

**Minutes of Meeting**

Wednesday, November 5, 2014

**I. Chair’s Report**

In her remarks about the Academic Planning Council, Chair Jutta Heckhausen reminded the committee that APC had previously discussed CCGA’s policy of distinguishing professional degree titles (Master of X) from the regular academic degree titles (M.A., M.S.). She noted that there is substantial resistance on the current APC to institutionalizing this policy and that CCGA will likely have to continue with the cumbersomeness of pushing back on confusing degree titles one program at a time. A second topic discussed at APC was the issue of SSPs and the notion of the term “compelling.” CCGA has been charged by the Academic Council to determine the crucial elements that convince the committee that a proposed program or conversion should be an SSP. It has been suggested that the committee look at the previously approved programs to glean a definition or guidelines that could help proposers frame a “compelling” argument for self-supporting programs.

After some discussion, the Chair asked that each campus submit a list of SSPs and PDSTs (including conversions) in the pipeline for the year ahead. This list should also include notation as to the status of each proposal (pre-planning, writing, or submitted to graduate council stage). Members observed that it is an important task for CCGA to monitor these proposals and how they may negatively impact neighboring programs.

Chair Heckhausen reported that Academic Council discussed the results of the total remuneration study at length. Also discussed were the President’s Challenge Grant Program and the University’s decision to invest in UC-related ventures.

The Chair discussed the letter CCGA wrote the leadership regarding ORGS and said that she didn’t feel that the committee should be dictating terms to the president, but that it should underscore the need for strong leadership in the OP regarding graduate education and the belief that research should not be moved out of Academic Affairs.

CCGA Vice Chair Valerie Leppert reported to the committee on the Council of Graduate Deans. Executive Director Bill Tucker told the deans that many companies are looking for students with entrepreneurship experience and that the President is promoting the idea of how to offer such opportunities to UC students. Jessica Jones from Student Financial Support shared data that show that many UC feeder schools are Hispanic-serving CSU campuses. Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom talked to the deans about the many facets of the University budget and how the medical schools are required to have six-month reserve, but several had more reserve and could use that for other purposes. Some of that reserve has now been moved to funds with a longer time horizon and a greater yield, which might open up funding for deferred maintenance on the campuses. The Vice Chair stated that the Provost talked to the deans about the search for a new Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies, and the expectation to have someone on board by July 1.

**II. Consent Calendar**

- A. Approval of the Agenda
- B. Approval of the Minutes of October 1, 2014

***Action Taken: The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.***

### III. Proposed Policies for Review (Part 1)

#### A. Doctoral Student Support Review

##### 1. **Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition**

CCGA was asked for input regarding the following three options with regard to NRST:

- a. Change Regental policy so that NRST is not charged after the first year;
- b. Make it a UC policy to either reimburse faculty grants for NRST or not charge NRST to faculty grants at all;
- c. Encourage campuses to engage in financial NRST work-arounds, and share those plans with other campuses, without a formal change to UC or Regental policy.

##### Response

Overall, CCGA felt that the issue of NRST was being adequately addressed at the campus level. Members expressed concern that the adoption of a uniform, systemwide policy would reduce the efficacy of the individual campus solutions. Concerns were shared regarding the following topics:

- Cost/expenses normally covered by NRST being pushed to the campus level.
- The political implications of eliminating graduate fees at a time when the University likely will be raising undergraduate fees.
- A substantial number of NRST students have private support and that money would just be “left on the table.”

The committee largely agreed with Options 2 and 3 with the stipulation that the wording be made more forceful, e.g., replacing “Encourage campuses to engage...” with “Establish shared principles to engage...” Members felt that such principles should have the flexibility to allow each campus to operate in the way that works best. The principles also need to be able to adapt to changes in the state and University budget.

Members agreed:

- NRST should not to be charged (or reimbursed) to graduate students after the first year to equalize domestic and international students.
- NRST should not be charged to grants.
- The NRST process needs to be transparent and predictable enough that campuses can communicate confidently and definitively in their offer letters to students.

##### 2. **Net Stipend Competitiveness and Multi-Year Offers**

CCGA was asked for input regarding the following three recommendations with regard to Multi-Year Support:

- a. Identify existing resources/services on all ten campuses to provide multi-year support drawn from a wide array of sources.
- b. Make multi-year funding a stated policy of each UC Graduate Division.
- c. Make explicit the source of back-up funds so that departments do not become more conservative in making offers of admission.

##### Response

CCGA discussed the issue of risk and where it would be borne on each campus in relation to offers that rely on funding that may not materialize. It was agreed that departments need to be empowered to feel comfortable and educated about risk. The committee largely supported the risk management model of multi-year support and felt that it made a positive statement about the value of graduate education.

