

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting**Tuesday, January 5, 2010****10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.****UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320****Telephone: 510-987-9466**<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>**I. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates – Chair Farid Chehab**

- Dec. 16 Academic Council Meeting:
 - The budget will again be a key challenge this year.
 - Russ Gould, Chair of the Board Regents will attend the February Council meeting; nominations for the 2010-11 Academic Senate Vice Chair will also be discussed.
 - The annual Council/Chancellor's annual meeting is set for April 7, followed by the usual Council meeting on April 28.
 - Master Plan Hearing: A key conclusion was that the Master Plan is not broken but that it is broke (figuratively, underfunded). The three segments (UC/CSU/CCCs) supported face-to-face advocacy meetings with legislators. They also agreed that the Master Plan could be tweaked, but changes should leave the spirit of the Master Plan intact.
 - Gould Commission: Council heard reports and floating concepts from three Working Groups, followed by a far-reaching discussion on: how to interface with the State on the Master Plan; how should UC grow and/or shrink; joint JDPs and where purview lies (UC or CSU?); how UCOP interfaces with campuses; how can UCOP facilitate interaction with MRUs; the concept of 3-year undergraduate program; a "high fee" model for professional Master's programs/SSPs; the idea that some undergraduate courses can be taught systemwide; the concept of no student fees in return for a contract with students to pay-off fees after graduation; what defines UC quality; the pros and cons of online instruction including whether or not UC quality can be maintained; the role of graduate education; the ratio of academic vs. professional graduate students, research policies, and industry engagement .
 - President Yudof announced that freshman enrollment will decrease by 2,500 students for a second straight year and still leave 14,000 undergraduates unfunded systemwide; he also reported that transfer student applications are up by 20%.
 - Council reached a compromise with Berkeley Chancellor Bergeneau on the format for special honorary degrees from that campus; Council opposed the Differential Fee proposal; modifications to the Patent Acknowledgement Policy and revisions to the Compendium were also discussed.
- PDPE Draft Report: A revised report is expected sometime in mid-January. CCGA will have the opportunity to discuss and provide comments, if needed. The report provides recommendations for the funding shortfall for graduate students; adopting new graduate growth enrollment goals; no changes in allocation for graduate student diversity support; simplifying budgets for graduate funding; and easing of restrictions on how certain funding sources can be used.

- The GSHIP proposal was accepted by the Regents. Provost Pitts is assembling a team to formulate new UC policy for implementation by fall 2010 chaired by Jeff Gibeling and Joe Castro which will include representatives from each campus, the Graduate Deans, UC students and the Academic Senate. Chair Chehab asked for a CCGA member to serve as the Senate representative; John Hildebrand (UCSD) volunteered.

II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the December 5, 2009 Meeting Minutes
- Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved with minor modifications and the minutes as noticed.

III. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Council, Academic Affairs

Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Henry Powell, Chair Academic Council

Daniel Simmons, Vice Chair Academic Council

Todd Greenspan, Director Academic Planning

Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

S. Beckwith:

- NSF AGAP Grant: grant renewal in question due to larger funding challenges and NSF mismanagement; NSF would like to continue supporting UC system graduate diversity efforts and has invited UC to submit a proposal.
- VP Beckwith discussed structural issues pertaining to graduate education including budget pressures disincentives to growing graduate enrollment and the relative cost and advantages of hiring graduate students vs. post docs. He spoke to the need for a coherent business model for UC graduate education enterprise and for multiple strategies to encourage faculty to choose to hire graduate students when given the choice. Return-to aid for graduate student funding could be an incentive. One member noted that some deans mandate that grant proposals include a request for graduate student support funds. Another expressed dismay over UCOP's seemingly unsympathetic public response to student protests over fee increases and their real impact on students. Others felt that the University needs to do a better job of explaining the cost of educating graduate students (how fees are allocated; e.g., x percent of every dollar funds y). Chair Chehab asked if the University administration considers that undergraduate fees support graduate education and if so, the math doesn't add up considering that current undergraduate fees don't even cover the cost of undergraduate education (fees cover about 45% only, the rest coming from state sources). VP Beckwith replied that it's more like English departments (with more students enrolled at lower cost) subsidizing engineering departments (fewer students enrolled at higher cost).

H. Powell/D. Simmons:

- Chair Powell announced that he, Vice Chair Dan Simmons and Chair Chehab are planning to meet with Regent George Marcus on current graduate issues with a goal of cultivating support for graduate education at the Regental level; an invitation to attend a future CCGA meeting will also be extended to Regent Marcus. Also in the works is invitation to President Yudof to attend a future CCGA meeting.

- Vice Chair Dan Simmons reported that ICAS has adopted a paper on Master Plan in which it suggests that UC reconsider its historic position on its purview over graduate professional degree programs at a time when CSU’s interest in growing its role and establishing its own doctorate degree programs, apart from the joint UC/CSU JDPs. He noted the importance of asking how degree proposals/endeavors contribute to UC mission and questioned what kinds of standards and broad framework are to guide UC’s thinking how the segments can best respond to the state’s future educational and training needs. Chair Powell noted a change in the political terrain with regard to terminal Master’s degrees and that with historic differences on key issues between the segments shrinking on the importance of cultivating relationships between UC, CSU and the CCCs.

T. Greenspan/H. Baxter:

Hilary Baxter noted that the ICAS paper raises a series of questions on professional doctorates, potentially opening the door for CSU to offer all but professional doctorates. She asked for Council’s thoughts and extent of UC’s participation in drafting the statement.

IV. Continued Roundtable on the Value of UC as Research Institution, Graduate Education and Why Graduate Students are Critical to UC – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: CCGA is preparing a document on the value of UC as a graduate research institution. At the last meeting, members reviewed a draft letter and considered additional information that would be advantageous to include in the document’s appendix and illustrate the accomplishments achieved by University faculty and students across multiple disciplines. It was agreed that each member would contribute to the appendix by providing a list of significant achievements from their respective campus. Specifically, members were asked to provide examples of programs from their local campus that have contributed to the environment, economy, arts, sciences, humanities, and quality of life in California and beyond.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed edits and changes before finalizing the draft letter. Suggested edits included the addition of a concluding statement or paragraph, e.g., what are we asking the reader to do; correction that CFCs are not global warming issue (omit global warming and replace grave environmental danger to the planet; addition of an example or two to the third to last paragraph; including non-scientific examples in the body of paper; and that the paragraph on post-graduate endeavors should focus on contributions to the state.

ACTION: Chair Chehab asked members to please get their contributions for the appendices turned in for inclusion with the final version of the letter.

V. **Gould Commission on the Future: Research Strategies Working Group Update** – *Chair Chehab and immediate past Chair of the Academic Council Mary Croughan (UCSF)*

ISSUE: The Commission and its five working groups – on the size and shape of UC, its education and curriculum, access and affordability, and funding and research strategies – will meet through March 2010 to consider, among other issues:

- What is the right size and shape of the University going forward? Where should it grow, or should it?
- What educational delivery models will both maintain quality and improve efficiency for UC's future?
- How can UC maximize traditional and alternative revenue streams in support of its mission?

Prof. Mary Croughan and Chancellor Henry T. Yang (UCSB) are Co-Chairs of the Research Strategies Working Group. Prof. Croughan will lead a discussion on the issues put forth by the Working Group as well as other issues of potential interest to CCGA.

DISCUSSION: Prof. Croughan presented an overview of the Working Group's process for developing its list of priorities and recommendations: the critical role of research at UC; role graduate education; role of graduate research vs. faculty productivity and undergraduate education; research policies and practices needed to increase research productivity; opportunities and threats: and what can be done to recruit and retain faculty research talent. Questions raised by the discussion included: how can UC protect graduate education and keep it affordable for both faculty and graduate students; how do we maintain UC storied quality and adequately support infrastructure and support for UC faculty; the impact of losing graduate students to other universities due to \$3-4K less for their stipends; what are best practices for engaging and collaborating with private industry? Prof. Croughan noted that it is important that the process includes participation from various faculty subgroups, graduate students, postdocs, graduate student administrators, funding agencies, and alumni, and other stakeholders. Members discussed the pushback on interdisciplinary collaborations and that the Working Groups should be strategic and not purely tactical. Other comments included: How do we mitigate the impact of fee increases on graduate students and research; support for graduate students in humanities, e.g. implementing tuition remission in a way that does not adversely impact departmental budgets. One member expressed concern over function and reach of IRBs and questioned how to merge varying traditions and scale of humanities vs. science grant funding and accompanying stipulations, levels of rewards and recognition and what are the institutions barriers that inhibit productivity.

ACTION: No further action was taken. Prof. Croughan will report back to CCGA for further discussion before the Working group formulates its recommendations to the Regents.

VI. Preliminary Draft of Proposed Revisions to the Compendium – Chair Chehab and Associate Director Todd Giedt

ISSUE: A joint task force of Academic Senate and UCOP staff members presented a preliminary draft of proposed changes to the Compendium to the Academic Council in December 2009. Revisions to the Compendium are particularly timely as many of the topics to be addressed by the Gould Commission on the Future impinge upon the purview of the Academic Senate. CCGA had been asked to provide informal comments on the preliminary draft (Council will decide in January on whether to send the draft for Systemwide review). Prof. Tony Norman (UCR) is chair of the Compendium Review Task Force; Todd Giedt is lead staff to the task force. Immediate past Vice Chair of CCGA Ken Rose (UCSB) served as CCGA's representative on the task force. Chair Chehab will present a synthesis of comments and edits from the Compendium Review Task Force Report. CCGA members discussed their perspectives on the proposed revisions and provided additional comments or edits on the preliminary draft.

DISCUSSION: As a point of process, Chair Chehab suggested that the committee go through the list of recommendations and determine which of these it wants to opine or modify. Committee comments included:

- *Page 107 line 7, should be “education leadership”*
- *Page 108: Addition of designated emphases should be discussed as part of the new compendium and recommended to be approved either on campus and/or at CCGA. We recommend that they be approved on each campus, but consultation with CCGA is an option.*
- *Page 108: Add that the discontinuation of a program should first be approved by the divisional Grad Council and then by CCGA.*
- *Page 112: We don't think that the Senate paid less attention to financial viability of new Schools. The UCR Med School, the SON UCD school were discussed in terms of long term financial viabilities. Consider revising this statement.*
- *Page 113: Should we have an option that Council can put a momentary freeze on new School proposals in difficult financial times?*
- *Page 114: State that the minimum timeline for a new school approval is two years from the time the pre-proposal is submitted.*
- *Page 115: New proposals for Schools should also include external reviewers, who often have a completely different outlook than internal reviewers. Consider adding the option of external reviewers.*
- *Last page: Add a statement that CCGA along with UCPB and UCEP should discuss and make recommendations to Council for reviewing systemwide schools. In addition, CCGA will review and approve systemwide academic programs just like campus-specific programs.*

ACTION: The Committee agreed to forward the above comments to Council's Task Force. Chair Chehab will forward CCGA's comments to the task force Chair Prof. Tony Norman.

VII. Review of the Legislative Analyst’s Office Report – The Master Plan at 50: Improving State Oversight of Academic Expansion – Chair Chehab and Associate Director Todd Giedt

ISSUE: A recently issued report from the state Legislative Analyst’s Office recommending greater legislative oversight of the establishment of new academic programs and schools across California’s public higher education segments was briefly discussed at the December Academic Council meeting. The report takes issue with UC over its approval of new Schools in recent years and calls for needed structural changes to the approval process for new programs and schools. Future Council discussions are planned and a formal response from the Academic Senate is expected. A copy of CPEC’s program review guidelines is included as additional background.

DISCUSSION: Chair Chehab provided an overview and shared his take on the report’s key recommendations and implications for UC and CPEC processes. Committee comments included:

- *The recommendations to reverse the review process (page 29) are a top down approach, which is quite different than the UC culture where academic programs start with a group of faculty members more in the spirit of a grassroots approach.*
- *The suggestion that the Legislature will make recommendations about the fields in which to develop graduate programs is also not in line with UC programs development, since often times UC generates those fields and drives market demand. The recommendations in Figure 6 on page 31 are unacceptable and essentially propose that CPEC will dictate the growth of programs. The academic spirit of programs and School development is a major driving force in their future success.*
- *Sharing pre-proposals of Schools with CPEC is a reasonable suggestion and change to the current review process.*
- *The CPEC review should be prior to the Senate review. CCGA doesn’t see any reason why CCGA and CPEC reviews could not be concurrent. This would allow CPEC to have an opinion early in the process rather than late.*
- *On page 17 of the report, SB 724 allowed the CSUs to offer Ed.D. programs in Education Leadership only (not any Ed.D. program).*
- *CPEC review should remain advisory and in this context UC’s decision to continue with UCI’s law school did not break any rule (page 27).*

ACTION: The Committee agreed to forward the above comments for possible incorporation in Council’s formal response to the report.

VIII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a graduate degree program in Architecture-Based Enterprise Systems Engineering leading to the Master of Advance Studies (M.A.S.) at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Morris Maduro (UCM)

REPORT: Prof. Maduro provided an overview of the proposal and reported that he is in the process of identifying potential reviewers.

B. Proposal for a Ph.D. degree program in Epidemiology and Translational Science at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UC Davis)

REPORT: Prof. Goodhue summarized the one external review received which she described as mostly positive. She will follow-up with the reviewer on a few questions raised in the review. She is waiting for 3 to 4 others reviews to come in.

C. Proposal for an M.S. degree program in Dental Hygiene at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Steven Nelson (UCLA)

REPORT: Prof. Nelson presented an overview of the proposal and reported that 1 of 4 reviews have come in; the review was supportive.

D. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Nursing Science and Health-Care Leadership at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Ira Tager (UCB)

REPORT: A letter summarizing CCGA’s key concerns was sent to the campus. Prof. Tager will be conducting a site visit where he will meet the proponents next week.

E. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. degree program in Chicana and Chicano Studies at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Jim Carmody (UCSD)

REPORT: Prof. Carmody reported that he has received one external review from Yale which he described as very positive. He is waiting for a review from Columbia.

F. Proposal for a joint UC San Diego/SDSU Ph.D. degree program in Engineering Sciences (Bioengineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Structural Engineering) – Lead Reviewer Valerie Leppert (UCM) .

REPORT: A letter summarizing CCGA’s key concerns was sent to the campus and Prof. Leppert is waiting for the campus response.

IX. New Business

- **UC Global Health Institute formerly known as the UC School of Global Health – Chair Chehab**

ISSUE: The July 2009 decision to create the UC Global Health Institute rather than a UC School of Global Health as first proposed in 2006 raises questions about the extent of review and approval processes associated with establishing a new institute or School, e.g., new degree proposals for a new School are subject to Academic Senate approval, but it is not clear what Senate approval is required for a new institute to enroll candidates for existing degrees. Furthermore, the Institute’s plans to establish three new “Centers of Expertise” funded entirely by external sources raise similar concerns that the academic review of these centers may not be as rigorous or thorough as the Senate’s customary review process for Multicampus Research Units (MRUs) for example.

DISCUSSION: The Committee discussed issues associated with planning for a systemwide entity such as the UC Global Health Institute and discussed a mechanism to review systemwide schools and associated graduate academic programs. Chair Chehab questioned which existing local degrees referenced will be used by the Institute and raised the same question with curricular changes. He expressed opinion that Institute reviews should follow the same Academic Senate process as other new graduate groups/programs. Others suggested that such proposals should also be reviewed by the Committee on Research and that the Institute’s plans for distributed model to grant degrees from multiple campuses constitute a significant change. Academic Senate Director Martha Winnacker noted concern that no formal senate review was conducted yet as no proposal was submitted and that the process and its mechanisms of funding were fairly well advanced and that a formal proposal has been requested.

ACTION: The Committee will continue its discussion at the next meeting.

X. Executive Session (members only)

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest: Farid Chehab, CCGA Chair
Prepared by Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst

CCGA 2009-10 Remaining Meeting Schedule:

February 2, 2010 – Room 12322
March 2, 2010 – Room 12322
April 6, 2010 – Room 12322
May 4, 2010 – Room 12322
June 1, 2010 – Room 12322