COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Annual Report 2018-19

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Per Senate bylaw 180, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) advises/ the University President and all agencies of the Senate on matters regarding research and learning related to graduate education. One of CCGA's chief responsibilities, as delegated by the Regents, is the authority to review and evaluate campus proposals for new graduate programs and schools that require approval of the President. In addition, CCGA establishes basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various graduate councils and divisions, recommends to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students, reviews policies applied by graduate councils, reviews policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies, and approves UC graduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in divisional catalogs.

Review of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs

During the 2018-19 Academic year, CCGA approved 25 program proposals, and declined one. Eight of the approved proposals were Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), and one proposal was a PDST (Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition). Seven proposals are currently under review and will carry over to the 2019-20 year.

Programs Approved During the 2018-19 Year

Campus	Program	Date Received	Date Approved	SSGPDP?
UCB	Master of Bioprocess Engineering	5/17/18	2/6/19	Yes
UCB	Flexible Master of Social Welfare	10/30/18	3/6/19	Yes
UCB	Master of Design	1/2/19	5/1/19	Yes
UCD	Online MBA	8/16/18	4/3/19	Yes
UCD	Certificate in Future Undergraduate Science Educators	3/21/19	7/3/19	No
UCI	PhD in Language Science	7/24/18	4/3/19	No
UCI	Master of Engineering	7/24/18	2/6/19	Yes
UCI	MS in Public Health	1/15/18	3/6/19	No
UCLA	MS/PhD in Communication	5/9/18	11/7/18	No
UCLA	Master of Legal Studies	12/5/18	6/5/19	Yes
UCM	MS/PhD in Bioengineering	5/31/18	9/26/18	No
UCM	MS/PhD in Materials and Biomaterials Science and Engineering	6/9/18	9/26/18	No
UCM	MS/PhD in Management of Complex Systems	6/28/18	11/7/18	No
UCR	MS/PhD in Biophysics	7/12/18	12/5/18	No
UCR	Master in Supply Chain and Logistics Management	6/12/18	3/6/19 (not approved)	Yes
UCR	MS/PhD in Entomology	6/12/18	4/3/19	No
UCSB	Master of Environmental Data Science	5/1/19	8/9/19	No
UCSC	MS in Molecular, Cell, and Developmental Biology	5/21/18	11/7/18	No
UCSC	MFA in Environmental Art and Social Practice	7/16/18	8/9/19	No

UCSC	MS in Natural Language Processing	6/21/17	4/4/18	No
UCSD	MA in Global Health	3/26/18	12/5/18	No
UCSD	School of Public Health	2/20/19	6/5/19	No
UCSD	MS in Biostatistics	5/24/18	11/7/18	No
UCSD	BA/MPP in Economics	1/8/19	1/9/19	No
UCSF	MS in Genetic Counseling	12/18/18	6/5/19	No
UCSF	Certificate in Supplemental Studies in Advanced Practice in Nursing	11/8/18	3/6/19	Yes

The committee worked diligently with campuses and faculty throughout the year to help them craft and improve proposals that would meet the University's expectations of excellence.

Proposals Under Review to be Carried Over to 2019-20

Campus	Program	Date Received	Status	SSGPDP?
UCI	Master of Presentation Design	7/24/18	Waiting on campus feedback	Yes
UCI	Master of Data Science	2/13/19	Under Review	Yes
UCI	Master of English	3/2719	Under Review	Yes
UCI	School of Pharmacy	6/25/19	Under Review	No
UCI	PhD in Global Studies	4/5/19	Under Review	No
UCLA	Master of Applied Geospatial Information Systems and Technologies (Online)	5/14/19	Under Review	Yes
UCSC	MS in Human Computer Interaction	3/21/19	Under Review	No

Topics of Note During the 2018-19 Year

SSGPDP Review

The Academic Senate Chair requested that CCGA, UCPB, and UCAP undertake a program review of the self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) as a whole, not of particular programs. The review, led by CCGA, took a step back to see how successful the SSGPDP program has been relative to its stated goals and to gauge its impact on curricula and students, budget and faculty. Also, the Regents are very concerned about diversity, and it is unclear if SSGPGPs are working to address diversity goals in their programs. At the end of the year, CCGA, UCPB and UCAP sent an interim report to the Academic Council, noting what was done and learn so far and that the review is still ongoing and will be completed by the incoming CCGA, UCPB and UCAP slates. One of the things that was learned in the process of undertaking the evaluation is just how complicated the SSGPDP landscape is, how rapid the growth of self-supporting degree programs has been, and how difficult it is to track and assess certain aspects of self-supporting programs, including areas of greatest interest to the Academic Senate and the three committees mentioned above.

CCGA, UCPB and UCAP worked together to develop a set of questions to be distributed to individual campuses to begin to assess SSGPDPs in terms of academic quality, finances, contributions to the university mission, etc. It was soon realized that administering a single questionnaire would be difficult. Some questions might need to be answered by program directors, others by departmental staff, others by assistant deans, and so forth. As UCI had just put together two task forces looking at resource implications of SSGPDPs and

implementation issues, the joint review took advantage of this situation to pilot the questionnaire at Irvine with the help of staff in the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Planning. The latter had multiple in-person meetings with SSGPDP stakeholders on-campus and gathered considerable information relevant to the systemwide review. The systemwide committee then reviewed and discussed the information gathered, primarily at UCPB with a CCGA representative present and participating. CCGA also began to collate completed program reviews of approved SSGPDPs for further detailed analyses for aggregate and trend patterns without singling out any specific SSGPDP. With the support of Academic Affairs, CCGA also began to look at the existing UCOP data on SSGPDPs across the UC.

There is enormous variety in SSGPDP types, from entirely online programs, small programs aimed at niche clienteles, large ones providing fairly traditional professional training, those that draw locally, to those that draw internationally. There does appear to be a trend toward programs that look much like state-supported graduate programs (viz., fulltime programs with courses offered during the week and during usual working hours). Further, one can also roughly split SSGPDP types into two major categories: those that generate sufficient income to hire faculty who teach in the program on-load (most notably the case for business degrees); and those that draw entirely or mainly on faculty hired to staff state-supported programs and who teach on overload, whose courses are on-load and "bought out," or a mixture of the two. Both UCI and UCLA have recently pushed in the direction of overload teaching as the default for SSGPDPs in order to mitigate impacts on state-supported programs. This is not a model that works for all programs, however, such as the business programs just mentioned. On the whole, there are few programs that currently generate more than relatively moderate revenues, and some are currently in the red. Most programs are still in the process of being phased in, so revenues may go up in the middle or longer term (except for those programs not designed as scalable or intended for niche clienteles—often one and the same).

One of the possible goals of SSGPDPs is to provide supplemental funding for state-supported programs and traditional university missions. UCPB was therefore particularly interested in finding out how the revenues are being used. It was discovered that it is actually very difficult to track this. Program directors do not usually know the answer to this question; they simply know, at best, how a given program is "taxed." A department chair might know how the portion of revenues that remains in the department is employed, but not all programs are housed in departments. Most revenues, however, go into a general fund at the level of the dean, where they become by and large untraceable. Interestingly, when asked what revenues were used for, the most prevalent response of interviewees was "graduate support." It is not known at this point whether this response names a truth or is simply an impression. Further, it is unclear that indirect costs are being adequately accounted.

Going forward, recipients of SSGPDP revenues should be asked to track their spending if there are to be concrete and reliable answers to the question. Assistant deans are generally the best-positioned for such tracking. (Note there is no suspicion that revenues are being used inappropriately. Rather, it would be useful not only to understand how SSGPDP revenues are supporting the university missions and perhaps even to showcase the good to which such revenues can be put. This might lead to the discovery that the generally modest income margins to date that self-supporting programs, which require significant faculty and staff time and effort to run, are an efficient way to supplement otherwise underfunded university missions.

There is a similar vagueness with the measurement of academic quality, a topic in which CCGA is particularly interested. Notably, UCI's Graduate Council only recently began requiring that new SSGPDP proposals explicitly address student learning objectives/outcomes (SLOs). In itself, this is not unusual, as SLOs and other assessment tools have only barely begun to penetrate graduate degree programs, with the exception of those where accreditation is at stake. Potentially more troubling is that self-supporting programs have generally been treated as extraneous to the core teaching mission of schools and have thus largely escaped scrutiny during academic program reviews (where self-supporting programs have existed long enough to have been subject to such reviews in the first place). The UCOP mandated third-year review of all newly established SSGPDPs is vague in its intent but appears mainly aimed at measuring financial viability. The third year of operation may be premature to attempt to assess academic quality in any case. At present, all

Schools offering SSGPDPs will need to ensure that these programs are adequately addressed in periodic academic program reviews and that all programs develop SLOs and related assessment criteria. As part of this systemwide Senate review of the SSGPDP program, it may be wise to have a mandated review of academic quality after—for example—year five of operation of a given SSGPDP. This should be separate from regular academic program reviews. Of course, such a mandate would clearly place further burdens, both service and financial, on the Senate.

Another issue that needs closer monitoring and assessment is the ratio of teaching by ladder-rank faculty done on-load or overload. As noted, the trend on at least two campuses that have seen rapid growth in SSGPDPs over the past several years is toward requiring mainly overload teaching to mitigate impacts on state-supported programs. Overload will not work in all cases, however. Moreover, many programs have already been approved that allow for onload teaching (with buyout) and/or overload. Both options are stipulated as possible under current UCOP policy, although individual campuses can, of course, have more restrictive policies. Presumably, overload teaching is not without impact on state-supported programs or missions, as faculty have limited time and capacity. Teaching on overload would, for example, presumably cut into research time. Currently, compensation policies exist that limit the amount of work that can be done on overload. If SSGPDPs continue to grow, these policies will need revisiting. Further, given the wildly differing course loads among Schools on any given campus, impacts are not uniformly distributed. Indeed, because deans have the ability to set course loads, there is potential for abuse (i.e., course loads could be lowered to allow for more overload teaching and more compensation). There is no evidence that this has happened, but the potential is at least there and could lead to degradation of state-supported programs and pay/labor inequities.

The matter of onload versus overload teaching also introduces issues relevant to academic personnel review and the merit system. Overload teaching has usually been treated as outside of personnel review procedures (teaching in summer session, to take the most relevant case). In any SSGPDP in which faculty can teach either onload or on overload, the same course might be treated as either relevant to a faculty merit review or not. Since the intent is to maintain academic quality in SSGPDPs on par with state-supported programs, what would be the justification for not considering teaching performance in courses taught on overload but otherwise fully part of UC offerings? Similarly, it is not clear how service to SSGPDPs ought to be credited. Campus CAPs and CAPRAs will need to think these issues through with care, probably with central guidance from UCAP.

The picture with regard to diversity and accessibility is also complicated. Compared to the diversity statistics provided by UCOP in the fall of 2018 for all SSGPDPs across the system, UCI's programs on the whole seem to have made steps toward greater diversity measured in terms of gender and URM status. In the case of programs aimed primarily at international applicants, URM status becomes largely irrelevant, although there are other ways that such programs can contribute to the support of diversity on their campuses (e.g., by providing revenue for diversity-based fellowships in state-supported graduate programs). Accessibility is considerably harder to measure, as UCI does not ask for or track the socio-economic status of applicants to graduate programs. Systemwide, SSGPDPs have greatly varying return-to-aid percentages, and it is not clear how money in a return-to-aid pool can be appropriately or equitably distributed according to need given the dearth of information.

Ultimately, CCGA, UCPB and UCAP recommended that the SSGPDP program review be continued and completed in the new academic year. The incoming chairs of the three committees are aware of this need and will pursue this review to completion. As needed, the outgoing CCGA, UCPB and UCAP chairs will provide support to the incoming CCGA, UCPB and UCAP to ensure a smooth transfer and execution of the review.

Graduate Studies Issues

Academic Council Chair May told the committee that the Senate has been asked by the President to look at standardized testing. GRE value is are an issue that departments make on the campuses, and some are turning away from them. If UC decides to do away with the SAT it would have an incredible impact on the national educational scene. There are two areas – professional graduate student testing and undergraduate SAT testing. Grad admissions lies with the departments and undergrad is with the University. Executive Director Jennings voiced the hope that CCGA would look at the GRE; there is evidence that the exam disadvantages some groups and advantages others. It also been proven to not be a good indicator of student success. Chair May said that it would be useful for the committee to get a sense of methods of evaluation in different disciplines.

The committee was also asked to look at posthumous degrees for graduate students and education for incarcerated students.

Open Access Policy

CCGA members discussed the Open Access policy. The issue of revenue to publishers was important to the members and its implementation and impact on faculty and University library budgets. The committee discussed its experience, knowledge, and concerns about Open Access and how it is being implemented in parts of Europe. The committee endorsed a set of 18 principles and deferred to the Academic Council Chair to request further input from campus library committees and faculty prior to approval of the proposed policy.

The Council Chair told the committee that UC has "walked away" from the Elsevier contract. This is seen as an important Academic Freedom issue. This may result in some level of inconvenience for faculty, but the campus librarians are working to help alleviate that. In addition, libraries all over the country are ready to help with interlibrary loan. This was discussed at length by the committee.

APM 210

The COGD is working on revising APM to include graduate student supervision and mentoring as part of tenure promotion etc. They are looking at expanding it to include effective mentoring, accomplishments of mentees, degree completion, attention to completion of degrees by URMs, and successful transition to work after completion. The Vice Chair will circulate it when the draft is complete. There was considerable discussion among members about poor mentoring, lack of accountability, and lack of oversight in mentor/mentee relationships. It was suggested that perhaps mentorship teams would be a good idea. The student representative noted that it is intimidating to have one person with that much power over a student's future.

Redacting Data in Graduate Admissions

- Will redacting some information in graduate school applications increase diversity?
- If so, what information should be redacted?

The Chair said that the committee has been asked to consider this by the Senate leadership to ultimately bring forward to Council and to the Assembly. The concept would be to leave out socio-demographic information. The rationale is that the information might be used unfairly in graduate admissions. Committee members were largely opposed to this idea. The Chair asked members to bring forward any ideas they had for improving diversity in graduate admissions and also to share their concerns regarding redaction. Members said that UC is not competitive because it does not have financial rewards for diverse students. This is also true for faculty diversity.

Acknowledgements

Director Pamela Jennings, Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; Academic Planning and Research Analyst Chris Procello, and Council of Graduate Deans representative Marjorie Zatz (UCM). Thanks, too, to Academic Council Chair Robert May, Vice Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani, and Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter. Finally, special thanks to our student representatives, Deyanira Nevarez Martinez and Nicole Taylor.

Respectfully submitted,

Onyebuchi Arah, Chair (UCLA)
Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Vice Chair (UCM)   LeRoy Westerling (UCM)
Mark Wilson (UCB)   Hyle Park (UCR)
Carlson Arnett (UCD)   Lynn Russell (UCSD)
Priya Ranjan (UCI)   Beth Phoenix (UCSF)
Caroline Streeter (UCLA)   Amr El Abbadi (UCSB)
                                            Gina Dent (UCSC)