Members stated that not all programs want 100% fellowships the first year (some want immediate

research training), and that some of the language of the recommendations should perhaps be adjusted to accommodate departmental norms. CCGA liked the idea of multi-year funding packages that are clearly articulated in a letter and are competitive within the context of the field. Members stressed the importance of the offer being anchored to the department or field.

Similarly, the concept of stipend competitiveness was welcomed by the committee. However, concern was expressed regarding the source of funds. It was later explained that additional funding could be pulled from the \$50M recently apportioned for Academic Quality. That fund also will be used for other projects, but could contribute to student stipends.

Member discussed ways to identify a competitive rate for stipends:

- Initiate direct contact with comparator institutions, asking what they offer and their stipend range.
- Identify students who showed an interest in UC but then accepted other offers; determine how those offers differed from package offered by UC.
- Use national data from AAU or Grad Cafe.

CCGA supported the overall goals, and did not have any suggestions for improvement.

### 3. **Professional Development**

CCGA was asked for input regarding the following three recommendations with regard to Professional Development:

- a. Identify existing resources/services on all ten campuses, assess current graduate student satisfaction with existing resources/services, and identify gaps in the resources/services currently being offered.
- b. Develop a UC-wide online resource, and supporting services, for graduate students to facilitate professional development and employment.
- c. Re-assess graduate student satisfaction post-deployment of the UC-wide online resources and services and measure their effectiveness in supporting student professional development and employment.

#### Response

Members were largely supportive of Recommendation 1, and agreed that there is probably much being done on individual campuses that could be shared and replicated for the benefit of all of the campuses. Many noted that it would be helpful to have a designated person to help with career advisement in non-academic careers. Collaboration with existing campus career centers might be an effective strategy. In general, it was recognized that professional development systemwide can be “hit and miss” from campus to campus and department to department.

CCGA expressed little interest or satisfaction with the online portal concept. While a centralized means to share best practices was considered beneficial, the portal was perceived as a poorly conceived undertaking that would consume considerable resources for its maintenance as an up-to-date resource. It was suggested that online tools that already exist, such as VersatilePhD.com, be used in lieu of an independently-developed portal and that the funding instead be channeled to funding for faculty mentorships, career center development/liaisons, information sharing methods, and staffing to make these resources more available, accessible, and widely-known.

### 4. **Diversity Programs & Proposals**

CCGA was asked for input as to whether, and to what extent, the Summer Bridge, UC-HBCU, and HSI/TCU programs could be expanded if funding is increased.

#### Response

CCGA discussed current and proposed diversity-related programs, including UC-HBCU, PFPF,

UC-Leads, Summer Bridge, and the HSI/TCU Initiative. The committee was strongly supportive of these programs and felt that they should be expanded and strengthened as much as possible.

Members discussed the possibility of building more intersegmental ties and processes to help broaden and strengthen the pipeline for URMs. The goal would be to create sustainable links that extend beyond grant funding. URM undergraduates should be actively exposed to more than one UC campus so that they will think of staying within the UC system for graduate school.

The term “earmark” should not be applied to humans (page 9) and thus needs to be replaced with a more suitable word.

CCGA noted that recruitment and support of URMs might be a strong platform for philanthropy – particularly as an area of emphasis for the Regents.

A good investment might be incentives for UCs to reach out and build institutional relationships with CSUs. The University might also look at exploring other activities such as providing undergraduates with a “visiting quarter” with some graduate-level coursework and experience at least two years prior to application. UC should also explore ways to facilitate the success of first generation, economically disadvantaged, and scholastically (i.e., high-schools in poor neighborhoods) disadvantaged students.

The committee unanimously agreed that efforts to increase and strengthen diversity should be strongly championed.

#### **IV. Announcements from the President’s Office, Academic Affairs**

Graduate Studies Director Pamela Jennings announced that the new RFP for the UC-HBCU has been released and has a deadline of March 11. ORGS has publicly released the results of the systemwide doctoral alumni survey that CCGA saw in the spring. Additional data related to the placement survey will be available at the next CCGA meeting.

Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan told the committee that there had been some confusion regarding the issue of professional degree titles and SSPs. The issue will be discussed again at the December Academic Planning Committee meeting. In a similar vein, the Provost would like to more specifically define the criteria for the approval of SSPs. Input and feedback regarding the approval of self-supporting programs is due by January.

#### **V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

Academic Council Chair Mary Gilly remarked that the Legislative Analyst’s Office is reporting that tax revenues are coming in according to original projections, so UC may be able to secure \$50M in funding from the state. Vice President Patrick Lenz is working with the governor’s office to ascertain UC’s position relative to that funding.

Chair Gilly stated that all of the segments of higher education are dealing with the issue of sexual assault on their campuses. Another intersegmental issue is the continuing shrinkage in the pipeline for K-12 teachers. Many faculty are retiring due to the adoption of common core, and the continued low salaries and insecurity of the profession make it unappealing to many.

Contrary to plans, UC PATH will not going live at OP on January 1. Its release will be delayed to an unannounced date.

Chair Gilly discussed the Innovation Council that the President appointed. She noted that the Innovation Council was created specifically to advise the President and not to make UC policy – any policy changes will have to come through the usual pathways.

## VI. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

- A. Proposal for a Joint Ph.D. in Applied Social Science with an Emphasis on Substance Use at UC San Diego (with San Diego State University)– *Lead Reviewer Carol Burke (UCI)*  
*(To be included:* Proposal for a Degree/Title Change from JDP in Applied Social Science with an Emphasis on Substance Use to JDP in Interdisciplinary Research on Substance Use at UC San Diego)  
Professor Burke said that she had just received word from the CSU chancellor’s office that they are now satisfied with the proposal. The authors have made considerable changes at the request of the various reviewers, and the proposal should be ready for a final review in December. She remarked that joint UC/CSU proposals are challenging to review.
- B. Proposal for an M.A. and Ph.D. in Sociology at UC Merced –  
*Lead Reviewer John Kim (UCR)*  
Professor Kim remarked that the proposal was very well-prepared and that he would discuss it at the December meeting.
- C. Proposal for an M.S. in Scientific Computing and Applied Mathematics at UC Santa Cruz –  
*Lead Reviewer John Bolander (UCD)*  
Professor Bolander explained that there is a growing market for this type of data scientist, and that the program will also serve as a feeder into UCSC’s PHD program in statistics and applied mathematics. The program would add new elective courses that could enrich educational experience for other departments. He said that the reviewers’ comments were largely positive, and that he did not see any major issues with the proposal.  
***Action Taken:*** *The proposal was approved 9-0-1.*
- D. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Rehabilitation Science at UCSF – *Lead Reviewer Valerie Leppert*  
Professor Leppert said that she had been waiting on the fourth reviewer, and that person had expressed substantial concern about the proposal. Voting on the proposal was deferred until the campus is able to provide a detailed response to the concerns raised by the reviewers. Additional clarification is needed.
- E. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Mathematical, Computational, and Systems Biology at UC Irvine -  
*Lead Reviewer Shauna Somerville*  
Review and feedback is still needed on this proposal.
- F. Proposal for Ph.D. in Education at UC San Diego – *Lead Reviewer Tania Israel*  
UCSD would like to phase out its Ed.D. in Teaching and Learning and establish a Ph.D. in Education. They are interested in transforming education in diverse contexts and are highlighting some aspects of their interdisciplinary technology. In the course of discussion, it was revealed that the campus had begun to prematurely promote the program on its website. Chair Heckhausen said that further review was still needed and that she would write a letter to the campus specifying that they discontinue active promotion of the degree program until such time that it is approved.
- G. Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (MPP) in the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IRPS) at UC San Diego - *Lead Reviewer Ken Kletzer*  
Professor Kletzer said that he had gone through the proposal and was in the process of securing internal and external reviewers.
- H. Proposal to establish a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Public Health Sciences at UC Davis  
***Action Taken:*** *David Salmon was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

**VII. Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishments, and Discontinuances**

- A. Proposal for a Simple Name Change from Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering to Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at UC Davis  
**Action Taken: The name change was approved 8-0-1.**
- B. Proposal for a Simple Name Change from Comparative Pathology to Integrative Pathobiology at UC Davis  
**Action Taken: The name change was approved 8-0-1.**
- C. Proposal for a Simple Name Change from Biomedical Physics Interdepartmental Degree Program (MS/PhD) to the Physics and Biology in Medicine Interdepartmental Degree Program  
**Action Taken: The name change was approved 8-0-0.**  
Chair Heckhausen observed that UCLA is approving and implementing changes without first securing CCGA approval. She will write a letter to the campuses clarifying the role of CCGA.

**VIII. Proposed Policies for Review (Part 2)**

- B. *Presidential Policy for Open Access for UC authors who are not members of the Academic Senate - Lead Reviewer Carol Burke*

Professor Burke briefly discussed the proposal, with Analyst Jocelyn Banaria providing some relevant background information. The policy has been designed with the STEM fields in mind, which mainly publish their work via quick turn-around journal articles. Other fields, such as in the humanities and some social sciences mainly publish books and thus need considerably more time before preliminary work such as dissertation theses can be made publically available online without undermining the author's opportunity to publish the book with a publisher.

Professor Burke will write up a report for the committee's review in time for the December meeting.

**IX. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils**

Members updated the committee on proposal development and issues of change/concern on their campuses.

**X. New Business**

No new business was discussed at this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest: Jutta Heckhausen, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst