COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Revised Notice of Meeting
Wednesday, March 6, 2013
10:00 a.m. – 4 p.m.
UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320
Primary Dial-In: 1-866-740-1260 | Passcode: 9879466
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/

Action	Item		Enclosures
Information/ Discussion 10:00-10:25	**I.**	**Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates** – *Chair Ruth Mulnard* • February 22 UCOP Budget Call Meeting *(Donald Mastronarde)* • February 27 Academic Council Meeting • February 28 Academic Planning Council Meeting • March 1 PDST Task Force Meeting *(Robert Powell)*	
Action 10:25-10:30	**II.**	**Consent Calendar** • Approval of the Agenda • Approval of the Meeting Minutes of February 6, 2013 ***ACTION REQUESTED:*** *Approve the agenda and minutes as noticed.*	**1** (pp. 6-13)
	III.	**Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review** *All program proposals and current reviews are posted on the CCGA SharePoint site; contact the committee analyst if you would like proposal materials or documents e-mailed to you.*	
Discussion/ Action 10:30-10:40		**A. Proposal to establish a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Public Health at UC Irvine** – *Lead Reviewer Donald Mastronarde*	
Discussion 10:40-10:50		**B. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in pursuit of the degree of Master of Technology at UC Santa Barbara** – *Lead Reviewer Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)*	
Discussion 10:50-11:00		**C. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Games and Playable Media at UC Santa Cruz** – *Lead Reviewer Martin Olsson (UCB)*	

i

Action 11:00-11:10	**D.**	**Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Political Science at the University of California, Merced** *ACTION REQUESTED: Select a lead reviewer.*
Action 11:00-11:10	**E.**	**A Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in the Interdisciplinary Humanities for the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees at the University of California, Merced** *ACTION REQUESTED: Select a lead reviewer.*
Action 11:00-11:10	**F.**	**Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Master of Information and Data Science (MIDS) at the University of California, Berkeley** *ACTION REQUESTED: Select a lead reviewer.*
Information 11:10-11:40	**IV.**	**Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs** *Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director, Office of Research and Graduate Studies* *Hilary Baxter, Interim Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*
Information 11:40-12:15	**V.**	**Updates/Inquiries from the Divisional Senates** *– Chair Mulnard and Members*

A. UC Irvine: Graduate Learning Program Outcomes – *Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)*

B. UC Berkeley: On-line Course Approvals at Berkeley – *Martin Olsson (UCB)*

C. UC Riverside: Campus and UC policies that prevents the awarding a second Ph.D. to students who already have a Ph.D. – *Mike Vanderwood (UCR)*

12:15-1:15		**– Working Lunch –**
Information/ Discussion 12:30-1:00	**VI.**	**Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership –** *Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair* *William Jacob, Academic Council Vice Chair*

ii

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.

Discussion/ **Action** **1:00-1:45**	**VII.**	**Planned March 11 Meeting with Legislative Staff in Sacramento** **–** *Donald Mastronarde and Members*

CCGA members are asked to provide input concerning important points of discussion with the legislative group in Sacramento.

<div style="text-align:right">2
(to follow)</div>

Discussion/
Action
1:45-2:30

VIII. **SSP Policy Revision** – *Chair Mulnard and Members*

 ACTION REQUESTED*: Review draft comments/letter.*

Discussion/
Action
2:30-2:45

IX. **Proposed State Legislation: AB 609 & AB 1348**

A. AB 609 (Nestande): Public Access to State-Funded Research

AB 609 would create a public access policy for state-funded research. This bill would (1) Include a requirement that electronic versions of the author's final manuscripts of original research papers that have been accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and result from research supported from state agency funding, be submitted to the funding state agency; (2) provide free online public access to such final peer-reviewed manuscripts or published versions as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after publication in peer-reviewed journals; (3) to the extent in compliance with copyright or patent protection, produce an online bibliography of all research papers that are publicly accessible under the policy, with each entry linked to the corresponding free online full text; (4) provide for the long-term preservation of, and free access to, published research findings in a stable digital repository maintained by the state agency or in any repository determined by the state agency to meet these conditions; and (5) be developed in conjunction with any other state agencies that provide funding for direct research or that underwrite the cost of facilities, equipment, hardware, information resources, personnel, or otherwise fiscally support direct research. In addition, this bill would make exceptions to the public access policy for certain types of research and data. The bill would also require that each state agency annually submit a specified report on their public access policy to the Governor, Senate Committee on Rules, and Speaker of the Assembly. The full text of the proposed bill is available at:
http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/asm/ab_0601-0650/ab_609_bill_20130220_introduced.pdf.

B. AB 1348 (Perez): CPEC 2.0 **3**

Although existing State law establishes the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to be responsible for coordinating public, independent, and private postsecondary education in this state and to provide independent policy analyses and recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor on postsecondary education issues, the Budget Act of 2011 deleted funding and personnel from CPEC. AB 1348 would establish a new CPEC, which would have a complex set of responsibilities similar (and in some cases identical) to the old CPEC – maintaining an integrated higher education database and acting as the primary data repository in the state for higher education; developing state goals for higher education, measuring progress of the segments toward their own institutional goals, and measuring effectiveness and efficiency in meeting state goals; oversight over capital outlay decisions, etc. The enclosure compares the responsibilities of the envisioned CPEC alongside those of the old CPEC. Last year, UC opposed an identical bill on the grounds that did not allow segmental representation on the new Authority. The full text of the bill can be found at: http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/asm/ab_1301-1350/ab_1348_bill_20130222_introduced.pdf.

ACTION REQUESTED: Submit informal comments on both bills to Todd Giedt, Senate Associate Director & Legislative Analyst.

Discussion
2:45-3:30 **X.** **New Business**

Discussion
As time permits **XI.** **Executive Session** (members only please)

Agenda Enclosures:

1. Draft CCGA Meeting Minutes of February 6, 2012

2. Background: SSP Policy Revision

Important Meeting Information

Location: The March meeting will convene in room 5320 at the UC Office of the President in downtown Oakland. UCOP is located at 1111 Franklin Street, between 11th and 12th Streets. Upon arrival, please check in at the security desk where you will be issued a visitor badge. Directions and a map are available online.

If you are arriving by way of the Oakland International Airport, you may taxi or BART to the UCOP building. For BART, purchase an AirBART ticket from the shuttle operator. The shuttle will take you to the Coliseum BART station. From there board a Richmond- or Pittsburg/Bay Point-bound BART train and exit at the 12th Street/Oakland City Center BART station.

Parking: Visitor parking is available at UCOP on the 12th Street side of the building. The rate is $11 per day if you enter the parking structure before 9 a.m. Daily parking is also available at a number of lots proximate to the building.

Travel Regs: Detailed travel information is available online. Please submit completed and signed travel voucher with original receipts within 21 days after the meeting to:

Business Resource Center – Team Blue
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 9th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Account/Fund Number: M-430384-19900-33

<u>CCGA 2012-13 Remaining Meeting Schedule:</u>

April 3, 2013 – 5320 Franklin
May 1, 2013 – 5320 Franklin
June 5, 2013 – 5320 Franklin

CCGA <mark>DRAFT</mark> meeting minutes– February 6, 2013

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
<mark>DRAFT</mark> MEETING MINUTES – FEBRUARY 6, 2013**

Present: Ruth Mulnard (Chair), Donald Mastronarde (Vice Chair), Mark Stacey (UCB-alternate), Ari Kelman (UCD-T), Carol Burke (UCI-alternate), Joseph Nagy (UCLA), Michael Vanderwood (UCR), Kwai Ng (UCSD), Youngho Seo (UCSF), Divy Agrawal (UCSB), Bruce Schumm (UCSC), Charles Saenz (student representative-UCSD), Bob Powell (Council Chair), Bill Jacob (Council Vice Chair) Todd Giedt (analyst), Tyrus Miller, Steven Beckwith, Hilary Baxter, Pamela Jennings, and Jesse Bernal

I.   Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates
UPDATES:
Academic Council
Chair Ruth Mulnard briefed members on the January Academic Council meeting, and provided the following updates:

- President Yudof recently announced his decision to resign as of August 31, 2013.
- Composite benefits rate(s): She reported that a benefit rate of 0% will be applied to summer salaries and to emeriti faculty.
- UC Path: UCOP is delaying the implementation date of UC Path.
- Council of Executive Vice Chancellors' Meeting with Council: A portion of the last Council meeting was devoted to discussions with the Council of Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs) over budget priorities, on-line education, salary increases, etc. In particular, the EVCs noted that they only have a fixed amount of money, which they can use for either line faculty or lecturers, but not both. With respect to on-line education, $10M is included in the Governor's Budget; RFPs will be issued for this purpose soon. A report on on-line education will be delivered by Provost Dorr to the Regents at every other Regents meeting. She clarified that "on-line courses" does not mean hybrid courses. The EVCs also observed that the Governor's insistence on no tuition increases probably means any faculty salary increases are unlikely given the current political environment. That said, the EVCs commented that faculty incentives may continue – e.g., a targeted decoupling initiative at UCB that significantly rewards meritorious faculty accomplishments.
- Total Remuneration Study: Council raised the possibility of doing another total remuneration study, as the previous studies were based on old data. However, UCOP has declined Council's request. Subsequently, Council is asking for a limited remuneration study that would only look at ladder-rank faculty (and would also not faculty within the Health Sciences).
- Council iLinc Meeting: On January 30, Council held an iLinc meeting, and discussed the open access proposed policy and its "rebenching" letter. With respect to the former, Council tasked UCOLASC with rewriting this policy with the aim of resubmitting it later this year.

Academic Planning Council
Vice Chair Donald Mastronarde briefed members on the most recent Academic Planning Council (APC) meeting. The Compendium revisions were discussed, with all CPEC references removed (including the questionnaire that was traditionally included with the graduate program proposals). The CCGA Handbook will also need to be revised to reflect this change. APC members also discussed the utility of the 5-Year Perspectives with the general consensus being that they are still indeed useful. It was also initially suggested that SSPs could be considered as "an alternate funding mechanism," which implies that the current four CCGA criteria would be removed. However, a slight majority voted

against this idea; Senate members opined that one must not only have a statement or preamble explaining what SSPs are, but also an explanation on how they relate to other programs in the system in terms of their quality and other metrics. Vice Chair Mastronarde also presented CCGA's position/letter on SSPs, which stressed the Committee's main concerns of overload teaching, delivery partners, financial aid, and accessibility. VP Debra Obley voiced her support for the Senate position, noting that very similar programs across the system could be both self-supporting and state-supported, which would be noticed at the State budget level, and eventually become problematic. There is also some consensus within the PDST Task Force that the SSP policy needs to be entirely rewritten. Council Chair Powell added that APC felt that the SSP policy needs to be reconceptualized because it has become too complex in part due to so many revisions. He also noted that the question of SSP-conversion keeps coming back. Given the reluctance to convert programs to SSPs, it may become increasingly difficult for programs to obtain SSP status going forward.

ACSCANR
Vice Chair Mastronarde also briefed members on the January meeting of the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR), which is charged with consulting with leadership from the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR), on a regular basis, to review the mission and strategic objectives of the Division, and to consider issues related to the ANR budget, the Division's academic and capital planning, and the intersection of its academic and outreach missions. ANR is responsible for Cooperative Extension and the Agricultural Experiment stations, and is funded out of UCOP. Funding for ANR includes $58M for the agricultural experiment stations (UCD, UCR, & UCB) with 545 FTEs; system assessment for $60.7M (including Cooperative Extension) and 504 FTEs, and $28B in restricted funds for 76 FTEs. There have been significant cuts to ANR over the past couple of years, including staff at UCOP and in the field. Marketing is an ongoing issue, as various marketing boards have contributed $114M for individual awards and education. There is an acknowledgement that this needs to be increased. The agricultural lobby is one of the most reliable in Sacramento, and is likely that they will continue to contribute in terms of grants to UC faculty. Finally, he noted that ACSCANR was founded in order provide oversight over endowments that ANR administers, which affects some academic programs on some campuses. These grant programs have become more competitive; ACSCANR is on record for advocating for additional graduate student support within these programs.

Council of Graduate Deans
Ari Kelman (UCD) briefed members on the Council of Graduate Deans meeting. Sacramento Day has been rescheduled to June 4. With respect to UC Path, there is general acknowledgement that the different campuses are in quite different positions with respect to UC Path, and its implementation is therefore being delayed. There was also some debate about whether students who are on filing fee will be required to have UC health insurance. The goal is to get rid of adverse selection. Currently, some campuses require their students on filing fee to have proof of health insurance (either UC or private insurance), but this is not universal, and still is controversial among the Graduate Deans.

DISCUSSION: Regarding on-line education, one member asked about opportunities to develop systemwide graduate courses. Chair Mulnard responded that the focus seems to be on undergraduate courses. That said, it will be important to clarify that the upcoming RFPs do not exclude graduate courses. Members also raised the issue of infrastructure building (or lack thereof) for on-line education. With respect to salaries, observed that targeted decoupling is really decoupling from the salary scales; a serious examination of these scales needs to be undertaken to determine whether they are feasible going forward. Members briefly discussed differences between SSPs and PDST programs, noting that

CCGA has never reviewed them differently than other programs. Removing the criteria for SSPs would be a first step towards reducing the rigorous reviews of these programs. Indeed, there is a danger that SSPs could eventually begin to admit lower-quality students. Both SSPs and PDSTs are designed to shift the financial burden from the state tax base to the consumer. Members agreed that the line needs to be held on the rigor of all programs, which the criteria support. Chair Mulnard invited members to revisit CCGA's letter and provide comments on any components enumerated in it. One member raised a local issue, specifically guidelines associated the SSP policy on the Berkeley campus – 1) that there should be an equal mix of ladder-rank and non-ladder-rank faculty in SSPs and state-supported programs; and 2) ladder-rank faculty cannot teach in SSPs as overload. Members observed that these guidelines are not systemwide. Consultant Tyrus Miller mentioned that one of the legitimate uses of PDSTs is the ability to bring in professionals in the field. Therefore, a guideline that advises for a similar mix of faculty in both state-supported and SSPs does not make sense.

II.   Consent Calendar
   A.   Approval of the Agenda
   B.   Approval of the Meeting Minutes from December 5, 2012, and January 2, 2013
   ACTION: Members approved the agenda; the draft minutes were not available.

III.   Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review
   A.   Proposal to establish a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Public Health at UC Irvine
   ISSUE: This program first came to CCGA in 2010-11. After extensive review, CCGA rejected the proposal on the grounds that it was not written as a Ph.D. research program, but as a professional doctorate. CCGA has now received a significantly revised proposal, which includes 30 support letters.

   ACTION: Vice Chair Mastronarde volunteered to review this proposal.

   B.   Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in pursuit of the degree of Master of Technology at UC Santa Barbara
   ISSUE: One external review is posted on SharePoint. CCGA will discuss this program at its March meeting.

   C.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at UC Davis
   ISSUE: The lead reviewer reported that he has received all four reviews, which are about 75% positive. The department already has a bachelor's program in this area; the proposers see potential in industry for a M.S. degree program. They envision two years' lab time before a master's thesis. The main criticism on the part of the reviewers is the absence of a budget in the proposal. That aside, the quality of the program seems very high. The proposers only want to admit 4-6 students in the initial years, so it is a progressive plan, which is a strength. Other weaknesses include funding, courses descriptions (descriptions have now been posted in SharePoint however), research projects (potential problems in hosting additional students in the lab), and the monitoring of potential outcomes (e.g., graduate placement). The lead reviewer did not feel that these weaknesses were significant however, and advocated for approval of the program.

   DISCUSSION: Members observed that in the current economic climate, there may be a reluctance in industry to hire high-salary PhDs in Chemistry. One member raised the issue of access to financial aid.

The lead reviewer assured the Committee that all students would be vetted through financial aid; this is not a PDST or SSP program, but a traditional academic masters program.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved (with one abstention) the proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at UC Davis beginning in Fall 2014.

D.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Games and Playable Media at UC Santa Cruz
ISSUE: There is one new review posted on SharePoint. The lead reviewer will be consulting additional reviewers. CCGA will discuss this program at its March meeting.

E.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Art History at UC Riverside
ISSUE: This department already has a BA and MA in Art History, and is looking to admit 2-3 Ph.D. students per year. It will be funded from the MA program. The lead reviewer received one internal review and one external review, which were generally positive. Any lack of enthusiasm for the program had to do with the question of whether there is a need for another Art History Ph.D. program in the system (or even the nation). Reviewers were also concerned about which unique contributions that UCR could offer to its Ph.D. students in Art History that could not be found elsewhere. A more specific criticism concerned the lack of faculty members in the UCR Art History department who specialize in non-Western art history. The proposers responded that UCR is indeed engaged in a search for new hire in Asian Art History, and the next FTE after that will be for a faculty member in Latin American Art History. Despite this weakness, the lead reviewer emphasized the relative modest size of the new program, and recommended its approval.

DISCUSSION: Members remained concerned that despite the planning for the new hires, the remaining nine faculty do specialize in Western Art History. However, the reviewers tend to think there is a relative lack of polarization between scholars in Western- and non-Western Art History, which could ameliorate this issue. Members also raised the issue of a lack of documentation in the proposal regarding employment opportunities for graduates of this program. Although there is one letter of support from the Getty Museum, it does not suggest any interest in hiring their graduates; the proposers could have made a better case in documenting a viable job market for their graduates (e.g., museum curators). More generally, members commented that program proposers should obtain letters of support that show that the letter writers value the level and nature of training in a PhD program, not that they would necessarily hire graduates from this program. The lead reviewer responded that UCR does have a solid record in placing its graduates of its MA program; there is also a consensus that these graduates may not be seeking traditional tenure-track positions. One member raised the issue of the marginal benefit to the UC system of approving a program that would produce very few PhDs. This department's particular niche does seem to be photography; a post-graduate program in this or visual culture might make more sense. The lead reviewer added that this proposal has received approval from all authorities at Riverside, a fact that should not be overlooked. He remarked that there is no other UC program that has such expertise in photography; they may indeed go in this direction.

ACTION: Members approved the program with 6 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions

F.   Program for an M.S. in Healthcare Administration and Inter-professional Leadership at UC San Francisco

ISSUE: The lead reviewer reported that he has received three external reviews, which are uniformly positive. That said, concrete suggestions and criticism include issues related to curriculum, differences in student preparation, capstone, and advising. However, the proposers have adequately responded to these concerns. With respect to the existing Masters program, it will not be disestablished, but the department will close admissions to that program. The lead reviewer recommended approval of the program. That said, he noted that there is still a need to install ladder-rank Senate faculty in the leadership of this program.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the program with one abstention, but made approval contingent upon a modified proposal which names a co-director with a Senate title of Associate rank or higher.

G.   Proposal for a Self-supporting Master of Finance Program at UC Riverside
ISSUE: While there is a large international market for graduates in this area, members observed that China is developing programs within its own universities in this field. Therefore, it is likely that there will be diminishing Chinese demand in this area within a couple of years. Therefore, there is a need to develop an alumni base with linkages to local businesses. Initially, the proposers want their base of applicants be half and half domestic and international students. Some external reviews observed that Riverside is not really a banking center, but even local companies do need such financial expertise. The proposers have adequately responded to all stated concerns, and the lead reviewer recommended approval of the program.

DISCUSSION: The budget in the proposal notes that the first three years of campus fees will be forgiven. The Riverside member clarified that it would be the Graduate Dean who would forgive the campus charges. The lead reviewer will ask the proposers to get confirmation from the appropriate administrator(s) that the first three years of campus charges will indeed be forgiven.

ACTION: CCGA unanimously approved, with one abstention, the program with one abstention contingent upon confirmation from campus administration that the first three years of campus charges will be forgiven.

IV.   **Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs**
REPORT: Vice President Beckwith reported that ORGS is undergoing an evaluation of all of its research programs that are currently funded by UCOP (the Portfolio Review Group). There are a number of programs that have been funded historically year-after-year; UCOP must now make strategic decisions concerning why they should, or should not, continue be funded. .

V.   **Updates/Inquiries from the Divisional Senates -- UC Davis: Template documents for graduate program reviews for the WASC review team**
UPDATE: The Davis member noted that WASC has more-or-less backed off this requirement, so it has essentially become a non-issue at this point.

VI.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership**
REPORT:
<u>Presidential Search</u>
The search committee consists of six regular Regents, one alumni Regent, one student Regent, and the Governor as an ex-officio Regent. A 13-member faculty advisory committee, which will advise the

search committee on the academic merits of the candidates, will also be established. It will consist of a representative from each Division, one at-large member, and the Council Chair and Vice Chair.

UCR Chancellor Search
This search is on pace; there should be a new chancellor in place at Riverside by September 1.

On-Line Education
The Administration will hold a couple of workshops on this topic in April. The $10M in the Governor's Budget for on-line education is a "carve-out" as opposed to entirely new money. The focus has thus far been on undergraduate gateway courses; one intersection for CCGA is the TAs associated with such courses. The Senate's voice (including CCGA) will need to be heard at these workshops despite the focus on undergraduate education. At this point, there seems to be very little traction for graduate courses, or even upper-division undergraduate courses. Two RFPs are also coming out in the near future. On a related issue, Vice Chair Jacob noted that there also seems to be a bubble in upper-division undergraduate enrollments coming over the next 24 months (10% total over three years), which will result in increased teaching loads (measured in student credit hours).

Sacramento CCGA Meeting
Chair Powell reported that the recent BOARS meeting in Sacramento was very successful. However, setting up these meetings takes a lot of work for staff at both the Senate and the State Governmental Relations unit in Sacramento. With that in mind, the Senate is looking at convening a UCORP/research meeting with key CCGA members invited. This meeting is scheduled for March 11.

Council iLinc Meeting
Chair Powell reported that there is legislation (SB 1053/1054) to create open textbooks. Council is currently selecting UC representatives to populate the group that will select these open textbooks.

VII.   Revisions to the Draft 2012 WASC Handbook
REPORT: Consultant Hilary Baxter reported that the Commission is set to vote on the draft handbook in February. The language in the previous version largely concerned setting the levels of proficiencies; the new revisions move away from implied quantitative language around competencies to allow institutions greater discretion across competency levels in different disciplines. UC sees these revisions as an improvement. In other news, UCD has been told that the group of institutions that go through the second pilot will not have to submit graduation and retention data at all. This data will be required in the third pilot, along with doctoral completion and retention data. Regarding WASC's review of professional schools, representatives from professional schools have stressed that they must provide similar data for separate accreditation processes by their respective professional organizations; requiring the resubmission of such duplicative data represents a significant burden on these professional schools. Ralph Wolff, the WASC Executive Director, has also announced his retirement. The Department of Education recently reviewed WASC, which is currently responding to this review. Finally, a number of members are rotating off the WASC Board; UC will submit nominations for the three open slots in the near future.

VIII.   CCGA Discussion of PDST Task Force Item
ISSUE: Chair Mulnard informed members that the PDST Task Force has tasked CCGA to answer the following question – *How to define "professional program" for the purposes of administering Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST)?* Consultant Jesse Bernal also briefed the Committee on the last PDST Task Force meeting. Pursuant to the request stated above, Provost Dorr

asked the task force to look at the many areas or criteria that determine PDSTs and draft a set of streamlined principles and/or guidelines. Such criteria include affordability, financial aid, diversity, consultation with faculty and students, indebtedness levels, etc. Accountability for diversity is one area of clear consensus within the membership of the PDST Task Force. At the meeting, Provost Dorr articulated her goal of streamlining the current policy, which is overly complex and lengthy, into a set of core principles. It is envisioned that PDST guidelines will be developed from these principles.

DISCUSSION: Members opined that professional doctorates can be either PDSTs or SSPs; Ph.D. programs cannot be SSPs however. While defining professional programs as those degrees that are considered necessary to obtain a professional position may be a good starting point, this definition is problematic in that some Ph.D. degrees also meet this condition. For example, a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology is considered both a professional degree and an academic degree, depending on the tract followed by particular students. This is an interesting case because if one wants to go into an applied field, one needs this degree. It is true that even people in research with Ph.D.s end up in applied fields, but this is not necessarily the purpose of the degree. That said, some professional programs do indeed have a research focus.

Another member observed that this debate really revolves around the magnitude of the fees that can be borne by the market. It is certainly true that professional degree programs offer less support to their students than academic programs. Chair Mulnard commented that while a professional program may enter the market with fees set at market rates, there must be a justification of extra expenses in order for a program to be allowed to charge PDSTs. On this point, a number of professional degree programs do have additional demands for experience in the field (e.g., nursing), which justify the use of a PDST. Another driver of PDSTs is the need to both hire and retain high-quality faculty members. Members also agreed that there are two distinct elements to this question – what defines a professional program and what defines the PDST itself. Members agreed that the pedagogical aspects of the program may be more important in making the distinction between an academic degree and a professional degree. Should every degree program within a professional school be considered a professional degree? Currently, the decision regarding the status of a "professional program" is made on a case-by-case basis. The process to obtain a PDST goes through the local campus administration, the Chancellor, UCOP, and then to the Regents. Members observed that more recently, receiving PDST status has become increasingly difficult for programs, mainly due to the challenging political environment. One streamlining policy option being considered is whether decisions regarding PDST program status could be delegated to the Administration, with the Regents approving the three-year plans. Chair Powell added that the Regents are becoming increasingly interested in PDSTs; Governor Brown asked that these proposals be pulled as consent items from last November's Regents agenda.

Chair Mulnard remarked that when CCGA reviews new program proposals, it does not evaluate them on the basis of their status as professional degree programs or academic degree programs, but on their academic rigor. However, there may be certain characteristics of professional programs that proposers can use in making a case for the application of a PDST. Defining a professional program by its extra professional expenses (above and beyond the academic work) may be one direction that CCGA can take in its response to Provost Dorr. However, accounting for these costs may prove to be more complicated (and even problematic) for some programs than others. One member articulated that it is not whether a program is "professional" or not, it is more about whether the market can bear the extra professional costs associated with the program. Indeed, a better suggestion might be to change the policy from "*professional degree supplemental tuition*" to simply *"supplemental tuition"*. However, Academic Council has historically taken a strong stand against charging supplemental tuition writ

large. Members also observed that not all professional degrees charge PDSTs (and some PDSTs may not be entirely professional degree programs). Members opined that in today's climate, the need for revenue cannot be the only driver in approving PDSTs. Consultant Bernal added that while the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) does not define "professional", it does provide a list of programs/degree titles that are considered "professional". A related task is determining which existing programs should be allowed to charge PDSTs. Consultant Hilary Baxter also clarified that there is an OGC opinion that Regental approval is needed to even maintain existing PDSTs at their current levels for 2014-15. Programs like nursing, in which the State has both cut its funding for and has been pressuring UC to expand, are being placed in the difficult position of not being allowed to increase their supplemental tuition despite the additional costs associated with state-mandated growth.

ACTION: Chair Mulnard will draft a response to Provost Dorr regarding the definition of PDSTs.

IX.   CCGA Discussion on Academic Efficiency
A portion of this discussion was held in executive session.
ISSUE: Chair Powell noted that UC will have to teach about an additional million student credit hours (SCHs) over the next three years on an annual basis. These increases will come from increases in non-resident students and modest increases in resident students. As one example, UCD has a 2020 Plan, which will increase its undergraduate enrollments by 5,000. He added that across the system UC faculty are aging, contributions to UCRP will only increase, and the campuses continue to have a limited capacity to recruit new faculty. Therefore, it is hard to envision a situation in which the University will be able hire substantially more faculty than its current separation rate (about 3.5%, which is a jump from the historical rate of 2–2.5%). This means that there will be roughly about 1M more SCHs with roughly the same number of faculty over the next three years. In the last five years, UC faculty have taught between 10-12% more SCHs per faculty member than has been the case historically. The student faculty ratio is approximately 24:1 across the system (it is supposed to be at 18.7:1). The Administration is putting together a Regents' meeting item on academic efficiency for an upcoming meeting.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that Governor Brown will continue to be pushing the University hard on academic efficiency. One member commented that the current separation rate (and lower recruitment and retention rates) may have been negatively impacted by a decrease in UC's overall competitiveness. In measuring faculty course loads, there is agreement that instead of counting courses, UC will be reporting SCHs.

X.   New Business
Members did not have any new business.

XI.   Executive Session
Minutes were not taken for CCGA's executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Attest: Ruth Mulnard, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Associate Senate Director

AB 1348 California Higher Education Authority responsibilities compared to CPEC

Topic	AB 1348, as introduced	CPEC statutory responsibilities	Notes
Higher Education Goal Setting	Developing, presenting, and monitoring postsecondary education goals for the state, including, but not necessarily limited to, monitoring and reporting on the progress of the postsecondary segments toward their long-term goals.	None.	Other state bills (this year it is SB 195) continue to seek to create an accountability framework that would include the setting of state goals for higher education. In SB 195 the Governor's Office of Planning and Research has the most prominent role among state agencies in the framework.
Measuring Efficiency and Effectiveness in Meeting State Needs	Measuring, and reporting about, how efficiently and effectively the postsecondary education segments are serving the state's needs.	66900 (c)(3): Ensure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste & unnecessary duplication, & shall promote diversity, innovation, & responsiveness to student & societal needs. Also, 66903 (k): Develop criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of all aspects of postsecondary education.	Different language used but these are similar charges – measuring efficiency and effectiveness in serving state needs.
Recommendations on Improving Performance	Making recommendations about how to improve the performance of the postsecondary education segments.	Section 99182 of the Ed Code tasked CPEC with an extensive annual "performance report", but the language may be outdated because they did not produce such annual reports recently.	Nothing in this AB 1348 provision looks problematic; it's very general and seems appropriate to have a coordinating body make these types of recommendations.
Coordination with Private Postsecondary Institutions	Pursuing an integrated approach to the state's overall postsecondary education policy by including private postsecondary education within its	None.	Including private postsecondary education in this authority's jurisdiction would be a significant change from past

IMPAC
March 1, 2013

AB 1348 California Higher Education Authority responsibilities compared to CPEC

	jurisdiction.		coordination.
Capital Outlay Role	Exercising an oversight and advisory role in postsecondary education capital outlay decisions.	Advisory role on capital outlay of existing & new campus locations. Advisory role re decisions on capital outlay for existing & new campuses, colleges, & off-campus centers(§ 66904). Also, CPEC had managed the process whereby the state establishes standards for the square footage for various higher education functions in state-supported capital facilities (e.g., standards for instruction, office, research space), and had responsibilities re: joint use facilities.	AB 1348 goes further than an advisory role by adding "oversight." Does BCR see any concerns with adding oversight to the responsibilities of this new authority? Would it be less problematic if the bill limited it to state funded capital outlay?
Policy Advisory Role	Developing information in order to assist state and local policymakers and consumers in making cost-effective investments in postsecondary education and training to meet the long-term goal of a strong state economy and vibrant communities.	Not sure, can't find anything in code.	Any thoughts on this language?
Fiscal Advisory Role	Developing and recommending strategic finance policy to the Governor and the Legislature on topics including, but not necessarily limited to, the allocation of state appropriations among the postsecondary education segments, student fee policy, and student financial aid.	Somewhat similar to 66903 (b) for CPEC to prepare a state plan for higher ed (includes student fee policy, student financial aid) but not appropriations to each segment.	CPEC did not produce such a state plan, at least in recent years. Does BCR have any problems with the authority recommending the "allocation of state appropriations among the postsecondary education segments"?
Capacity Development or	Developing and presenting basic	66903 (q) laid out CPEC's	The wording is different, but I

Realignment	policy parameters for capacity development or realignment, including, but not necessarily limited to, expansion or realignment of enrollment capacity among or within the postsecondary education segments, to meet the state's higher education goals.	responsibilities to conduct eligibility studies. I can't find anything on enrollment capacity development or realignment, except the capital outlay provisions.	believe CPEC did have a similar role on capacity development in terms of recommendations on sites for new campuses, branches, etc. This is broader in terms of potential enrollment "realignment" among campuses or segments.
Mission Change, Establishment of New Campuses or Centers	Reviewing, and making recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature relating to, major capacity decisions, such as changes in mission or the establishment of new campuses or centers, that are to be financed with state appropriations or state-approved student fees.	66903 (e): It shall advise the Legislature and the Governor regarding the need for, and location of, new institutions and campuses of public higher education.	
Education Database	Acting as a clearinghouse for postsecondary education information and as a primary source of information for the Legislature, the Governor, and other agencies, and developing and maintaining a comprehensive database, as specified.	Same. Current Ed Code sections are identical to the comprehensive database provisions in AB 1348.	The language in AB 1348 is identical to current Ed Code for CPEC in regards to data responsibilities.