Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
Annual Report 2014-15

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 all 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 all 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 standards and 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 2014-15 Academic year, 38 proposals were submitted to CCGA for review; of these, 31 were approved, and seven were left to carry over into the next academic year. This included 21 new degree program proposals, of which eight were SSGPDPs and one a PDST.

Campus	Program	Degree	Request	SSGPDP
UCB	Earthquake Engineering	Master	Establish	Yes
UCB	Public Affairs*	Master	Establish	Yes
UCD	Entry Program in Nursing*	Master	Establish	Yes
UCD	Integrative Pathobiology	Graduate Group	Name Change	No
UCD	Public Health*	PhD	Establish	No
UCI	Mechanical and Aeronautical	MS/PhD	Name Change	No
UCI	MA/PhD in Integrated Composition, Improvisation, and Technology 3/13/14	MA/PhD	Establish	No
UCI	PhD in Mathematics, Computational and Systems Biology	MS/PhD	Establish	No
UCI	Legal and Forensic Psychology	Master	Establish	Yes
UCI	American Law*	Master	Establish	Yes
UCI	Art History*	MA (4+1)	Establish	No
UCLA	Near Eastern Languages and Cultures and Islamic Languages Interdepartmental Degree, Islamic Studies, Public Health, Islamics.	MA/ C. Phil PhD MPH	Transfer/ Discontinue/ Rename	No

UCLA	Applied Linguistics	Department	Disestablish	No
UCLA	Online Engineering	MS	Establish	No
UCLA	Physics and Biology in Medicine	MS	Name Change	No
UCLA	Applied Statistics	MS	Establish	Yes
UCLA	Social Sciences*	Master	Establish	Yes
UCLA	Teaching Asian Languages*	MA	Establish	No
UCLA	Biochemistry, Molecular and Structural Biology	Program	Name Change	No
UCLA	Herb Alpert School of Music Arts and Architecture	Schools	Preproposal: Reconstitute, Establish, Redefine	No
UCLA	Nursing Science	PhD	Convert from DNSc	No
UCM	Sociology	MA/Phd	Establish	No
UCM	IIGP	N/A	Approve/ Extend	No
UCSB	Global Studies	MA	Name Change	No
UCSC	Scientific Computing and Applied Mathematics	MS	Establish	No
UCSD	Education	PhD	Establish	No
UCSD	IR/PS	MPP	Establish	PDST
UCSD	Applied Social Science	JDP	Establish	No
UCSD	Business Analytics	MS	Establish	Yes
UCSD	Biostatistics	PhD	Establish	No
UCSD	Master of International Affairs	Master	Name Change	No
UCSF	Rehabilitation Science	PhD	Establish	No
UCSF	Anatomy	PhD	Disestablish	No
UCSF	Biochemistry	PhD	Disestablish	No
UCSF	Nursing	DNSc	Disestablish	No

UCSF	Microbiology	PhD	Disestablish	No
UCSF	Physiology	PhD	Disestablish	No
UCSF	Pain Management	Certificate	Disestablish	No

*Indicates proposals that were carried over to 2015-16

Topics of Note During the 2014-15 Year

Degree Titles for Professional Degree Programs
Starting in 2013-14 CCGA became increasingly concerned about the use of Master's degree titles for degree programs which are professional by nature and thus undermine the distinctiveness of academic graduate degrees. In 2014-15 the discussion culminated in a decision of CCGA to use the following guidelines for degree names when evaluating graduate program degree proposals:

> CCGA Guidance on Degree Titles
> In recent years CCGA has tried to uphold the distinctiveness of academic graduate degrees by strongly supporting the view that a professional Master's degree should not be an M.A. or M.S., but rather a Master of X (with X being whatever the professional specialization is; e.g., "Master of Professional Accountancy").
>
> CCGA therefore recommends to proposers of new degrees and to local Graduate Councils and Graduate Deans that in the development and review of new proposals this distinction be carefully considered. Proposals for programs that are professional in nature (as indicated primarily by program content but also disciplinary practice, conventions of institutional peers nationally, students served, and likely employment prospects for graduates) should by default use Master of X rather than M.A. or M.S. degree titles. Programs deemed professional for purposes of being offered as Self-supporting Graduate Professional Degrees or of charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition should also use Master of X degree titles. Use of M.A. or M.S. titles in professional program proposals can be proposed, if an explicit justification is given. Such a justification might be the requirements of an accrediting or licensing authority, the generally accepted practice of a discipline on a national basis, or the relatively high research content in a hybrid degree (e.g., one combining research and technical elements with elements of applied practice and management).
>
> Previously approved degrees that do not follow this practice are not required to change titles. We have no desire to create extra work for those who have already been reviewed and approved. But if any program wishes to seek a name change to conform to this recommendation, CCGA will look favorably upon such a request.

These guidelines on degree titles were also added to the CCGA Handbook.

UC-wide Strategy for Developing Professional Degree Programs

In 2014-15 CCGA received an increasing number of proposals for professional degree programs (mostly self-supporting graduate professional degree programs) and witnessed an extremely uneven distribution of such proposals and programs across the UC campuses, with some submitting a great number and others none or very few. Given the potential detrimental and beneficial effects of such programs for state-supported regular undergraduate and graduate degree programs as well as for faculty and graduate research, CCGA developed recommendations for developing professional degree programs and distributed them to the campuses via the Graduate Councils. The following is the

text of the strategy paper, which also was included in the CCGA Handbook:

CCGA Recommendations Regarding Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Current planning on different campuses in the UC system indicates that three campuses (UCI, UCLA, UCSD) anticipate starting a relatively large number of new self-supporting graduate professional degree programs, whereas the other campuses have plans for few or no such programs. Given the potentially substantial impact - for better or worse - of these programs on our campuses' instruction and research, CCGA has developed the following statements and recommendations for consideration by the divisional Graduate Councils. We hope you find these helpful in the immediate and intermediate future to guide your judgment and initiatives as well as joint academic planning with the administration on your campus.

Self-supporting graduate professional degree programs differ from traditional academic programs. The complementary missions of a Research One university are research and instruction. What distinguishes UC from the Cal State system is its dedication to research, both pure and applied. Professional programs do not typically focus, as do our doctoral programs, on the generation of new discovery. They exist, in large part, to train and to certify working professionals. Apart from our well-established state-supported professional schools of law, medicine, public health, social work, and business, these programs supplement our core mission in research and instruction. In the aftermath of large budget cuts to the University of California system, the development of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs promises new streams of revenue for our campuses. At the same time, these professional programs help address the needs of the State's working professionals for high quality graduate education. Of course, all educational programs need the robust involvement of the faculty in the relevant academic unit. Faculty engagement is a prerequisite for creating any educational programs, whether traditional academic or professional.

A distinguishing feature of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs is that they have a predominantly applied focus, as seen in reviews of recent proposals for new self-supporting programs. This is often reflected in the capstone requirement and its focus on applied research and not on generating new discovery. Students in professional programs are typically working full-time or are looking to pursue a specific career.

CCGA recommends that Graduate Council and Provost's Offices on the individual campuses should jointly engage in strategic planning for self-supporting professional graduate programs. For the already very active campuses in this regard, the conversation probably needs to focus on prioritizing and sequencing new proposals and their start-up funding. For the less active campuses, Senate-administration discussions might focus on exploring opportunities and identifying and overcoming possible obstacles (e.g., regional constraints may be overcome with online formats). CCGA would like to see in the introduction section of every proposal for a new self-supporting program answers to the following questions: How does this program fit into the campus' priority planning for self-supporting programs and into its overall strategic academic plan?

We recommend that campuses conduct rigorous marketing analyses to identify the professional graduate programs that will attract robust cohorts of applicants over the next decade. Launching a self-supporting program takes a significant investment of faculty and administrative time as well as start-up funds. To assess the market for some self-supporting programs, campuses may look at the professional education needs in their local or regional community, whereas for evaluating the potential for other programs, particularly those that promise the on-line delivery of courses, campuses may want to evaluate national or international demand. Estimates of market need for a given professional program should be based on high-quality and specifically targeted analyses, which may require seeking the input from a consulting company for higher education institutions or for economic modeling.

We recommend that campuses invest in these programs with sufficient start-up packages for developing new courses and advertising, additional faculty where needed, and support services necessary to ensure not just self-supporting status, but sufficient growth to yield revenue beyond mere cost-coverage.

CCGA believes strongly that self-supporting professional master programs must adhere to UC's commitment to affordability and accessibility and should have solid financial aid components. This implies that a significant part of the revenue from a new program should be reinvested in financial aid, particularly in programs that are targeting applicants with limited financial means.

Our campuses and their respective Senate Graduate Councils and Offices for Planning and Budget should assess at regular intervals (possibly every three years) whether these programs are thriving, whether the funds they generate are supporting the core mission of the university, and whether they are draining faculty time from teaching in traditional academic programs or from research.

If programs do not thrive, there needs to be a process in place, administered by the respective Graduate Councils, to sunset them. With the judicious choice of particular programs to develop, self-supporting programs should be generating strong revenue by year five.

We strongly recommend that campuses think ahead about the proper distribution of "profits" from these programs. We know that some programs will be more financially successful than others, and we fear that serious inequities might result. We strongly recommend, therefore, that campuses think ahead about the proper distribution of "profits" from these programs between the sponsoring department, school, and general campus. We realize the need for incentives, but we also fear a situation in which some parts of a given campus may enjoy the lion share of revenue generated by professional programs, while other parts of that campus, where entrepreneurial efforts are less promising, languish with far less support for their research and doctoral programs.

In sum, CCGA recommends that the Graduate Councils on all campuses engage in serious strategic academic and budgetary planning efforts regarding SSGPDPs with the cooperation of their campus' Provost and key leaders in budget and planning.

Open Access
At its December 3 meeting, CCGA discussed the extension of the Open Access policy to non-faculty staff and graduate students. CCGA noted that the policy for both faculty and non-faculty groups appeared to have been designed for fields in which productivity is measured primarily in articles rather than in books. However, in many disciplines in the humanities, as well as some social sciences, an argument first sketched out in an article will often be refined, expanded, and become the center of a book-length work. At the same time, book publishers have become reluctant to publish manuscripts with sections that have already appeared in print. Expressions in the proposal like "open access, "extending opportunity" and "allows non-Senate authors of scholarly articles to maintain legal control over their research articles," sound reassuring, but the proposal failed to allow for nonparticipation if everyone is required to deposit her/his work. The policy promised openness and freedom, it nevertheless, imposed restrictions. Most humanities faculty cannot augment their nine-month salaries through their research. If a faculty member opts for a "commercial license" for reuse, will the university collect the royalties to the book that they have uploaded and pass those along to the author? Will a university official or a censorship committee assess whether a particular text is suitable for a general audience?

CCGA strongly suggested that the open access policy be rewritten to reflect the ability to "Opt In" rather than "Opt Out." CCGA saw graduate students and postdocs as particularly vulnerable to the disadvantages of an Opt-Out open access policy, it should be re-considered for faculty in order to protect the legitimate interests of scholars in the humanities and social sciences.

Doctoral Student Support
At its November 5 meeting, CCGA considered several draft proposals related to doctoral student support, namely in the areas of professional development and partnerships, non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST), competitiveness in net stipends, and competitiveness in diversity and student recruitment.

Overall, CCGA felt that the issue of NRST was being adequately addressed at the campus level. Members expressed concern that the adoption of a uniform, systemwide policy would reduce the efficacy of the individual campus solutions. Members agreed that:

- NRST should not to be charged (or reimbursed) to graduate students after the first year to equalize domestic and international students.
- NRST should not be charged to grants.
- The NRST process needs to be transparent and predictable enough that campuses can communicate confidently and definitively in their offer letters to students.

Professional Development

CCGA was asked for input with regard to Professional Development. Members agreed that there is probably much being done on individual campuses that could be shared and replicated for the benefit of all of the campuses. Many noted that it would be helpful to have a designated person to help with career advisement in non-academic careers. Collaboration with existing campus career centers might be an effective strategy. In general, it was recognized that professional development systemwide can be "hit and miss" from campus to campus and department to department. CCGA expressed little interest in the concept of developing a centralized means to share best practices. It suggested that online tools that already exist, such as VersatilePhD.com, be used and that available funding instead be channeled to funding for faculty mentorships, career center development/liaisons, information sharing methods, and staffing to make these resources more available, accessible, and widely-known.

Diversity Programs & Proposals

CCGA was asked for input as to whether, and to what extent, the Summer Bridge, UC-HBCU, and HSI/TCU programs could be expanded if funding is increased. The committee was strongly supportive of these programs and felt that they should be expanded and strengthened as much as possible.

Members discussed the possibility of building more intersegmental ties and processes to help broaden and strengthen the pipeline for URMs to extend beyond grant funding. URM undergraduates should be actively exposed to more than one UC campus so that they will think of staying within the UC system for graduate school.

In addition to providing incentives for UCs to reach out and build institutional relationships with CSUs, the University might also explore other activities such as providing undergraduates with a "visiting quarter" with some graduate-level coursework and experience at least two years prior to application. UC should also facilitate the success of first generation, economically disadvantaged, and scholastically (i.e., high-schools in poor neighborhoods) disadvantaged students.

The committee unanimously agreed that efforts to increase and strengthen diversity should be strongly championed.

Reconfiguration of the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Position

At its meeting on October 1, 2014, the members of CCGA met with Interim Vice President Tucker and discussed the future organizational structure of the Office of Graduate Education, Research, and Technology Innovation. The committee emphasized the critical need for a dedicated and continuously active leader to oversee Graduate Studies. While a leadership position for Graduate Studies may or may not be joined with the Office of Research and/or Technology Innovation, close collaboration of these efforts is required. Graduate education and graduate students' contributions to the research and technology innovation missions are at the core of the University of California.

Acknowledgements

President William Tucker, Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; Academic Planning Manager Kimberly Peterson, Academic Planning and Research Analyst Chris Procello, and Council of Graduate Deans representative Tyrus Miller (UCSC). Special thanks to Council Chair Mary Gilly, Council Vice Chair Dan Hare, Senate Associate Director Jocelyn Banaria and Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter.

Respectfully submitted,

Jutta Heckhausen, Chair (UCI)   John Kim (UCR)
Valerie Leppert, Vice Chair (UCM)   David Salmon (UCSD)
Shauna Sommerville (UCB)   Karen Duderstadt (UCSF)
John Bolander (UCD)   Tania Israel (UCSB)
Carol Burke (UCI)   Ken Kletzer (UCSC)
Alex Bui (UCLA)   Erica Smeltzer, Student Representative
Kathleen Hull (UCM)