

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MINUTES OF MEETING – FEBRUARY 8, 2005**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Quentin Williams*Concurrent Resolution

Chair Williams reported that there is a lot of interest in this document at the California State University (CSU) system. A discussion was conducted at the last Academic Council (AC) meeting on changing the wording from "UC" to "UC and CSU".

Merced Academic Senate Division

Differences are currently being worked out between the AC and UC Merced (UCM) regarding the establishment of the Merced Division, particularly in the funding of a divisional Senate office there. However, Chair Williams noted that UCM will not be able to confer degrees until UCM has divisional status, so these differences should be worked out by September.

Miscellaneous

- Executive Vice Chancellors (EVC's): At the end of March, the AC will be meeting with the EVC's to discuss diversity and graduate education.
- National Labs: University of Texas (UT) has dropped its bid and is not competing for the Los Alamos Lab.
- CPEC/Student Aid Commission: A bill is currently being drafted to be introduced into the state legislature that focuses on how specific sectors (UC, CSU, community colleges) of higher education are performing in terms of accountability.
- Larry Zahn: Larry Zahn (UCR) has resigned from CCGA due to the fact that he has recently been appointed as the interim Dean of the Graduate School of Management at UCR.
- 2005-06 AC Vice Chair: John Oakley from UC Davis (UCD) has been confirmed as the 2005-06 AC Vice Chair.

II. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic InitiativesProvost's Presentation on the Master Plan and Graduate Student Enrollments to the Regents

At the last Regents' meeting, Provost M.R.C. Greenwood made a presentation on the Master Plan. The presentation will be distributed to the members via email. She followed that presentation with a presentation on the history of graduate enrollments over the 45 years since the initiation of the Master Plan. It showed that in terms of the proportion of total California graduate enrollments, UC is currently at 23% (of which about 6% is health sciences). For the purpose of comparison, UC was at 45% graduate enrollment in approximately 1960. For its part, the percentage of CSU's students that are at the graduate level has grown to 17%. In terms of doctoral training, UC was producing 54% of California's doctorates 45 years ago, while it is currently producing 50%.

Joint Ed.D. Update

At the CSU Trustees' Meeting, a proposal was presented to advance a legislative agenda of a category of 'professional doctorates' to be offered exclusively by CSU (see distribution item 4). The proposed legislative language does create a somewhat 'undefined' professional doctorate

(not limited to audiology or physical therapy). It also specifically excludes the Master Plan-reserved professional fields. David Spence, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer at CSU, made a report to the CSU Board of Trustees on the joint Ed.D.: (1) CSU believes that California schools will need thousands of new Ed.D.'s (based on a comparison with other states); (2) Although private programs do offer Ed.D.'s, those programs are at capacity, and affordable alternatives should be provided; (3) UC is less convinced about the state demand for additional educational doctorates; (4) The former UC Provost, Judd King, told CSU that UC's commitment to enrollment funding was limited due to budget constraints; (5) That UC would have to hire at least 50 new faculty to meet the demand for education doctorates that CSU anticipates; (6) That CSU already has the number and quality of faculty interested in meeting the anticipated demand; and (7) The process of establishing joint programs is difficult given the different institutional cultures.

Provost Greenwood also made a presentation on joint Ed.D.'s: (1) Both the CSU and UC systems contribute significantly to the California economy and to meeting the state's workforce needs—likewise these two systems should work together; (2) The difference in system perspectives (and the recent progress that has been made in joint doctorates) owes itself to UC's experience in developing new doctoral initiatives (it takes a long time to create high-quality programs); (3) Within two years, 18 CSU and 9 UC campuses will be involved in joint-education leadership programs, and the joint Ed.D. Board has discussed possible program expansion, but determined that the new programs need adequate time to establish themselves before their contributions to meeting state needs can be assessed; (4) There is concern that if CSU walks away, it will hurt these joint doctoral programs that are just emerging; and (5) She argued that changes to the Master Plan should not be addressed piece-meal. UCOP is concerned that the cooperation that has been made on the joint Ed.D. programs be maintained.

It was also noted that overall, Ed.D. enrollments are below what was expected. The only exception to that is the UC Irvine program. In a separate but related item, the Provost offered CSU a mock-up of an ad for the Ed.D. programs, however CSU wasn't interested. The joint Ed.D. Board, which met in January, agreed that a market study is needed, however CSU has not been inclined to move in that direction. Members agreed that such a study/survey is warranted.

Graduate Enrollment Planning

The Provost will be putting together a long-term graduate enrollment planning task force. The task force will have a 'staged' charge. In Stage one, the task force will deal with the immediate professional doctorates that are within the CSU target area. Expanding from there, graduate enrollment planning will be conducted across the board. Within that framework, there will be a 'strike group' that will develop solid contextual information about audiology (and possibly also physical therapy), and develop a list of options.

Audiology

There are two possible options associated with audiology: (1) Provide a path for the doctorate, either at UC or with joint degrees; or (2) Let some other institution do it (such as the CSU). When compared to the joint Ed.D. programs, the enrollment numbers in audiology are quite small.

Provosts' Office Reorganization

There will be two large units—Student Affairs (merger of the Student Academic Services and 'Outreach') and Academic Programs (merger of the Academic Initiatives' unit, Research, Continuing Education of the Bar, UC Press, Education Abroad Program, and Academic Advancement). There will also be two new smaller units: (1) An external relations' unit that will focus on intersegmental and legislative relations (including Strategic Communications); and (2) a planning and analysis unit. Academic Programs will be in charge of graduate issues.

III. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans

International Students

Dean Mason handed out a number of charts on new doctoral student enrollments (see distribution item 7). She outlined a couple of potential proposals (some of which are already being applied at comparable institutions—University of Michigan and University of Washington for example):

(1) Treat international graduate students as residents when they serve as graduate student instructors (GSI's), or alternatively, treat them as residents from the second year on; or (2) treat all graduate students as residents. The disadvantage of these proposals is that, with the exception of reaching residence status in the second year, graduate students would be teaching in the first year. The cost of these GSI's is roughly \$4 million, which comes from block grants that the departments receive (although there may be some loss in federal grants). In other words, such a proposal would give departments independence to take more international students, and could be considered revenue neutral. Members also brought up the issue of graduate student researchers (GSR's), and whether such proposals could be applied to them as well. However funding for GSR's (within such proposals) would not be revenue neutral, as the tuition income is derived from granting agencies. But granting agencies typically limit the amount of money that are available for GSR's, and further increases in international student tuition could jeopardize the ability to fund international students. Members also expressed the view that in the long-term, non-resident fees are extremely damaging to international students, and that this issue would have to be looked at as a long-term fix to this problem.

COGD Trip to China

Members of the COGD will be taking a trip to China in April, including Dean Mason. One of the major motivations for the trip is the concern over the decline in Chinese applicants to UC. The COGD will be visiting four Chinese universities—two in Beijing and two in Shanghai. The agenda for the trip includes credential issues (i.e. the authenticity of Chinese transcripts), a visit to the GRE and TOEFL offices, and meetings with individual university officers to discuss future plans and to enhance relations/collaborations between UC and Chinese universities. They will also make a visit to the US embassies in China.

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the January 11, 2005 Minutes

ACTION: The January 11, 2005 minutes were approved with minor amendments.

B. Simple Name Change for the UCD M.A./Ph.D. Program in “Dramatic Art” to “Performance Studies”

ISSUE: UCD Graduate Council Chair Trish Berger reported that the only program/department that overlapped with Dramatic Art was Music, and it did not object to the name change.

ACTION: CCGA approved the simple name change unanimously.

C. Systemwide Course Wording

ACTION: CCGA approved the systemwide course wording unanimously. It will be inserted into the CCGA Handbook.

V. CSU Report on Applied Doctorates

ISSUE/DISCUSSION: This discussion was incorporated within the announcements from the President’s Office, Academic Initiatives. See section II.

VI. Senate Regulation 694 (residency)

ISSUE: Chair Williams made the observation that there are a growing number of UC graduate programs—both already existing and in development—that offer a significant portion of their coursework either offsite in foreign locations (such as Singapore) or on-line. As examples he pointed to the Masters of Advanced Studies (MAS) in Clinical Research at UCSD (with a proposed option to do the program entirely in Singapore), the Executive MBA at UCLA/National University of Singapore (NUS), as well as the UCI’s on-line MAS in Criminology, Law & Society. Specifically regarding the proposed overseas option associated with the MAS in Clinical Research at UCSD, he noted that this option would be offered entirely in Singapore using distance-learning technologies. Given the fact that this program was already approved at UCSD by CCGA, the Compendium does not explicitly give CCGA the right to re-approve it with this new overseas option. In terms of residency, Senate Regulation 694 does not prohibit such professional graduate degree programs in which course work is completed entirely on-line or overseas. There are limitations on M.A. and M.S. programs however, which require half of the coursework to be completed in residence. This regulation does not provide any specificity for higher degrees such as the Ph.D.

Chair Williams posed a number of questions to the committee: Should there be a policy dealing with doctoral degrees, and especially applied doctoral degrees? Should CCGA cede the authority to approve such overseas or on-line components of already-approved graduate degrees entirely to the various Graduate Councils? Or is it sufficient that the respective Graduate Council only inform CCGA of the new overseas or on-line degree component? Does SR 694 need to be changed to better reflect the changing realities of these emerging graduate programs?

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the potential forms that these new graduate programs may take. Chair Williams pointed out that as UC CCGA-approved programs, they would utilize UC professors rather than adjunct foreign professors. It was noted that in terms of marketability, the MAS is a UC-construct and not really well-known outside of California. By contrast, the M.A. and M.S. are well-recognized degrees internationally. While SR 694 does not specifically require that these programs be offered in cooperation with UC Extension, it does leave open that

possibility (and some of them are offered in part through UC Extension). Generally though, overseas programs (or international components of existing domestic programs) are self-supporting. The possibility of these overseas programs being offered via the UC system as a whole, rather than by competing individual campuses, was also raised. Consensus was reached that parts of SR 694 should be redrafted to reflect an expanded purview of CCGA in these matters. At a minimum, members agreed that CCGA should be informed of any new international components that are added to existing graduate programs.

ACTION: Chair Williams will draft new wording for SR 694. The committee will review it over email.

VI. (A) Course Recordings

ISSUE/DISCUSSION: CCGA reviewed the draft policy on course recordings and made the following suggestions:

- Section B: Replace “chancellor” with “chancellor or his/her designee”.
- Section B.1: At the beginning of this section, the policy should specify current enrollment in a course. Therefore, the text in this section should be changed to (see underlined words) “students currently enrolled in or approved to audit that course...”, rather than just “students enrolled in or approved to audit a course ...”
- Section C: In its present form, the policy does not completely address the use of previously copyrighted materials within course presentations. The policy should state that previously copyrighted materials must be cleared for this level of distribution. The committee also noted that the last sentence in this section might be a little ambiguous.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a response for the Academic Council.

VII. International Graduate Student Task Force/Data

ISSUE: This item was incorporated under the Announcements for the Council of Graduate Deans (see distribution item 7). See section III.

VIII. Senate Regulation 600(B)

ISSUE: The proposed wording for SR 600(B) was reworded in response to AC Chair Blumenthal’s concern that Senate faculty members, who serve on committees that may have fiduciary control over the degree-granting department, should be excluded from receiving such higher degrees. The wording below was added to SR 600(B):

“In addition, degree candidates cannot be members of committees or be in positions of administrative authority that have influence or control over the resources, funding, degree granting, and academic personnel actions of the degree granting department or program unless they are able to recuse themselves from any decisions/actions involving the said department or program.”

ACTION: Members unanimously agreed to the new wording.

IX. The Graduate Funding Gap: Next Steps

ISSUE: Chair Williams discussed future options regarding the graduate funding gap: (1) Send a memo to President Dynes (via the AC); or (2) Ask the AC to draft a resolution (see distribution item 8).

DISCUSSION: Members expressed the viewpoint that the \$20 million funding gap (10,000 new graduate students per year multiplied by the \$2,000 gap per student) estimated by CCGA may actually be much higher. Members discussed a number of strategies, including the two options above, as well as assembling an ad-hoc group of faculty to go before the Regents. Considerable discussion was devoted to Regental protocol and how best to bring this issue to the attention of the Regents. However this is done, members agreed that addressing the problem of non-resident tuition would be key. A joint CCGA/UCPB task force on graduate education was proposed, in which CCGA would concentrate on the qualitative aspects of the problem, while UCPB would work on the quantitative aspects of the problem.

ACTION: Chair Williams will draft a letter to AC Chair George Blumenthal, requesting the establishment of a task force on graduate education. CCGA Vice Chair Duncan Lindsey would chair such a task force.

X. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for M.A. and Ph.D. Programs in Religious Studies at UC Riverside –
Lead Reviewer Michael Hanemann (UCB)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Hanemann recently conducted a successful site visit (see distribution item 9). He met with the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC), Provost, and the Associate Dean, as well as with a number of faculty members. The geographic focus of the program is Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand), which fits quite well within the larger context of expertise in Southeast Asian Studies that UCR is trying to develop (in fact they plan to develop a graduate group in this area). Islamic law is also important in this context (as it is influenced by religion to a much greater degree than law in predominantly Christian countries), and should improve the employment prospects for the program's graduates. It is anticipated that the variety of language instruction will also increase (Indonesian is already being offered), as this larger focus of Southeast Asian Studies is developed. The issue of financial aid for graduate students is also addressed with this larger focus, as there will be opportunities for graduate students to teach in related departments/programs. They are also trying to raise funds for an Endowed Chair in Judaic Studies, which would bolster this program. In regards to a commitment to resources, the EVC understood the need for a letter of a commitment and agreed to submit a ramp-up scenario with three stages. Professor Hanemann also felt that the existing faculty were strong—and in particular that both assistant faculty members would probably get tenure.

ACTION: Professor Hanemann will pursue a letter from the EVC, ramp-up plan, and more detail on the course descriptions.

B. Proposal for a Ph.D. Program in Health Economics at UCLA – Lead Reviewer
Reen Wu (UCD)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wu received the external reviewers' reports back. One of the reviewers raised the issue that it may be difficult to recruit students because the program is both 'health' and 'economics' with an emphasis on mathematics. Also, the program would probably concern itself more with domestic health policy rather than international health issues. The reviewer suggests that the program be more international, and that two tracks in Health Economics and Health Policy be created within the program. Another suggestion focused on increasing the number of available courses—especially in the area of epidemiology.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the possibility that this program might either be a small esoteric program, or that it might be unviable due to recruitment issues. The issue of a student market will be key, and the committee wants to wait and see how the program proposers respond to the external reviewers' criticisms.

ACTION: Professor Wu will forward the external reviewers' letters to the program proposals for response.

C. Proposal for a Masters of Financial Engineering at UCLA – Lead Reviewer
Stephen Ritchie (UCI)

ISSUE/REPORT: The Anderson School is in the process of responding to the reviewers/CCGA concerns.

ACTION: Professor Ritchie will be scheduling a site visit within the next couple of weeks.

D. Proposal for a Ph.D. Program in Culture & Theory at UCI – Lead Reviewer
Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Sharrer sent Professor Grewal an email outlining both the CCGA concerns as well as those from the internal/external reviewers. He received a response from Professor Grewal (see distribution item 10), where she responds to the following issues:

- **Comparative Cultures Ph.D.:** The process of discontinuation of that program was placed on the agenda for UCI Graduate council for their meeting on Thursday, February 3rd. It is important to note that the proposed program in Culture and Theory (CT) and Comparative Cultures are very different in conceptualization—CT is a Critical Theories of Race, Gender and Sexuality focus and Comparative Cultures is a Comparative US Ethnic and American Studies program that is social science based.
- **International Focus:** Professor Grewal believes that several of the internal/external reviewers were mistaken in trying to depict the proposed program as strictly an Ethnic Studies/Women Studies program with US focus. She reiterates the international focus of the program, as well as its theoretical aspects.
- **Core Course Revisions:** Professor Grewal is pleased with Professor Jaynes' suggestions regarding core course revisions, as well as his recommendation that the

program admit fewer students, at least initially. The C&T Steering Committee also agreed to these suggestions.

- Critical Theory Institute: Professor Grewal notes that the Critical Theory Institute is not a doctoral program but a research ORU. The Critical Theory Emphasis, whose faculty members are also part of the Graduate Group for C&T, is a doctoral emphasis, and will be an important part of the Culture and Theory PhD.
- Chicano/Latino Studies: Professor Grewal does not really respond to the issue of the lack of participation by faculty of this department, except to say that some affiliated faculty from Chicano/Latino Studies will participate in the program (however no core faculty members).
- Graduate Student Support: Noting somewhat dated statistics, she attempts to show that this is not a matter of great concern, and that for the most part, graduate students in the Humanities at UCI are well-supported. While she expresses optimism that graduate students will be well-supported, there is no clear statement from the administration on this point.
- Social Science Participation: She states that CT Program will include faculty members with interdisciplinary degrees (History of Consciousness, Science and Technology Studies, Ethnic Studies) and faculty with multiple affiliations.

Professor Sharrer also mentioned that he has received an additional internal review of the proposal. The review is positive overall, but makes similar suggestions regarding the core courses as other reviewers have made (see above). However, the reviewer is concerned about teaching assistantships and fellowships. Although the figures for teaching assistantships do seem sound, the reviewer notes that fellowships are needed.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the issue of program abeyance and official discontinuation through CCGA. The main concern is the possibility that a program in abeyance be restarted under the same name, but as a truly different program. Members are also still concerned about graduate student financial support, especially in regards to a possible split of the Department of English and Comparative Literature into two separate departments. This would essentially create two departments in which one would have a lot of undergraduate teaching, while the other would be weighted much more heavily with graduate students. It is not entirely clear how TA support and distribution would work with these varying departments and emphases, especially in regards to the proposed CT Program. Members noted that it would be helpful if written commitments from the affiliated teaching departments (or EVC) regarding teaching assistant support for CT students were obtained. The issue of participation by the Chicano/Latino Studies faculty is still an outstanding issue. Members agreed that before a site visit could be scheduled, these outstanding issues need to be resolved.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will look for a list of programs in abeyance, compiled by CCGA a couple of years ago. Two further inquiries will be made: (1) Professor Sharrer will write another letter to Professor Grewal requesting specific information as to where new teaching assistantships will come from, as well as a five-year plan outlining student support; (2) Stephen Ritchie will make inquiries of

the Dean or EVC to determine the actual levels of student support and obtain assurances that new teaching assistantship slots would be filled by CT students.

E. Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group & Ph.D. Program in Animal Biology at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Grayson Marshall (UCSF)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Marshall received a good response back from UCD in response to his initial inquiries. He has also received the first external review, which he will forward onto program proposers. While the reviewer feels that the faculty members involved with the program are excellent, he believes that there are too many mentoring committees. He also notes that the coursework seems excessive.

ACTION: Professor Marshall will forward the external review onto the program proposers at UCD.

F. Proposal for a M.S. Program in Neuroscience at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Larry Zahn (UCR)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Zahn has resigned from CCGA. No report was given.

ACTION: Chair Williams will conduct this review.

G. Proposal for a Joint UCSC/CSU Monterey Bay/San Jose State Ed.D. – Lead Reviewer Don Wayne (UCSD)

ISSUE/REPORT: Primarily, Professor Wayne is concerned with a structural issue—mainly by the fact that the UC component (one of the three units) is only a 1/3 component. Another issue is the expertise of the associated faculty members in that the key faculty seem to be at San Jose State, rather than at UCSC. At this point, he is not sure of the expertise in Educational Leadership at CSU Monterey Bay. Professor Wayne is also unclear regarding the exact meaning of the ‘cohort model’ in terms of the rate of student progress. Coordination is another concern—especially in regards to the staff support. Finally, he notes that the qualifying exam may be an issue in the sense that it is just a dissertation prospectus (oral exam).

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the efficacy of attempting to standardize qualifying exams across the different UC campuses, given that the Ed.D. is a professional degree. In response to Professor Wayne’s questions regarding the cohort model, a member (who has had previous experience evaluating Ed.D. proposals) noted that this model is used as a way of dealing with the high faculty workload. Essentially, students are team taught throughout the length of the program so that no one faculty member is overwhelmed by the high workload (since by practice, half of the advising load is taken by UC).

ACTION: Professor Wayne is currently contacting external reviewers.

XI. Executive Session - Members only

An executive session was not held.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Attest: Quentin Williams, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst