

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Present: Donald Mastronarde (Chair, UCB), Alex Bui (UCLA Alternate), Kwai Ng (UCSD), Carol Burke (UCI), John Bolander (UCD), Valerie Leppert (UCM), Shauna Somerville (UCB), John Kim (UCR), Bruce Schumm (UCSC), Youngho Seo (UCSF), Hilary Baxter, Pamela Jennings, Mary Gilly (Council Vice Chair), William Jacob (Council Chair), and Todd Giedt (Analyst)

I. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates

BRIEFING: At the budget call on January 24, UCOP is hopeful that if the State's surplus continues to increase, but UC may be able to garner some one-time monies. Budget issues include State contribution to UCRP, as well as capital bond issues. The Academic Planning Council (APC) is developing a Presidential policy on Open Access; this policy will be based on the Senate policy, but will be broader in scope. Chair Mastronarde noted that graduate students do not own their own copyright for works that they are either paid to produce or make "substantial" use of University resources in producing said work(s). Other issues discussed at the APC meeting included the establishment of a special Committee on International Activities, Compendium changes (MRU changes, which CCGA reviewed previously), enrollment principles, and cost of instruction models.

Chair Mastronarde also briefed members on the January Academic Council meeting. He reported that the climate report will be going to the Regents in March and become public at that time; it encompasses all of the campuses, UCOP, and other UC sites (e.g., the National Laboratories). At the Regents meeting in January, there was some discussion of the Master Plan, which included President Napolitano's transfer initiative. There are some questions about UC's capacity to take additional transfer students; this initiative is now focused on streamlining and creating efficiencies. There is also a new Presidential initiative on increasing collaboration with Mexico. With respect to the budget, discussions are ongoing about capital expenditures; Council approved a UCPB [letter](#) that establishes principals on future capital expenditures. Council's systemwide review of the proposed policy for Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP) has concluded; Council's draft letter asks for clarification and further review of the following points: 1) Rationale and definition of a self-supporting program (SSP); 2) how to distinguish a state-supported professional program with PDST from a SSP program; and 3) the criteria for review of these programs. Another theme of the letter is ensuring financial accessibility to these programs for low-income and disadvantaged students, as well as student diversity within these programs (with appropriate campus flexibility). Chair Mastronarde remarked that CCGA should add additional language to its *Guidelines for Program Proposers* within its Handbook on this issue. Council is also requesting that the balance of Senate and non-Senate faculty in SSGPDPs should be similar to that in related state-supported programs to not only ensure quality in these SSGPDPs, but also so that Senate faculty are not diverted from UC's core state-supported programs. Other concerns included the frequency of SSP conversions, program reviews, principles guiding fee setting, and the role of the Graduate Councils in the supervision of SSGPDPs. Finally, the Council members insisted that this policy should be viewed as a minimum standard; individual campuses may indeed go farther in their regulation of SSPs.

DISCUSSION: Members voiced concern over the fact that there is no formal body watching over the diversity of these programs; CCGA's 2008 memo on this issue is informative, but is not sufficient to monitor the diversity of these programs. It should also not be left solely to the individual Graduate

Councils. At the very least, UCOP should collect data, and track these programs for their diversity and access on an ongoing basis. While members were not in favor of strict enforcement of specific return-to-aid numbers or other measures, they did insist that regular data collection and monitoring be done regularly, with appropriate Senate intervention if necessary.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda.

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

REPORT: Consultant Pamela Jennings reported that ORGS recently held a round table meeting on alternate career pathways for doctoral students within industry in conjunction with the Bay Area Science and Information Consortium (BASIC). In attendance were two graduate division deans, Academic Council Chair Jacob, two graduate students, and representatives from industry. Key themes included intellectual property issues, the creation of sponsored research opportunities with industry, mentor/mentee development, better industry engagement with UC academic departments, and the value of a UC PhD education more generally. On the whole, industry leaders expressed a strong interest in hiring PhDs from a broad range of disciplines. That said, industry representatives expressed the common view that it is very confusing to work with UC. Consultant Jennings added that while some campuses already offer workshops for graduate students on how to better market themselves for industry, suggestions were made that actual courses might be developed to fill this need.

Consultant Hilary Baxter noted a proposed change to the five-year program planning perspectives collection schedules – they would be changed from an annual basis to a bi-annual basis. If approved, this will eventually be reflected in the Compendium. Academic Planning has sent out a call for this year's *Perspectives*; they are due by March 31.

DISCUSSION: With respect to the BASIC round table, Academic Council Chair Jacob remarked that one of the tensions that emerged from the meeting is the fact that industry is really interested in defining specific applied projects that they wish to collaborate on with UC (e.g., summer internships). On the other hand, the University is more accustomed to seeking funding for larger basic research (e.g., from national funding agencies).

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

REPORT: Academic Council Vice Chair Gilly noted that at the November 2013 Regents meeting, Chair Jacob and Provost Dorr made a presentation on the importance of doctoral education and the challenges facing the University in adequately supporting graduate students. At that meeting, Provost Dorr announced that an all-UC conference on doctoral education will be convened in the spring. This meeting will take place on April 15. A steering committee has been set-up; membership includes Provost Dorr and Vice Chair Gilly (as co-chairs), an executive vice chancellor, a vice chancellor for research, a graduate dean, CCGA Vice Chair Jutta Heckhausen, and a UCPB representative. One of the principal goals of the conference is to produce a number of actionable items (e.g., recommendations on net stipend and non-resident supplemental tuition) that could be brought to the Regents, with specific dollar amounts attached.

Council Chair Jacob also briefed members on the January Regents meeting. While Governor Brown has indeed given the University what he previously promised in his budget (5% on top of last year's base budget), He noted that the federal sequester resulted in a 12% drop in UC research grants awards. Presentations from UCOP included President Napolitano's presentation on transfer (as part of a larger presentation on the Master Plan from the States' three system presidents); Provost Dorr also gave an update on online education. He also noted that enrollment management is receiving renewed attention at UCOP. Composite benefits continue to be an ongoing topic of discussion; the Senate is particularly interested in how composite benefits will impact grants and graduate support. Academic Council, and UCFW's Health Care Task Force in particular, continues to follow the roll-out of UC Care closely. He also briefly spoke about Council's SSGPDP letter, remarking that Council is particularly concerned about the lack of constraints against the creation of new SSPs. Council has also taken a unanimous position against the lack of criteria in the review of SSGPDPs.

DISCUSSION: One member noted that with respect to SSGPDPs, the overall purpose of CCGA's original criteria for SSPs were intended to minimize impacts on state-sponsored programs. Another member stressed accessibility as a key concern. Chair Jacob added that Council is recommending another review of this policy. He observed there is a real danger to the academic quality of the University's graduate programs if these SSPs these programs are allowed to proliferate without proper review.

V. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

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

REPORT: This is an SSP program, and is patterned on an existing program in marine biodiversity and conservation. Two reviews have been received, which are quite different from one another. One review is more positive, but recommends that the proposal be more explicit in describing the skill sets it will develop. The other review is more critical, stating that students coming into this program would not have sufficient mathematics and physical sciences background to be competitive in the climate sciences courses. That said, the proposers are designing a summer "boot camp" to bring these students up-to-speed in these areas. Another issue concerns whether there is sufficient breadth in the courses associated with climate science. To accomplish this, the proposers will use a forum discussion course, bringing in external speakers to expose students to additional issues in climate science.

DISCUSSION: The San Diego member commented that it is a common practice for MAS students to take first-year courses with PhD students, noting that this has not been a problem on his campus. Other members remarked that the two reviews essentially comment on the same issue, and the proposers may want to rethink some aspects of the curriculum, especially if the proposed courses will impart the appropriate skills for successful careers in climate science

ACTION: The lead reviewer will ask the program proposers to respond to the reviewers' criticisms.

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

REPORT: The lead reviewer reported that he has received two external reviews. He has also had a telephone conference with the program proposer. The proposers have been receptive to the criticism and will submit a revised proposal in two weeks time.

ACTION: CCGA will review the revised proposal at its March meeting.

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

REPORT: The lead reviewer is awaiting a response from the proposers on his initial points of criticism. Professor Bolander already has invited three external reviewers and one internal reviewer, and has sent out invitations for additional external reviewers.

D. Proposal for a Master's Degree of Finance at UC San Diego-- *Lead Reviewer Youngho Seo (UCSF)*

REPORT: The proposers did respond to earlier criticisms with respect to the accounting of the program and the capstone project, but CCGA deemed these to be insufficient; they have recently provided another response. The accounting issue is now resolved. With respect to the capstone project, they are suggesting that two faculty members will grade the capstone project – the principal faculty member in charge of the project and another faculty member who would be assigned by the lead faculty member.

DISCUSSION: The proposers' capstone suggestion may impact the budget, as an honorarium will most likely be needed to pay the second grader. Members opined that this arrangement is not optimal, but it is probably reasonable. With respect to the quality of the capstone itself, proposers insist that it will be expansive and comprehensive, which is in line with UC's standards. Members voted to unanimously approve the program with zero abstentions.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the program with the condition that the program and local reviewers monitor (1) the arrangements for compensation of other departments if MF students enroll in a course outside the SSGPDP itself; and (2) the provisions for supervising and evaluating such a large number of capstone projects.

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

REPORT: Professor Schumm reported that he has received commitments from two external reviews; he expects these reviews to arrive by the end of February.

F. Proposal for an M.A./Ph.D. in Interdisciplinary Humanities at UC Merced-- *Lead Reviewer Chair Donald Mastronarde (UCB)*

REPORT: Chair Mastronarde reported that this proposal has been revised.

DISCUSSION: One member applauded that program's revised proposal, noting that it highlights the department's current strengths. However, despite the revised review, there are still a few questions. The first of these is why is coursework the same in both the MA and PhD programs? Second, why are the students in the PhD program not also receiving an MA along the way? Another member commented that these issues are not significant. For example, once students finish the coursework in most Humanities doctoral programs, an MA is conferred. In other words, it is always the same amount of coursework. UCM will also be offering more foreign language instruction, including Hmong instruction, which will bolster this program. Members also briefly discussed the job prospects for the program's graduates, as the proposal does not explicitly address this issue. One member countered there is an expectation that significant numbers of the current professoriate will retire.

ACTION: Members voted to unanimously approve the program with one abstention.

G. Joint Doctoral Program (with SDSU) in Applied Social Science with an Emphasis on Substance Use

ACTION: Carol Burke was assigned as the lead reviewer.

VI. Consultation – Chair Mastronarde

A. Final feedback on CCGA Guidance on Degree Titles

ISSUE: In recent years CCGA has tried to uphold the distinctiveness of academic graduate degrees by enforcing the view that a professional Master's degree should not be an M.A. or M.S., but rather a "Master of X." CCGA is therefore considering proposed language for its Handbook on that would insist that this distinction be observed in the development and review of new program proposals. Specifically, proposals involving PDST or SSP funding should be described as professional degree proposals and should by default use the "Master of X" degree title, rather than M.A. or M.S. Previously approved degrees that do not follow this practice would not be required to change their degree titles however.

ACTION: Members agreed to send a letter to the Graduate Councils, with a copy to the Graduate Deans, informing them of this change.

B. Discussion of comments from other committees about SSGPDP revision

ISSUE: The Academic Planning Council will consider the SSGPDP revisions in a special teleconference meeting on February 18.

C. Other matters of interest to local GCs

ISSUE(s):

- *Council of Graduate Deans (COGD) Meeting:* The graduate deans discussed some practical issues related to SSP programs: 1) The burden of data collection for SSP programs; and 2) the kind and amount of tuition that a state-supported student pays if he or she takes a course in a SSP. Another issue concerns a proposal to waive non-resident tuition for Engineering programs; the graduate deans expressed some concern that there was not sufficient consultation with the COGD. This proposal is an outcome from a recent Council of Chancellors meeting in which the President assigned individual chancellors to write whitepapers on the certain topics. CCGA will ask for a copy of this white paper.
- *Capstone Definitions:* The UCSC Graduate Council has been looking at the possibility of a plural review (multiple graders) for capstone projects. CCGA must decide whether to leave the policy as is, or develop a more explicit policy. Multiple graders for capstone projects is one issue; another issue is that the capstone project must be more comprehensive than a single 15-hour class. There are other trends in capstone projects that CCGA should be aware of as well. In Engineering for example, there has been a movement towards collaborative capstone projects, as opposed to solitary capstone projects. The UCSC Graduate Council is trying to maintain a basic standard with respect to these collaborative capstones.

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed the capstone issue, voicing concern about professionally programs that are practice-oriented; they might have some pre-conceived notions about what capstone projects entails. Their mode of assessment may be different than a traditional

report or paper. Therefore, if CCGA prescribes a capstone project too precisely, this may be problematic for these types of programs. That said, individual contributions (within collaborative projects) must be made clear in whatever mode the students are being assessed on. There should be some latitude in this area, but the capstone must remain a culminating experience. Assessment by more than one person is also a good idea. Another member opined that it is good practice to have one person in charge of the project, as there is a danger in inconsistent grading from multiple graders. A comprehensive exam may also be considered a capstone – specifically this is a Type II Masters capstone, which is usually judged by the entire committee, and is subject to a “Pass/Fail” assessment. Members expressed a desire to have some guidelines with respect to capstone projects.

ACTION: 1) CCGA will request the memo/proposal to waive non-resident tuition in Engineering programs; and 2) Chair Mastronarde will draft a letter to graduate councils in order to establish guidelines for capstone projects.

- **UCSD Graduate Council:** Some SSP program proposers have recently expressed interest in expedited reviews; there is an expectation that the process will be very brief at the systemwide level. The San Diego member asked if the option of an expedited review should be taken out of the CCGA Handbook in order to deflate this expectation. Chair Mastronarde clarified that the current language states that CCGA will make this assessment on a case-by-case basis. Indeed, it is often the case that long reviews come from delays in getting responses from the program proposers to external critiques of the proposal; and not from obtaining the external reviews themselves. Members agreed that CCGA should have the flexibility to do an expedited review, but retain its own measures of quality control. Some fine tuning may be needed for the CCGA Handbook; Chair Mastronarde will identify these and bring them to the March meeting.

ACTION: Chair Mastronarde will identify gaps (with respect to proposal requirements) in the CCGA Handbook for the March meeting.

- **UCR Graduate Council:** The Riverside representative reported back to the Committee on Online Masters program in Engineering. He has begun his research into this program, but he is not finished. At this point, he is concerned about an internal push to lower the admission requirements.
- **UCSF Graduate Council:** There is some concern that UCSF may be paying less for honorariums to its external reviews of existing programs than other campuses. He asked for input on how much other campuses are paying for their honorariums, as well as who pays these honorariums. One member replied that \$1,000 is probably typical at many UC campuses, which is probably less than other institutions. In most cases, the campus central administration pays for the review.
- **UCI Graduate Council:** UCI has developed a good list of the practices with respect to program reviews from the different campuses; she will send it out to committee members. One issue is the support for these reviews – are resources available to retain quality reviewers and are the reviews being completed in a timely fashion? She noted that the reviews of “Schools” are done every ten years; it is therefore very difficult to tie any funding decisions to these reviews. They are also looking at both the review process holistically, as well as the different measures that reviews should consider; they are asking how closely funding should be tied to these measures. Last year, the Irvine Graduate Dean also began to collect comparative data on stipends that departments pay to

graduate students. The goal of this collection is to better assess programs against programs at comparable and competitive institutions.

ACTION: The Irvine representative will send out campus data on program reviews to CCGA members.

- **UCB Graduate Council:** The Berkeley Graduate Council has been asked to review and approve certificates. Another member noted that CCGA addressed certificates in 2009 in its [memo](#) on certificates (“SR 735 certificates”). The Berkeley representative also responded to CCGA’s inquiry about online masters programs, noting that UCB has three online Masters programs. One program representative noted that there is often more frequent feedback on the online program (as opposed to traditional campus-based program). However, faculty teaching in this program must often do so on an overload basis. One solution is to apply time limits on how long faculty can serve on overload status. There are also differences in the pedagogy between online and traditional programs; professional development workshops are helpful in this regard. Developing a sense of community is difficult for online programs, but it is accomplished by frequent and timely responses to student inquiries and questions. Student services, especially within the context of job-placement, are very important; one program hired a staff member for this purpose. Start-up costs for these programs are significant, and usually require loans to cover expenses over the first couple of years.
- **UCM Graduate Council:** The Merced representative asked how to assess graduate program proposal review of professionally-accreditable programs, such as a Master’s in Public Health (MPH). Members commented that some graduate councils have traditionally relied on CCGA to do its external reviews. Merced is particularly concerned about the resource implications of such new programs. At Merced, the faculty are currently in separate tracks in other graduate programs; the suggestion is that these tracks be brought together to form a new MPH. At this point, there is no review about whether the campus can afford it. Members made a recommendation to solicit external reviews at the campus level given the unique conditions at Merced. Other members commented that if this level of detailed review is falling upon the graduate council, it may not have champions at the appropriate levels, and the program may not be viable in the end.
- **UCD Graduate Council:** The Davis Graduate Council will have a discussion with the Provost and the EVC at its next meeting; some issues will include: 1) Follow-up to the 2012 graduate education task force report; 2) campus financial support for graduate support; 3) UCD’s relative conservatism regarding its compliance with Proposition 209; 4) campus strategic plans (current plans separate undergraduate and graduate education, but a number of analyses recommend that these two should be coupled); and 5) the lack of a parental leave policy for graduate students.

VII. New Business: Discussion – Chair Mastronarde

There was not any new business.

VIII. Executive Session – Chair Mastronarde

Minutes were not taken during executive sessions.

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

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