

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting**Tuesday, February 2, 2010****10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.****UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 12322****Telephone: 510-987-9466**<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>**I. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates – Chair Farid Chehab**

- Jan. 27 Academic Council Meeting
 - Members were reminded of the importance of maintaining confidentiality with regard to sharing information between committees, campuses, administration, and others.
 - Commission on the Future: Preliminary recommendations will be discussed as informational item at the Regents meeting in March after which the Senate will have at least 60 days to review.
 - BOARS has convened a subcommittee on affordability issues for graduate studies.
 - President Yudof reported \$370M included in the Governor's budget, far short of \$905M needed; he discussed the need to decouple the proposed Constitutional Amendment from legislation guaranteeing a percentage of the state budget for public higher education as a percentage of the state budget; he reaffirmed his commitment to not continuing furloughs. However, the alternative option to reduce the shortfall in the budget may result in layoffs. The President stressed that ladder rank faculty will be excluded from any future layoffs. He alluded to the heavier impact on campuses with more state funding; he also responded to faculty concerns over alleged bonuses paid to Medical Center directors as recently reported by the media, stating that these were not bonuses but incentives included in their contracts and were important for UC to remain competitive in the recruitment of Medical Center senior administrators
 - Chair Chehab questioned whether or not the campuses are getting back correct amount of return-to-aid funds (50%) earmarked for graduate education/students he also recommended that members find out if their campus is receiving correct amount.
 - Council adopted BOARS white paper on the impact of new Freshmen Eligibility admission requirements on diversity.
 - The revised Compendium will come back to Council in March; members discussed the issue of keeping local divisional Senates abreast of program approvals.
 - Chair Chehab presented CCGA's comments on the LAO Report.
 - Council also briefly discussed a UCPB recommendation to keep NRT fees paid by graduate students on the campuses; Council also voted to oppose Differential Fees on campuses.
- Meeting with Regent George Marcus: Chair Chehab had an opportunity to discuss with Regent Marcus graduate education issues; Regent Marcus suggested that CCGA share the white paper with the Regents; they discussed the idea of extending Cal Grants to graduate students as a possible task that the Regents could take on in the future.

II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the January 5, 2010 Meeting Minutes
- Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved with modifications; the minutes were approved as noticed.

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

Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Pamela Jennings, Director of Graduate Studies

Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

- Pamela Jennings announced the upcoming Graduate Education Day in Sacramento.
- Hilary Baxter commented on the LAO report on the Master Plan. Members questioned LAO workforce projections in relation to educational policy.
- VP Steve Beckwith reported additional stimulus funds to UC and entertained questions from members. He spoke to changes to the nature and process of how funding is allocated for MRUs; commented on the three that were not funded: the UC Observatories, UC NEXIS, and the White Mountain Natural Resource Station. He updated members on issues under discussion by Research Strategies Working Group. He commented on key distinctions in what drives research agenda for UC and industry; how research overhead is charged and alternative models for cost recovery; separating overhead stream from the General Fund stream. Chair Chehab asked about issues associated with privately-funded MRUs such as the Global Health Institute.

IV. Planning for Discussion with President Yudof on Graduate Issues – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: President Yudof has accepted an invitation to meet with the committee at the March 2 CCGA meeting. Members considered topics and questions that it would like the President to address.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed specific topics and questions for the meeting with President Yudof. Suggested topics included: impact of graduate fee increases on graduate education; role of graduate students trained at UC in the state workforce; how to structure UC thinking about graduate student tuition so that it is tuned to the market better; role of graduate students in undergraduate education; ways in which the campuses solve real-life problems for the state. CCGA discussed take-away points for the meeting: quality of undergraduate education, University quality derived from quality of graduate education and research enterprise; UC maintain its purview of Professional Doctorates; Joint Administrative-Senate TF to examine how SSPs contribute to the privatization of the University.

ACTION: Members agreed on the following discussion topics:

- Issues associated with graduate student support, funding
- Ongoing need for advocacy for graduate education; inter-relationship between undergraduate and graduate education
- UC's purview of Professional Doctorates and relations with CSU
- Privatization of UC and philosophical issues associated with the recent growth of SSPs and Systemwide privately-funded enterprises, and the proposed revision to the professional degree fee policy.

V. Planning for Discussion with WASC Director Ralph Wolff on Issues of Concern to UC Graduate Education – Chair Chehab and Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

ISSUE: CCGA has previously discussed WASC’s interest in graduate student learning outcomes as well as the staff workload associated with providing data and documentation required by the WASC process. An invitation has been extended to WASC Director Ralph Wolff to meet with the committee at the March 2 CCGA meeting. Members will consider specific topics and questions for the meeting.

ACTION: The Committee deferred discussion of this item since WASC Director Ralph Wolff is not available until April.

VI. Commission on the Future: Education and Curriculum Working Group Update – Chair Chehab and UCEP Chair Keith Williams (UCD)

ISSUE: In December, Keith Williams, who co-chairs the Education and Curriculum Working Group with Dean Christopher Edley (UCB), fielded questions from members on the draft document and noted areas of focus of the Working Group. These include on-line education; methods of delivering curriculum; viability and completeness of curricular offerings on the campuses; level of quality that UC committed to, factors that are important to quality; and areas for compromise particularly with regard to undergraduate education. 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. Prof. Williams led a discussion on the issues put forth by the Working Group as well as other issues of interest to CCGA.

DISCUSSION: Prof. Williams provided a progress report and summarized the updated draft “Issues” document.. He outlined the process for bringing forward recommendations from the various Groups for the Regents. Among the Working Group’s key recommendations: facilitating time-to-degree, inquiry into different modes, e.g., online education; how to best utilize faculty and teaching workload. Chair Chehab expressed a serious concern to the differentiation in specialization across the campuses, which might lead to their stratification. Members questioned the potential benefits to faculty retirement incentives. Another member questioned the logic of recommending increases in faculty teaching loads and minimizing impact on research. One member commented on the disconnect between prematurely driving students to specialized majors without regard to how this may impact their future job prospects and the workforce needs of the future. A member asked about the extent of consideration of given to efficiency of resources for the three-year degree model. Chair Chehab cautioned against the overemphasis of the use of technology as a panacea. One member questioned the academic planning process for some of alternative modes of delivery being considered. Council Vice Chair Dan Simmons suggested separating concepts SSPs and Master’s degree programs.

ACTION: Chair Chehab and Prof. Williams agreed that it would be useful to schedule one more follow-up discussion with CCGA.

VII. Continuation of CCGA Discussion on the UC Global Health Institute – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: The establishment of a systemwide UC Global Health Institute raises questions about the extent of review and approval processes associated with establishing a systemwide institute or School, e.g., new degree proposals for a new campus-based School are subject to Academic Senate approval, but it is not clear what Senate approvals are required or needed for a systemwide institute to enroll candidates in existing graduate degrees. Furthermore, the academic review of the Global Health Institute’s new “Centers of Expertise” is not well defined and needs to be similar to the Senate’s customary review process for Multicampus Research Units (MRUs).

DISCUSSION: CCGA continued its discussion of the issues associated with planning for the UC Global Health Institute and discuss a mechanism to review systemwide schools and associated graduate academic programs. Chair Chehab outlined key questions and procedural concerns associated with the establishment of systemwide entities. There was a broad discussion of concerns, logistical questions, and procedural e.g., mechanism to assess educational and research coherence of the program and that it makes academic sense. Director Martha Winnacker questioned the trajectory of the Global Health Institute (GHI) in the absence of a formal proposal and the lack of institutional input vis-à-vis the Senate’s customary review process for the establishment of MRU and the fundamental question of the Senate reaffirming its role in the review of such programs. One member asked what value is added to UC in addition of what the campuses are already doing with respect to global health. Chair Chehab suggested that the Committee may want to invite Prof. Pat Conrad, who chaired UCPB last year and is involved with the GHI to speak to CCGA’s concerns and detailed questions. It was suggested that Academic Council and CCGA could send a letter to the proponents stating that based on the information available, the review and approval of the Global Health Institute, rests with the Academic Senate and noting that no pre-proposal or formal proposal has been received by any of the standing committees. Chair Chehab suggested that the letter ought to be sent from Council, pointing out that the source of CCGA’s concerns are not solely procedural but stem from several legitimate questions about how this particular proposal affects CCGA’s future review and the Senate’s oversight of systemwide graduate entities..

ACTION: Members agreed to forward to the above concerns in a letter to Council.

New Item Review of Draft Response to LAO Report on Review of New Programs and Schools – Chair Chehab and Associate Director Todd Giedt

ACTION: Members agreed to forward the draft letter as modified, to Council and the President.

New Item Review of Draft CCGA White Paper on Graduate Education – Chair Chehab

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the revised draft paper and considered minor edits.

ACTION: CCGA voted to accept the white paper and its appendices as modified, along with a recommendation to disseminate copies to the President and that he share the paper the Regents.

VIII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

- A. Proposal for a graduate program in Nano Engineering leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees at UC San Diego – Chair Chehab**

ACTION: Prof. Sue Carter (UCSC) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

- B. Proposal for a graduate program in Energy leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees at UC Davis – Chair Chehab**

ACTION: Prof. John Hildebrand (UCSD) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

- C. 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 (UCR)**

REPORT: Prof. Maduro reported that he has one review in-hand which was very supportive and that three others reviews are forthcoming.

- D. 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 reported that she is still waiting on two reviews. She summarized key points of the new review she received (reviewer has requested anonymity) as well as the response she received from the campus in response to questions previously raised by CCGA. One member noted the program’s inherent limitations that this is not a “classical” graduate program in Epidemiology but one that targeted a specific group of students not normally drawn to existing UC Epidemiology programs. Members questioned the academic rigor of Epidemiological methods and Biostatistics courses and suggested that CCGA request from the proposers syllabi with sufficient detail to assess rigor of these courses; and also ask for a list of comparable programs that they consider as likely competitors.

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

REPORT: Prof. Nelson was not in attendance but reported via email that he has received three of four reviews.

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

REPORT: Prof. Tager shared findings from his site visit and assessment of the revised program proposal which he feels satisfactorily responds to CCGA’s concerns. He highlighted key revisions and recommended CCGA approval at this time.

ACTION: CCGA voted (8-1-0) to approve the revised program proposal.

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

REPORT: Prof. Carmody summarized the responses from four program reviews. He noted problems associated with the proposed name of the program and how its name and curriculum poorly connect to the specified areas of focus. With the exception of the review from Yale, common themes and shared criticisms included: concerns about future job prospects for graduates of the program; stated need for establishing new program not very compelling; differential requirements for students, e.g., teaching or dissertation defense not required of all students; the curious omission of a Spanish-language requirement; questions surrounding number of dedicated faculty, and changes in resource requirements, if any.

ACTION: Prof. Carmody will send a letter to the department requesting that campus responds to specific questions and concerns raised by programs reviews and CCGA members with copies of the program reviews attached.

H. 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: Prof. Leppert is following up with the campus on their response to a letter sent from CCGA in December.

IX. New Business

• **Inquiry on the Review and Approval Process for Evening M.B.A. Programs** – *Chair Chehab*

ISSUE: Currently, the M.B.A. degree is approved on five UC campuses. Evening M.B.A. degree programs or EMBA are offered at Berkeley and UCLA while Davis offers an M.B.A. for “fully employed” professionals. A recent campus inquiry has raised important questions about how such programs are reviewed and approved. Members will consider the following questions:

- How has CCGA previously dealt with proposals for EMBA where an M.B.A. already exists?
- Is the approval of the EMBA considered to be embedded in approval of the M.B.A.?
- Have M.B.A. programs become an umbrella that includes the EMBA without further approval?
- Would an EMBA program have to be approved even if the M.B.A. degree does not?

DISCUSSION: The general consensus of the Committee was that if the requirements of the Evening M.B.A. are the same as existing M.B.A., then no further review is required beyond local Graduate Council. As a general rule of thumb, separate admissions process for a proposed EMBA program would constitute a substantive change requiring the attention of the local Graduate Council to make a final determination whether the proposal needs a systemwide review.

Adjournment:

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

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