. A couple of key points have emerged from external and internal reviewers. Both reviewers agree that there is a market for a MPP in the Inland Empire. This program would also be able to recruit out-of-state and international students successfully. The proposer has made substantive changes to the curriculum in their revised proposal, changing the content of the course on regional policy and analysis, adding tools for regional analysis, and removing normative analysis as an emphasis of the program. Finally, they added the “Introduction to Policy Analysis” as a core course in the program. Currently, they have 12 FTEs, with plans to recruit additional FTEs.

DISCUSSION: One member wondered if the program is designed to cater to working professionals. The lead reviewer responded that at this point, the program is full-time and would – consequently – require a full-time commitment on behalf of the student. The program wants to slowly build up its cohort of students, and has a multi-pronged approach to recruitment, including local, state-wide, and international strategies. It also has an internship program in place.

ACTION: *Members voted unanimously (with one abstention) to approve the MPP within in the School of Public Policy at UC Riverside.*

C. Proposal from the UCLA Department of Economics to Establish a Master of Arts in Applied Economics – Lead Reviewers John Bolander (UCD)

REPORT: The lead reviewer reported that the proposal has been revised. He has two external reviews in hand, which are quite positive. However, given that indirect costs will be waived during the first three years, there is some question as to whether the program will be profitable after that time. Budgeting \$50K per course may also be problematic. The lead reviewer anticipates receiving the other reviews in time for the April meeting.

DISCUSSION: Both reviewers have commented that there is sufficient demand for this program. The proposers want to retain the M.A. degree title; CCGA may want to insist that the degree title be changed to a “Master of Applied Economics”. Only a small fraction of programs nationally use the “M.A. in Applied Economics” degree title. CCGA agreed that it is appropriate to ask the proposers to change the name to a Master’s of Applied Economics.

D. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Global Studies for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Barbara-- Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)

REPORT: The lead reviewer reported that he is still awaiting the external reviews. One issue that the lead reviewer has raised with the proposers is graduate student support. The proposers have responded that graduate students support includes block grants, campus fellowships, TAs for Global Studies

undergraduate students, six fellowships that currently go to MA students, endowed chairs that would support doctoral students, and extramural funding.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that CCGA should ask for specific numbers on graduate student support. Members also discussed gathering additional input for block grants and other sources of funding for the next meeting.

E. Proposal for an M.A. in Philosophy, Political Science, and Economics at UC Irvine

ACTION: *John Kim was assigned as the lead reviewer.*

F. Joint Doctoral Program (with SDSU) in Applied Social Science with an Emphasis on Substance Use — Lead Reviewer Carol Burke (UCI)

REPORT: This is a program centered on substance abuse prevention. It is a unique proposal that would recruit Masters graduates in applied Social Sciences. In the first year, students will be at UCSD; in the second year they will be at SDSU. The proposers have designated the Ph.D. as the appropriate doctoral degree due to the research focus of the program. It goes without saying that faculty at both institutions are of high quality. SDSU carries the biggest investment, along with the upfront money, including graduate student support for up to four years. It is unclear how state support would be allocated between the two institutions, but this would probably be negotiated through a MOU. Students that remain in the program past four years could be supported by faculty research grants, but there are not any letters of support from actual research faculty that substantiate this.

DISCUSSION: Members expressed the notion that -- as an academic Ph.D. -- this program may be too focused. It may be more appropriate as an applied Master's program. There may also be a de facto four year (funding) limit for students. The funding issue remains a concern for the lead reviewer, who noted that it will need further clarification. UCSD's contribution must be in the doctoral research area in order to cement the arrangement with SDSU. Such a contribution could take the form of one or more UCSD faculty members serving on student dissertation committees.

G. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) Degree in Data Science and Engineering (DSE) at UC San Diego

ACTION: *Youngho Seo was assigned this proposal.*

H. Proposal for a Program of Graduate studies in Physics for the M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees at UC Merced

ACTION: *E.B. Robertson was assigned this proposal.*

VII. Consultation – Chair Mastronarde

A. Graduate Education in the Humanities and STEM Fields

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the value of creative and competitive contributions made by PhDs in the Humanities and the Arts. The committee discussed composing a one-page paper for the President to use in discussions with the governor.

ACTION: **Chair Mastronarde will ask E.B. Robertson to draft a statement on this issue.**

B. Four-campus Joint Online Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree Proposal

ISSUE: This is a SSP program that would be jointly offered by UCSF, UCI, UCD, and UCLA. As such, it is unprecedented. The teaching of the degree would be done on a consortia basis. Proposal development is complicated by the fact that two of the campuses are at least one year away from their local Graduate Council proposal review, as they lack the current resources to host the program. One option could be to approve the degree on two campuses with a concurrent review, with the possibility of future negotiation with the other campuses when they are ready. CCGA agreed that even if students take courses at all four campuses, each campus that awards this degree must have it approved by that campus's Graduate Council. Therefore, CCGA will approve the program on a campus-by-campus basis, as long as the other participating campuses commit to offering the courses. Such commitments will need to be verified in writing. This is a two-year program, but all of the applicants will be required to have Master's degrees before entering the program.

ACTION: *Chair Mastronarde will write an email to the lead proposer of the program at UCLA to outline CCGA's approval process for this program proposal.*

C. Handbook Revisions: Preliminary Discussion

ISSUE: Chair Mastronarde mentioned a number of areas in the Handbook that need to be revised:

- CPEC: Now that CPEC has been eliminated; references to it need to be updated or perhaps removed.
- Adding a Master's Degree to an Approved Doctoral Program: Instructions regarding the capstone element has been added to this section.
- Review Steps: Changes have been made to improve the uniformity of the review process, which address the quality of proposed degree programs regardless of whether they are state-supported programs, PDST-charging programs, or SSPs.
- Capstone Projects has been updated.
- Professional degree titles have been added.
- The 2011 PDST review document added.
- The procedures for five-year perspectives, which now include bi-annual reporting, have been updated.
- Some of the appendices have been updated.
- The template for the program proposals has been updated (see Donald's copy). It includes the following: 1) Student support – comparison of per student support to comparators; 2) replacement of the CPEC questionnaire with the UCOP document on the seven key areas that were previously included in the old CPEC questionnaire; and 3) removal of Appendix D (CPEC).

ACTION: *Members should submit any further changes or corrections to Chair Mastronarde in the next one to two weeks so that he can prepare them for the next meeting.*

VIII. Discussion of Issues at Divisional Graduate Councils – Chair Mastronarde

DISCUSSION: There was some discussion of PDSTs at a number of Graduate Council meetings. Members reiterated that there is no such thing as a PDST "conversion"; there is only a process of applying to begin charging PDST for a professional program that previously did not charge one. The term "conversion" should be used only for the (rare) cases of transition from state-support to SSP status. Members also observed that UCOP's attention on five-year planning perspectives has ebbed and flowed over time. Currently, there is a renewed interest in the five-year planning perspectives. One member spoke of the value of these perspectives at the local level in terms of information sharing; the

perspectives can be seen as one barometer of a campus's strategic interests or areas of future growth. The five-year perspectives will be included in the April agenda.

The UCSD Graduate Council is currently working on guidelines for program proposers on its campus, including a flow-chart outlining the steps to get a proposal approved on the local level.

IX. New Business: Discussion – Chair Mastronarde

A. Review of the Whistle Blower Policy

ACTION: Jutta Heckhausen and John Bolander will be the lead reviewers of the policy and will report back at the next meeting.

X. Executive Session – Chair Mastronarde
Members did not hold an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Attest: Donald Mastronarde, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst