

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)  
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12**

**TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs met 12 times during the 2011-12 academic year.

**Reviews of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs**

One of CCGA's primary responsibilities is to review all campus proposals for new graduate schools and graduate degree programs. A total of 27 proposals were submitted to CCGA for review throughout the academic year, three of which were carried over from the prior academic year. Program proposals received by CCGA in the latter stages of 2011-12 will be carried over into the 2012-13 academic year. The following table summarizes CCGA's disposition of these proposals as of August 31, 2012.

Campus	Program Proposed	Lead Reviewer	Disposition Date	Disposition Status
UCB	Online Professional Master of Public Health (M.P.H.)	R. Mulnard	10/4/2011	Approved
UCB	M.S./Ph.D. in Computational Biology	A. Chisholm	6/5/2012	Approved
UCB	M.Eng. in Bioengineering	M. Vanderwood	—	Under review
UCB	Part-time SSP Master of Engineering (M.Eng.)	B. Schumm	5/9/2012	Approved
UCB	Online Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) in Integrated Circuits	S. Farmer/K. Gyls	4/9/2012	Approved
UCB-UCSF	Master of Translational Medicine	A. Chisholm	6/14/2012	Approved
UCD	Master of Professional Accountancy (M.P.Ac.)	D. Arovas	10/4/2011	Approved
UCD	M.S./Ph.D. in Energy	D. Arovas	5/1/2012	Rejected; proposal returned to campus.
UCD	M.S. in Environmental Policy and Management	N/A	10/4/2011	CCGA will resume review upon receipt of revised proposal.
UCI	M.S. in Biotechnology Management	D. Mastronarde	4/3/2012	Approved
UCI	M.S. in Engineering Management	M. Vanderwood	10/4/2011	Approved
UCI	Ph.D. in Nursing Science	D. Mastronarde	2/7/2012	Approved
UCI	Master of Professional Accountancy (M.P.Ac.)	A. Buckpitt/ D. Mastronarde	7/19/2012	Approved
UCLA	Conversion of Master of Architecture II to Self-supporting status	R. Mulnard	6/5/2012	Approved
UCLA	Conversion of Anderson Graduate School of Management M.B.A. Program to Self-supporting Status	N/A	8/31/2012	CCGA will resume review upon receipt of revised proposal after a UC conversion policy is approved.
UCM	M.S./Ph.D. in Chemistry and Chemical Biology	A. Buckpitt	6/19/2012	Approved
UCR	M.S. in Computer Engineering	B. Schumm	2/7/2012	Approved
UCR	Online M.S. in Engineering	R. Raffai	2/7/2012	Approved
UCR	Master of Professional Accountancy (M.P.Ac.)	W. Shadish	2/7/2012	Approved
UCR	Fully Employed M.B.A.	R. Mulnard	4/5/2012	Approved
UCR	M.A. in Finance	D. Mastronarde	6/18/2012	CCGA will resume review upon receipt of revised proposal.
UCSB	M.S. and Combined Five-Year B.S./M.S. in Actuarial Science	D. Mastronarde	—	Under review
UCSB	Interdepartmental M.A./Ph.D. in Dynamical Neuroscience	A. Chisholm	—	Under review
UCSB	Combined Five-Year B.S./M.A. in Pharmacology and Biotechnology	R. Mulnard/ A. Chisholm	8/24/2012	Approved
UCSC	M.A. in Theater Arts	R. Raley	2/7/2012	Approved
UCSC	Ph.D. in Latin American and Latino Studies	S. Farmer	3/6/2012	Approved
UCSC	Ph.D. in Feminist Studies	A. Buckpitt	4/3/2012	Approved

CCGA worked on a number of key initiatives and issues related to graduate education over the course of the 2011-12 academic year, including:

### **SSPs Update and Outstanding Issues**

CCGA members discussed key carry-over issues from last year, including some outstanding policy questions between the Senate and the Provost about the appropriateness of new Senate conversion guidelines: 1) the extent to which newly proposed SSPs are truly self-supporting; and 2) the necessary steps involved in the conversion process, (e.g., do campuses get to keep the former state-supported program on the books once it has been converted to self-supported status or must it first disestablish/discontinue it prior to the proposed conversion?). Another key issue discussed was what the appropriate CCGA review process is for SSPs, (e.g., CCGA had proposed that local Graduate Councils would get annual reports on an SSP's financial performance that speaks to the above issue comparable to the information to be provided to the Administration that is called for in the newly approved Presidential guidelines and consult with campus Planning and Budget committees as needed). CCGA formed a joint CCGA-UCPB subcommittee to follow-up on the above questions with UCPB members and divisional CCGA and UCPB committees. CCGA discussed the types of categories potentially missing in the accounting of SSPs including: effort by ladder-rank administrators (Dean, Associate Dean); IT support; Library costs; Graduate Division support; temporary Academic Staff costs associated with instruction by Teaching Assistants and Teaching Fellows; audit costs; cost of Senate's business (personnel actions, curricular review, etc.); and possible Systemwide costs. Other issues discussed included: general philosophy for basing estimates of SSP costs (marginal or extra incurred costs vs. pro-rated costs); assessment of the cost of participation by adjunct (non-ladder rank) faculty; costs associated with TA/TF support; tracking return-to-aid; and the nature of conducting audits of SSPs. Members also expressed concern about student access to SSPs; the utility of MOUs in program design; quality/oversight issues and prescribing review of SSPs commensurate with campus review cycle; and the particular learning objectives of each program as factors to be considered in the review of SSPs. The suggestion was put forth that CCGA could recommend the "proportionality" principle for student participation/access to courses proportionately assigned to programs to cover instructional costs. The Committee agreed to craft a general set of guiding principles and policy that would eventually be shared with the campuses. Among the basic points discussed was that: 1) SSPs should have MOUs regarding courses with joint enrollment of SSP and regular students. If there is not an MOU and students are denied access, then there is a structural problem with the design of the SSP. Faculty in either program should be advocates for their students. The problem is not different in principle from current cross-program enrollments. There is the possibility that issues could arise due to quality because students in the two types of programs have different objectives (research vs. other); and 2) review processes should properly assess possible implications for program quality of joint enrollments, including specifically the effects of having students with different educational objectives enrolled in the same course(s).

### **Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS)**

Chair Goodhue chaired the CAGSS task force. Vice Chair Sharon Farmer and UCLA representative Karen Gyls also represented CCGA on the task force. Graduate education is an essential part of UC's mission as a research university, and graduate students are essential contributors to advancing this mission. The Regents' graduate student support policy recognizes that the University must make competitive financial offers in order to attract highly qualified graduate students. The work of the task force highlighted a number of critical issues concerning the competitiveness of UC's academic doctoral programs. While many of the University's graduate programs are currently rated among the best in the world, rising tuition and uncompetitive stipends threaten to seriously undermine program quality. Enhancing the competitiveness of UC's academic graduate student support requires immediate action at the Systemwide level. The task force report offers four recommendations for consideration: 1) reduce the financial impact of NRST, a) waive NRST for Ph.D. students. Recognizing current budget limitations, the task force offers two additional options: b) Increase the number of years NRST is waived for international doctoral students and c) reduce the cost differential due to NRST over time by forgoing future increases in tuition from international academic doctoral students; 2) do not charge NRST to research grants; 3) eliminate the Systemwide time limits on graduate student instructor (GSI) employment; and 4) allocate additional resources for net stipends for academic doctoral student support.

## **Academic Council Principles for Enrollment Management in the Context of Rebenching**

As a member of Academic Council, Chair Goodhue participated in discussions regarding rebenching. Council considered the myriad issues embedded in the enrollment management component of the rebenching initiative. Council members agreed that rebenching requires enrollment management that the Senate must be extensively involved in shaping this aspect of the rebenching project, and that enrollment planning must address unfinished business in the larger Rebenching/Funding Streams restructuring of the University budget. Council unanimously endorsed a statement of principles as a baseline from which continuing discussion and negotiation should proceed. Specifically related to graduate education, Council recommended that UCOP and the Senate should analyze the impact of various enrollment scenarios under rebenching for both undergraduate and graduate students, especially when adding or removing educational paths and redistributing state funding. Council also endorsed the following principle:

**5a. The Systemwide enrollment management plan should reflect the President's Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (see especially Section 6A)<sup>1</sup> and consider not only the impact on the program itself and spillover impacts on closely related programs, but also how the conversion will affect enrollment targets for both undergraduate and graduate students under rebenching and UC's ability to meet its Master Plan obligations.**

Campuses are free to explore and propose changes to programs that could lead to new revenues, but a campus that converts a state-assisted program to a self-supporting program should give up the state funding that was allocated for students enrolled in that program. However, the campus may request to transfer the funding to expand another enrollment target, consistent with current policy<sup>2</sup>, or for meeting some other Systemwide priority. The University may find many professional degree programs, for instance, do not represent the best use of state funding, and should be increasingly self-supporting – a trend that is already underway. Those funds may be determined to have a higher priority use in assisting resident undergraduates or academic Ph.D. students, and the campus might be encouraged to redirect funding to such students. However, this should be a conscious, Systemwide decision about the role of state funding in professional schools in the UC system, not an ad hoc policy produced by a large number of independently generated proposals. To remain consistent with the rebenching recommendations, the campus should identify specific enrollment categories in which its target will increase.

## **Discussion with WASC President Ralph Wolff on Proposed Changes to WASC Guidelines**

CCGA discussed proposed changes to WASC guidelines and generated the following list of key questions for President Wolff, in a letter sent December 13, 2011:

- 1) We agree completely with the broader goals of the DQP, that students should receive a broad education covering the five areas defined in the DQP. We are wondering, however, if the DQP goes too far in extending? General education? Beyond the freshman and sophomore years, and if in so doing it: would slow down time to degree and dilute the quality of advanced study at the Upper Division and Master's levels?*
- 2) WASC question on review of Ph.D.s: The Ph.D. is a unique degree title. Its focus is explicitly to create new knowledge, creative avenues, and modes of application of knowledge, and explicitly not to acquire a set of skills spelled out by a pre-determined rubric. Does WASC share this perspective? If not, why not? It seems that there is no intent of having the learning-outcome-oriented rubrics apply to Ph.D. programs. Can you verify that? Also, CCGA is wondering about the evolution of WASC's views on review professional program activity on campuses. Does WASC have an official definition of what constitutes a professional program?*

---

<sup>1</sup> The policy states that “Self-supporting programs will not be funded from State General Funds and reports of state-funded enrollments will exclude students in self-supporting programs. However, these enrollments will be reported to the Office of the President as a separate category which is not counted against the campus-budgeted (state-funded)-enrollment target. During the approved phase-in period, distribution of enrollment between state and non-state targets will conform to specifications of the phase-in plan.” In effect, students in a self-supporting program are “removed from” the calculations that allocate state funding, under the Rebenching framework.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ucop.edu/planning/documents/self-supportpolicy-2011.pdf>

- 3) *What is (are) the problem(s) the new guidelines are designed to address? Is there knowledge these problems exist within graduate level training at research focused universities? Should a separate accreditation track be considered for research universities?*
- 4) *What specific requirements are being considered for Master's degrees?*
- 5) *We understand that there was at least some discussion of a minimum number of units (30) without allowing for fewer units combined with a thesis or comprehensive examination. Is this discussion headed anywhere?*
- 6) *Given that the problems WASC seems to be most interested in addressing are primarily with the for-profit segment of higher education, might it make sense to consider a two-pronged approach to accreditation, one for non-profit and one for for-profit institutions?*
- 7) *CCGA would particularly like to emphasize the unique nature of the Ph.D. degree. Rather than acquiring pre-determined skill sets, the focus of such a degree program is explicitly to create new knowledge, creative avenues, and modes of application of knowledge. Departments and programs oriented toward the production of specialized knowledge thus continuously and rigorously assess students in relation to the concrete goals of each respective degree (in the form of annual reviews, required research presentations, preliminary exams, oral qualifying exams, dissertations and theses and capstone projects, job placement). Does WASC share this perspective? If not, how does it understand the difference between a Master's degree and a doctorate? Or an undergraduate degree and a doctorate? From our discussion, it seems that there is no intent to apply learning-outcomes-oriented rubrics to Ph.D. programs. Can you verify and assure us that this is the case?*

As of August 31, 2012, CCGA was still awaiting a response.

#### **Proposed Affiliation Agreement between UCSD and California Western School of Law**

UCSD requested an expedited review of its proposed agreement with the California Western School of Law (CWSL) in December. CCGA discussed the proposed draft agreement between UCSD and the California Western School of Law at its January meeting. In the spirit of an expedited Academic Senate review, the questions raised by the committee were sent to the divisional Graduate Council as input into their deliberations. Based on some of the concerns raised, CCGA also decided to consult directly with UCPB and UCAP. The Committee discussed the campus response to a list of questions previously submitted by CCGA as well as the UCAP letter and recommendation not to approve the agreement. Members raised a range of concerns including concerns about the quality reputation of CWSL and the seemingly uneven nature of the partnership; advantages to UC for partnering with CWSL insufficient for moving forward; the LAO's past opposition to the need for new UC law school; motives behind CWSL aspirations; lack of substantive information on how the affiliation would further UCSD's long-term goals and benefit UC; campus interest in improving legal education in its local area; and that it would not like to see the agreement move forward without the support of the UCSD faculty.

CCGA was strongly opposed to any mention of the University of California or the University of California, San Diego on diplomas issued by CWSL for three reasons. First, and most important, there is a notable discrepancy in the quality of existing UC law programs and the CWSL program. Indeed, the background document provided to CCGA by the UCSD administration acknowledges this discrepancy and cites it as a reason for adopting the draft agreement rather than merging the institutions. Second, the program and school have not followed standard procedures for Academic Senate and UCOP involvement in program and school approval. Accreditation is not a substitute for formal Academic Senate and UCOP review. Finally, there is a lack of precedent for including UC's name on a non-UC degree. Academic Senate staff members were unable to find a precedent. CCGA asked specifically for precedents to be provided by UCSD. None were. CCGA, like UCAP, is very concerned about the lack of evidence of active UCSD faculty interest in the proposed agreement or, for that matter, in the previous one. Any benefits to graduate education are beyond hypothetical in the absence of grassroots faculty support. Existing joint programs have had few students. The one exception is a MAS program that was instituted after the expiration of the prior agreement. Thus, a formal arrangement such as the one proposed is not necessary for faculty to initiate joint efforts in graduate education. CCGA is also concerned with the lack of faculty involvement via the normal channels of shared governance because faculty involvement is a critical component of developing and maintaining UC-quality graduate programs. It appears that the draft agreement was developed without Academic Senate consultation until the last-minute request for an expedited review. Finally, CCGA

noted that if the long-term objective is the absorption of the law school into UCSD, proper procedures must be followed as specified in the Compendium and elsewhere. Ensuring that graduate education, including professional graduate education, meets standards for UC quality, is one important purpose of these procedures. At its meeting in February, CCGA unanimously voted to convey the above points in letter to Academic Council and elected to wait to see the Administration's response to concerns of the divisional Senate and Academic Council before making a final determination on the proposal. As of August 31, 2012, CCGA was still awaiting the Administration's response.

**UCSF Inquiry: Local authority to expand an approved graduate inter-professional post-baccalaureate program and to include graduate academic post-baccalaureate students** (*Can this be done administratively or would it require going back and obtaining Graduate Council/ CCGA approval?*)

After rereading the proposal for the original inter-professional post-baccalaureate program, CCGA determined that administrative approval alone is not sufficient to expand it to a program for academic graduate students. The students are in different classes of degree programs with different degree objectives. On the other hand, members were not sure a full review is necessary. If the program proposers are inclined to move forward, CCGA can entertain the possibility of doing an expedited review at the Systemwide level. At a minimum, an expedited review would entail resubmitting the professional post-bac application and all associated paperwork along with a justification for why it should be expanded to include academic graduate students. In addition, the timing of the request should be addressed, e.g., why should the program be expanded to academic graduate students now, when it presumably has either not started or has barely started for professional students; and if the program would benefit academic graduate students, why weren't the proposals submitted concurrently? After a brief discussion, CCGA agreed to forward the above comments to the campus.

**UCSF Inquiry: Joint class attendance of students enrolled in a self-supporting program in non-SSP courses offered on the same campus** (*Is it appropriate for student on campus to sit in the same classroom but pay different fees?*)

At this point in time, CCGA has not developed any policies or guidelines regarding the enrollment of students in SSPs and state-supported programs in the same course. The committee engaged in a discussion regarding SSPs and their implications for graduate education at UC that will continue in 2012-13. At present, the President's Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs states (in Section VI.H.) that students may enroll in the same courses "so long as there is separate accounting for the self-supporting and state-supplied costs." CCGA considered the use of M.O.U.s to help with accounting of resources and whether or not to develop implementation guidelines for the campuses. After a brief discussion, CCGA agreed to forward the above response to the campus.

**UC Davis Program Review Committee Report on the Soils and Biochemistry Group**

The Davis Graduate Council first brought the negative consequences of ANR's transfer of endowment income from AES research and graduate education activities on the campus to ANR purposes in the 2011-12 academic year. CCGA was quite concerned about the negative implications for graduate education, particularly graduate student support and research opportunities. As a result of a memo from former CCGA chair Jim Carmody, UCORP chair Phokion Kolaitis and UCPB chair James Chalfant, Academic Council approved unanimously a resolution requesting that the redirection of endowment funds by ANR be suspended until consultation with the Academic Senate. In April 2012, CCGA received a memo from the Davis Graduate Council. This memo indicated that Graduate Council had determined as part of its program review process that ANR's redirection of endowment income from research activities conducted on AES campuses has had notably negative effects on graduate education. Soils and Biochemistry is ranked as the top graduate program in its area in the country; the decline in graduate student support precipitated by ANR's action threatens the quality of education and competitiveness in graduate student support for a world-class graduate program. CCGA urged continued monitoring of ANR's decisions that affect graduate education, including the redirection of financial resources formerly dedicated to graduate education. ANR engages in periodic reassessment of its resource allocation across priorities. To date, CCGA has observed clear costs for graduate education of ANR's most recent resource allocation. The next reassessment should include those costs as part of the evaluation. Their existence sets a higher standard for the justification of the existing allocation than simply evidence of any benefit. CCGA encouraged the Academic Senate to participate in this review process.

## **Systemwide Reviews**

*APM 668 – Negotiated Salary Program.* CCGA discussed the newly proposed APM 668, and though it is difficult to predict the effects of the proposed APM 668 on graduate education at the University of California, CCGA members expressed a variety of views. The Committee’s two primary concerns centered on the extent to which APM 668 would redirect grant and endowment funds from graduate student support to faculty salaries and on the implications of APM 668 for UC’s ability to attract outstanding faculty and maintain the quality of graduate education. Regarding the redirection of research funds, some CCGA members felt that the proposed change would not affect training or funding of graduate students in their disciplines because the funding of graduate students is necessary for the faculty to conduct research. Others commented that APM 668 may possibly lead to the diversion of grant and endowment funds from graduate student support to faculty salaries, thus diminishing the number of excellent graduate students that UC graduate programs can support. On the subject of the effects of APM 668 on UC’s ability to attract outstanding faculty and maintain the quality of graduate education, some CCGA members thought that the flexibility created by this program might be valuable in some circumstances. Other members remarked that the program could possibly have deleterious effects if it diminishes the collegiality that the UC academic personnel system traditionally has fostered.

*Senate Regulation 610 (residency).* CCGA discussed proposed amendments to Senate Regulation 610. Overall, CCGA members were not satisfied with the proposed revision in the form suggested by UCRJ. The Committee made three recommendations, two that added clarity to the current language and a third that provided for counting online instruction but uses less sweeping, more cautious language. First, in the opening sentence following “approved by the Faculty of a student’s college or school,” CCGA recommended adding “and by appropriate Senate bodies” to make clear the necessity of review and approval by divisional CEP or GC and, if necessary, by UCEP or CCGA. Second, at the end of the paragraph, CCGA recommended changing the cross-reference from “[See SR 680-690]” to “[See SR 680-694]” so that the particular restrictions in 694 are also referred to here. CCGA also suggested that perhaps SR 630D should be referenced here to make clear that programs like EAP and UCDC have already been dealt with in this regard. And third, instead of adding the sweeping language “irrespective of physical location or mode of delivery,” CCGA recommended adding a separate new sentence expressing something like the following: “Exemption from the requirement of physical residency for a particular program may be requested by providing a specific justification, subject to review and approval by the relevant Academic Senate bodies (divisional CEP or GC and, if necessary, UCEP or CCGA).” Members of CCGA were convinced that in-person interaction continues to be essential to many aspects of high quality undergraduate and graduate education and physical presence should not yet be abandoned as a norm. Finally, given that programs that are adopting alternative modes are still experimental at this stage and that UC faculty are still gathering data about what works and what doesn’t and about how comparability in quality can be assessed, CCGA felt it was prudent to make clear that alternative modes of delivery need to be specifically justified in a rigorous approval process and reviewed frequently in the years immediately after adoption to ensure that UC quality education is indeed being delivered.

*University of California Observatories.* CCGA reviewed the external review committee report for the UC Observatories/Lick. The Committee recognized that many graduate students participate in research involving UCO/Lick, including students’ dissertation research. Consequently, CCGA members were surprised that graduate education was not even mentioned in the report. CCGA considered the importance of UCO/Lick in maintaining excellence in graduate education in specific fields at the University of California an additional reason for UC to continue to fund it.

*APM 430 – Visiting Scholars.* CCGA discussed APM 430 in response to a management consultation request. Committee members identified four concerns and suggested potential changes that would address those concerns. First, CCGA suggested that the policy differentiate between visiting scholars who have obtained their doctorates and visiting graduate student researchers. UC Berkeley has a campus policy that does so, and it could potentially serve as a model. Second, CCGA suggested making explicit that campuses not only should “establish authority and procedures to appoint and reappoint” (430-4), but should have the authority to establish additional policies and requirements, including payment of costs associated with the individual’s visit. Third, CCGA observed that there does not appear to be a minimum length of time for an appointment in this title and recommended that perhaps a minimum length should be specified, as in the Berkeley policy. Finally, CCGA noted that the definition of “on leave” is unclear, as is the reason it is included in the definition in 430-4 and subsequently raised the following questions for consideration. First, if a Visiting Scholar appointment is a short-term appointment and

one that prohibits receiving compensation from the University, what difference does the individual’s leave status make? And second, if it does make a difference, then what is the applicable definition of “on leave”?

### CCGA Handbook Revision

Over the course of the year, Vice Chair Sharon Farmer shepherded the updating of the CCGA Handbook to better reflect changes in CCGA practices and changes to the Compendium.

### Reviews of Proposals for Name Changes, Reconstitutions, Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishments, Discontinuances, and other Programmatic Matters

As shown below, CCGA considered numerous requests for name changes, reconstitutions, transfers, consolidations, disestablishments, and discontinuances of degree titles, programs, departments, graduate groups, or schools. A reconstitution refers to any combination of actions treated as a unified plan and intended to transfer, consolidate, discontinue, disestablish, or change the name of an academic program or academic unit. TCDD actions are defined as:

- *Transfer*: Moving a program or unit into another one that subsumes it.
- *Consolidation*: Combining two or more programs or units to form a new unified program or unit;
- *Disestablishment*: Eliminating an academic unit or research unit;
- *Discontinuance*: Eliminating an academic program.

Campus	School/Program/Group   New Name/Group	Lead Reviewer	Disposition Date	Requested Action	Disposition
UCSD	Establish a terminal Master of Science Degree in Oceanography, Marine Biology or Earth Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography	N/A	1/3/2012	Establishment	Approved
UCD	Discontinue Exercise Science M.S. Program	N/A	1/3/2012	Discontinuance	Approved
UCLA	Disestablish the Biomedical Engineering IDP and Transfer its graduate degree (M.S. and Ph.D.) programs into the Department of Bioengineering	N/A	4/3/2012	Disestablishment and Transference	Approved
UCLA	Transfer the Environmental Science and Engineering Doctoral Degree (D.Env.) to the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability	N/A	4/3/2012	Transference	Approved
UCLA	Bifurcate the M.P.H. for Health Professionals Program in the UCLA School of Public Health	N/A	4/3/2012	Bifurcation	Approved
UCSB	Proposed Name Change for the Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy in “Art History” to the Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy in “History of Art and Architecture”	N/A	5/1/2012	Name Change	Approved
UCSF	Retroactively Change the Doctor of Nursing Science (DNS) Degree to a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Degree	N/A	5/1/2012	Name Change	Approved
UCI	Reconstitute the Department of Education as a School of Education	S. Farmer	6/5/2012	Reconstitution	Approved
UCB	Proposed Name Change of the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Molecular and Biochemical Nutrition to the M.S. and Ph.D. in Metabolic Biology (received by CCGA 8/24/2012)	Unassigned	—	Name Change	Review will begin in 2012-13 academic year.

### Acknowledgements

CCGA is grateful to have had valuable input from and exchange with these UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Provost Lawrence Pitts; Provost Aimée Dorr; Vice President for Research and Graduate Affairs Steven Beckwith; Director of Graduate Studies Pamela Jennings; Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; Academic Planning Assistant Director Hilary Baxter; Associate Director of Labor Relations Peter Chester; Academic Senate Director Martha Winnacker; Academic Senate Associate Director Todd Giedt; and Chair of the Council of Graduate Deans Tyrus Miller. The committee also thanks the numerous faculty members who, as alternates, kindly represented their respective campuses at CCGA meetings throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted:

*Rachael Goodhue, Chair (UCD)*

*Sharon Farmer, Vice Chair (UCSB)*

*Donald Mastronarde (UCB)*

*Alan Buckpitt (UCD)*

*Ruth Mulnard (UCI)*

*Karen Gyllys (UCLA)*

*William Shadish (UCM)*

*Valerie Leppert (UCM)*

*Michael Vanderwood (UCR)*

*Rita Raley (UCSB)*

*Bruce Schumm (UCSC)*

*Andrew Chisholm (UCSD)*

*Robert Raffai (UCSF)*

*Monica Liou (UCB student)*

*Tianhong Song (UCD student)*

*Robert Anderson (ex-officio member)*

*Robert Powell (ex-officio member)*

*Eric Zárate (Committee Analyst)*