

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MINUTES OF MEETING – JANUARY 11, 2005**

**I. Chair's Announcements – *Quentin Williams***CSU Report on Doctorate Education

CSU has recently released a report, "Rethinking Graduate Education in the CSU: Meeting the Needs of the People of California for Graduate Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century". The release of this report was also accompanied by a fair amount of publicity, especially in the Central Valley. Basically, the report expresses the viewpoint that the CSU system is in a Master Plan imposed regulatory 'strait jacket'. In that respect, the report argues that the CSU is strongly motivated to provide doctorate education in certain applied fields, such as audiology and physical therapy. Specifically, Chair Williams is interested in ideas on the ways that CCGA can proactively respond to this report.

**ACTION: This report will be put on the February agenda for discussion.**

Academic Council (AC) Update

- UCAAD Graduate Admissions Guiding Principles Document: The University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) accepted all of CCGA's suggested edits to this document.
- Concurrent Resolution on Graduation Education: The Academic Council approved this resolution and the University of California (UC) is moving it forward as part of the UC legislative agenda.
- The alignment of the UC calendars was discussed.
- The draft request for proposals for the Los Alamos National Labs is out with a 60-day comment period.
- Mental Health Student Services at UC: The mental health services at UCSF and other campuses are in crisis due to the current budgetary situation with some tragic results. The AC is concerned with this issue.
- The NRC review of graduate programs has been postponed for at least one year.
- WASC: The Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS) discussed the WASC review process and its implications for UC, CSU, and the California community colleges.

**II. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Initiatives**International Education

Vice Provost Zelmanowitz noted that the role of the UC Office of the President (UCOP) is (a) coordination and (b) strategic system involvement. For example, if there is an opportunity for research collaboration in China with a requirement that only one UC proposal can be submitted, then UCOP would play a role in coordinating the efforts of the campuses to submit the best proposal possible. He also anticipates that the Provost will soon name a faculty assistant specifically devoted to this area.

Regents Meeting

At the Regents meeting next week, the Provost will give presentations on the Master Plan (to serve as an introductory primer) and graduate education at UC.

#### Applied Doctorates Update

- **Audiology:** Director Merritt reported that the Association that accredits programs in audiology has updated its implementation date by which the doctorate will become the entry-level degree for the profession. This date has been moved from 2012 to 2007. The reason for the change is that many masters' programs in audiology can easily upgrade to a doctoral-level program by adding a few additional components. Academic Affairs is currently trying to get more information regarding where UC medical schools stand as to their interest and capability in doing a self-supporting program.
- **Physical Therapy (PT):** The accreditation association just completed a review of PT professional entry-level requirements. The outcome of the review was to continue to accept the masters' degree as the entry-level program into the PT profession, however it recommended that masters' programs add additional criteria (which are also being added to doctoral programs). It is expected however, that by 2010, the PT doctorate will become the entry-level degree into this profession. One model that is currently being looked at is a consortial approach between UC and CSU in which the CSU would provide the coursework for the first two years (via their existing masters' programs), with students studying at UC campuses (such as UCSF) for the third year of a three-year doctoral program.
- **Occupational Therapy:** Although a doctorate of occupational therapy does exist, there is no evidence that this degree will become the entry-level degree in the near future. However, Director Merritt will be making further inquiries into this field.

**DISCUSSION:** Members and consultants discussed the possible CSU viewpoints on applied doctorates. First, it was noted that while UC graduate programs have contracted, graduate programs at the CSU have expanded. For example, 17% of CSU enrollment is at the graduate level (mostly masters' programs) with 2/3 of that in the applied disciplines. On the other hand, 23% of total enrollment at UC is at the graduate level. In regards to professional doctorates, the CSU faculty certainly want to keep their current professional masters' programs viable. However, a financial argument can also be made. In terms of state money, CSU would benefit by getting more money for their masters' students if their graduate students were counted on the same basis as UC graduate students are. For example, a UC graduate with 12 units counts as one full time equivalent (FTE), while a CSU graduate student requires 15 units to be counted as one FTE. Viewed this way, the effort to obtain permission to offer the doctorate independently of UC is a multi-pronged and long-term approach to secure differential funding for graduate education at the CSU.

One member also brought up the subtle difference between graduate education at UC (mostly doctorate) and that at CSU, where most of the graduate students are enrolled in masters' programs. Funding also plays a key role in this difference (masters' programs are much more class-based than Ph.D. programs). In this respect, it was noted that the original Master Plan was based on economic efficiency, thereby segregating high-cost graduate programs to UC (not only Ph.D. programs, but also high-cost masters' programs).

### **III. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans**

*Berkeley Graduate Dean Mary Ann Mason has replaced Dean Keith Alley as CCGA's representative to the Council of Graduate Deans.*

#### UC Berkeley Visa Holders' Survey

**ISSUE:** Dean Mason made a presentation on the 2004 UC Berkeley Visa Holders' Survey (*see distribution item 1*), and its implications for international student enrollments:

- The majority of international students has experienced delays at US consulates/embassies, has been forced to change travel plans, and experienced delays at US points of entry.
- By percentage of national region, Middle Eastern and Chinese students reported experiencing the most delays at US consulates/embassies.
- More Chinese students (almost 30%) were refused a US visa than any other national group.
- More than 90% of Chinese students (the highest percentage) had to alter their travel plans due to US immigration/visa regulations.
- Almost 70% of Middle Eastern students reported experiencing significant delays at US points of entry.
- Once again, over 70% of Chinese students, followed by almost 60% of Middle Eastern students, reported having to alter their research plans because of US immigration/visa regulations. About 45% of international students in the disciplines of science, technology and math also reported having to alter their research plans.
- 69% of international postdocs chose not to attend an international professional conference because of the fear that they may encounter difficulty or significant delay reentering the US.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Williams noted that federal policy is an important factor in the loss of international graduate students, and he encouraged UCOP to play an active role in the formation of federal policy. Along those lines, he recommended that CCGA write a letter to the Academic Council in an effort to sponsor a resolution towards this end. Dean Mason also noted that the fee structure for international students is problematic. She suggested that UC should try to convince the legislature that international students be treated as out-of-state students, which would mean that they would only be charged higher fees in the first year of enrollment. Members also spoke of the need for local graduate councils to make strong statements of support for international students to their respective campus administrators. Developing systemwide informational websites for international students was also mentioned as a possibility. The committee agreed that there are both long-term and short-term goals. The long-term objective should be the establishment of a task force on international students (with an emphasis on graduate students). Among the short-term objectives are an informational website to assist international students studying at UC (or contemplating study), and a letter to Provost Greenwood requesting the establishment of a task force. The recommendation was also made to consult with the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) on the establishment of a task force.

**ACTION:** Quentin will write a letter to Provost Greenwood regarding the lack of graduate support for international students at UC. In the letter, he will (1) recommend the establishment of a task force to address this issue; and (2) urge the establishment of a website or central repository of information for international graduate students.

**IV. Consent Calendar--Approval of the December 7, 2004 Minutes**

**ACTION:** The December 7, 2004 minutes were unanimously approved.

**V. Name Change for the UCD M.A./Ph.D. Program in ‘Dramatic Art’ to ‘Performance Studies’**

**ISSUE:** The UCD program in Dramatic Art would like to change its name to ‘Performance Studies’. The Department of Theatre and Dance and Graduate Council at UCD asserts that the name change is ‘simple’ and reflects the fact that its students work and study not only in dramatic art, but also in performance art, computer art, rhetoric, cultural history, and dance, among others. Performance Studies is now a well-recognized and respected field with clearly defined disciplinary methodologies and theories. The name change would reflect the current study, research, and work done by the graduate students in this program, and it would also benefit graduates applying for faculty/research positions, as degrees in this field would be immediately identifiable in the academic market. The department also claims that the name change implies no change in direction or requires substantial new resources.

**DISCUSSION:** Some members were concerned that the name change did not represent an encroachment on the part of the Department of Theatre and Dance into the fields of study of other departments at UC Davis. Along those lines, it was recommended that CCGA inquire with Trish Berger, Chair of the UCD Graduate Council, into this issue to confirm that this was indeed not the case.

**ACTION:** Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter to UCD Graduate Council Chair Trish Berger confirming that the name change does not imply any encroachment into the fields of study of other departments. If Chair Berger confirms that this is indeed not the case, then CCGA voted unanimously to accept the name change as ‘simple’.

**VI. Comments on the Academic Council Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources**

**ISSUE:** (*See distribution item 2.*) The committee seeks to clarify its position on this resolution. While CCGA agrees with the intent of the proposed resolution, it also wants to recognize the force of the counter-arguments that have been brought to bear in opposition to the resolution. Given that research funding impacts graduate students, and if truly unconscionable funding sources could be used to fund graduate education, avenues should be laid out for how such sources might be removed. CCGA asserts that such avenues exist, through the medium of the Regents. However, the current procedure (advising the Regents) may lack the immediacy or faculty-based outcome desired by some proponents of restricted funding. In other words, the committee seeks to provide an alternative algorithm between these two camps, which would strengthen the resolution. Such an algorithm can be phrased as, “Administrative units cannot impose involuntary restrictions on funding sources, and such restrictions should not be imposed by any body or person (including the Regents), except in the most extraordinary circumstances; but, in the event of such as circumstance, here is how a legitimate, university-wide constraint on a funding source could be initiated.”

Such an algorithm accomplishes the principal goal of the resolution—preventing administrative units from putting restrictions on the sources of research funds. At the same time however, it

allows the ideals of academic freedom to be trumped by societal and moral strictures via the plenary authority of the Regents.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed upon the above point of view and felt that it was important to present it to the AC.

**ACTION:** A motion was made to present this opinion to the AC and seconded. All members voted in favor of the said motion. Quentin will draft CCGA's official response to this resolution.

## **VII. Graduate Student Funding and the Cost of Competitive Recruitment Offers**

**ISSUE:** (*See distribution item 3.*) In 2001, the Commission on the Support of Graduate Education report showed that UC graduate support offers were on average \$2,000 below those being offered by comparable institutions. In the meantime, very few of the Commissions' suggestions were implemented. An update to the report in 2004 showed that UC still lags behind comparable institutions by \$2,000. If multiplied by the 10,000 graduate students in the UC system, this would mean that an additional \$20 million is needed to bridge this gap for each incoming cadre of graduate students. It was noted that \$20 million represents only a very small percentage of the budget. However, many members expressed the belief that this gap may have grown since 2001.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed possible funding models to bridge this gap in graduate support. One member brought up differential fees, and argued that differential fees have helped to keep certain graduate programs (mostly professional programs) competitive. Programs that use differential fees typically receive 90% of the money from these fees. In regards to fee waivers, the Graduate Deans should try to determine the average fee increase over the last year, and those numbers should be added to the existing data on UC competitiveness. It was also noted that when UC raises fees for GSR/GSI's, UC loses money for teaching and research as the costs of production also increase (due to fee waivers). On the other hand, the Masters of Advanced Studies (MAS) program model is self-sustaining (in part, these are offered through extension), and could be looked at by some departments as a way to lower delivery costs.

Members also discussed possible next steps. Members agreed that more lobbying is needed. The possibility of making a faculty presentation and appeal directly to the Regents was mentioned as one strategy (via the AC). It is important to convey that although graduate enrollment numbers have remained constant or even grown, the average caliber of the students has declined. Illustrating this point to both legislators and UC administrators may be one of the main obstacles in the way of securing more funding for graduate education. Another key problem is the lack of visibility of graduate students to the state legislature, when compared to undergraduates (whose parents are one of the main constituents of the legislature). Also problematic is the current fee structure in the sense that only part of the revenue (and sometimes very little) garnered from the fees is directly returned to graduate education. Dean Mason also discussed the varying models of graduate funding at comparable institutions. She noted that the University of Michigan (whose funding model is probably closest to UC) does use differential fees. She also pointed out that many of these institutions have large endowments, which is an area that UC is also pursuing. In terms of fundraising, it is important that the Graduate Councils

inform their respective campus Chancellors of their specific graduate funding needs, whose purview includes fundraising.

**ACTION:** (1) Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter to Dean Mason requesting the Graduate Deans to take a closer look at the actual gap that currently exists between UC and comparable institutions. (2) Chair Williams will write a letter to the Academic Council requesting action(s) to remove the current graduate support gap between UC and comparable institutions.

### **VIII. Review of a Review: CalSpace**

**ISSUE:** Grayson Marshall's review of the CalSpace review was distributed prior to the meeting. In essence, CCGA feels that while CalSpace has made substantial progress in the past 5 years, problems remain and a vision for development of a true MRU has not yet emerged. All indications are that the 15-Year Review Committee carried out a fair and comprehensive review. The Review Committee provides recommendations to open all aspects of the program to UC-wide competition, including the hosting of CalSpace headquarters, and these recommendations should be adopted to enhance space-related activities across the University.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed with the Grayson's report, but identified one typo that will be corrected in the final version sent to the AC. As an aside, members also discussed the distribution practices of individual campus Graduate Councils. One member voiced concern that not all campus Graduate Councils distributed the actual MRU "Director's Report". Chair Williams noted that this seems to be a procedural difference among campuses, but it should be corrected. The committee agreed that a letter should be sent to the respective Vice Chancellors for Research, reminding them to make sure that all documentation relating to MRU reviews goes to the Graduate Council on their respective campuses.

**ACTION:** Members unanimously voted in favor of sending CCGA's review of the CalSpace review to the AC for consideration. (2) Quentin will draft a letter to go to the Vice Chancellors for Research, reminding them to make sure that all documentation relating to MRU reviews goes to the Graduate Council on their respective campuses.

### **IX. Systemwide Graduate Courses**

**ISSUE:** The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) has recommended revisions to Senate bylaws 170, 180, and regulation 544 to the AC (and subsequently approved by the Assembly) regarding the establishment of systemwide graduate courses. These revisions state that UC courses approved by either UCEP or CCGA as systemwide courses will be listed in all campus catalogues. The rationale for these revisions are that UC-DC or on-line courses can be taken by students at multiple campuses.

**DISCUSSION:** Per these revisions, members agreed to add the following kind of wording to the CCGA Handbook: "CCGA shall evaluate proposals for systemwide graduate courses based upon the demonstration of multi-campus demand and scope, but also with attention to academic rigor, funding, and resources associated with the course. The proposed actions will be communicated to the campuses. Approval shall only be granted in cases where multi-campus importance has clearly been demonstrated." One member proposed that the approval process

include consultation with the respective campus committees on courses as well. Chair Williams noted that systemwide courses would only be added in exceptional circumstances.

**ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft language to go into the CCGA Handbook and will be placed on the consent calendar of the February agenda.**

**X. Review of the Graduate Group in Social and Cognitive Sciences (SCS) at UC Merced (UCM)**

**ISSUE:** Chair Williams noted that this is only an approval for a graduate group, not a degree program. Degree program proposals associated with this group will come to CCGA later in the regular program proposal format. He also noted that the group's membership is not limited to UCM, but could also include faculty from other UC campuses.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the fact that this group would consist of two schools, thereby emphasizing the interdisciplinary nature of the group. Members emphasized that the recognition of a cognizant Dean is important for the development of the group. Members pointed to the UCD graduate group as one possible model for UCM, where a 'lead' or cognizant Dean is identified for the graduate group. Members speculated as to why a graduate group model was chosen as opposed to an interdepartmental (IDP) model. Chair Williams explained that the graduate group model is more clearly defined, while the IDP model is a much broader rubric that can span a student's academic career. The committee suggested a change in the wording on grading (page 3 in the 'Policies and Procedures' document/page 26 in the January 11<sup>th</sup> agenda): "Only courses in 200 series in which the student receives grades of "A", "B", and "C" or "S" may be counted in satisfaction of the requirements for advanced degrees." Members recommended that a "C" should be removed as a grade that could be used to satisfy the degree.

**ACTION: UCM Guest Tom Harmon will take back CCGA's suggestions and incorporate them into a draft to be placed on the consent calendar on a future date.**

**XI. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review**

**A. Proposal for a Joint UCSC/CSU Monterey Bay Ed.D.**

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Williams noted that per the 'Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs', a CSU reviewer is also needed.

**ACTION: Suzanne Klausner will provide a list of internal reviewers for joint Ed.D. proposals. Don Wayne was selected as the lead reviewer.**

**B. Proposal for a M.S. Program in Neuroscience at UC Davis**

**ACTION: Larry Zahn was selected as the lead reviewer.**

**C. Proposal for M.A. and Ph.D. Programs in Religious Studies at UC Riverside –  
Lead Reviewer Michael Hannemann (UCB)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Hannemann has received a response (*see distribution item 4*) back from UCR Professor Jacobs, who is the chief proponent of the program proposal, regarding the issues raised by the external reviewers, and he will conduct a site-visit on

January 20<sup>th</sup>. It is anticipated that the site-visit will concentrate on staffing and resource issues.

**ACTION: Professor Hannemann will produce a site-visit report for the February meeting.**

**D. Proposal for a new interdepartmental Ph.D. Program in Health Economics at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Reen Wu (UCD)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Wu has received three internal reviews back from UCB, UCSD, and UCD; as well as commitments from two external reviewers with a due date of February 4<sup>th</sup>. The comments from the internal reviewers mirror the discussions within CCGA thus far: (1) graduate stipends (i.e. the competitiveness of the support); (2) program details (co-courses, minimal performance requirements, advisory program, and advancement to candidacy); and (3) bylaws (IDP—what are the administrative structures?). Professor Wu anticipates that he will be able to finish the review in March.

**ACTION: Professor Wu will make an inquiry to UCLA regarding the concerns raised by CCGA thus far.**

**E. Proposal for a new interdepartmental Masters of Financial Engineering at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Stephen Ritchie (UCI)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Ritchie confirmed that five reviews of the proposal have come in (three out of the four of the UC internal reviews (UCI, UCR, and UCB); and two external reviews). The UC internal reviews (Deans' reviews) were generally positive, however UCB suggested possible collaboration with their MFE program. The external letters are both positive, however one review does contain some criticisms. These include (1) the reviewer's observation that while the content of the program is sufficient, it is a little superficial in the area of mathematical foundations; (2) the curriculum could draw more upon UCLA's relative strengths in information technology; (3) the program could benefit from increased participation from the rest of the UCLA campus; and (4) placement issues (i.e. the program proposers may have underestimated the difficulties of placing graduates).

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed placement issues. However, it was noted that this should be mitigated via UCLA's extensive infrastructure, including a long-established business school and economic forecasting group. There was consensus that Professor Ritchie should wait for the response from UCLA before deciding whether to seek a third external review.

**ACTION: Professor Ritchie will seek a response from the program proposers regarding the comments from the external reviewers.**

**F. Proposal for a new Ph.D. Program in Culture and Theory at UCI – Lead Reviewer Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Sharrer has continued to collect the external and internal reviews. He now has three internal reviews—from UCI (Asian American Studies) and



two others from UCSB (Women's Studies and Chicano Studies) (*see distribution item 5*), and two external reviews. The internal reviews are positive, however they list many of the same concerns that CCGA has discussed previously. In particular, Eileen Boris (from Women's Studies at UCSB) notes that while this program would be unique, it is most closely linked to UCSC's History of Consciousness and UCD's Cultural Studies programs. Professor Sharrer is currently following up on another internal review from Professor Caren Kaplan at UCD, who is associated with the Cultural Studies program there. Other concerns included the lack of financial support, as well as the absence of involvement from faculty in Chicano/Latino Studies. The external reviews mirror these same issues, but emphasize the lack of involvement of other social science faculty. In response to these concerns (*see distribution item 6*), Professor Inderpal Grewal, the spokesperson for the proposal, states that the reason for the lack of participation by the Chicano Studies faculty is that they are currently focusing their resources on creating their own Ph.D. program.

Professor Sharrer also investigated the current status of the Comparative Cultures Ph.D. program at UCI. As noted previously, this program can be found in a course catalogue from 1994/95, but is no longer accepting students. The UCI Graduate Council suspended this program in 1993, and the faculty associated with it were transferred into other programs. However, it has not officially been discontinued.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee's discussion centered on the status of the suspended Comparative Cultures Ph.D. program. Chair Williams noted that two years ago CCGA did a survey of the campuses that had programs in abeyance for more than a couple of years. The survey yielded very few responses of actual programs in abeyance, however. Of concern to CCGA is not only that such programs may be 'reborn' with an entirely different purpose and mission, but maintaining such non-functioning programs also hurts UC's credibility. Chair Williams suggested that Professor Sharrer informally ask UCI to officially discontinue this program. Members also re-emphasized the importance of the involvement of faculty from Chicano Studies, as well as other disciplines in the social sciences. On this point, the committee speculated as to other possible explanations for this lack of involvement. Members encouraged Professor Sharrer to further investigate this reluctance to involve the Chicano Studies faculty in the program.

**ACTION:** (1) Professor Sharrer will make an informal request that the UCI Comparative Culture program be officially discontinued; (2) forward the internal external reviews to Professor Grewal for comment; and (3) make further inquiries into the reluctance to involve the Chicano Studies faculty in the program.

## **XII. Executive Session - Members only**

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

Attest: Quentin Williams, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst