

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF MEETING

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2008

I. Chair's General Announcements and Updates – CCGA Chair Schumm

REPORT: Chair Schumm briefed members on the January Assembly meeting, the GSI memo, and the WASC review of UCOP, which specifically looked at UC governance between UCOP and The Regents. Governor Schwarzenegger has released his proposed budget, which calls for a 10% cut to all state agencies—including UC. The Governor is honoring the Compact, so this equates roughly to a net 5% cut, not accounting for inflation. UCOP has also been told that it will need to reduce its operations by 10%. Some of the cut will be mitigated by fee increases however. Although the CSU initially stated publicly that they would freeze enrollments, UC has not made a final decision on enrollment growth yet. A proposed joint CCGA-UCPB letter will go to Council Chair Brown requesting the reconstitution of a follow-on GSAC committee if CCGA and UCPB approve it (see Agenda Item V. below). At the joint Council-Chancellors meeting on March 5th, Chair Schumm will collaborate with Chancellor Marye Anne Fox (UCSD) on a presentation on graduate support. He noted that the Task Force on 'Roles' report, which was presented at the last Regents' meeting, did not include a discussion of the role of the Academic Senate was not really addressed either. The PDPE's Interdisciplinary Activity Report on Doctoral Education is out; its primary conclusion is that interdisciplinary-minded faculty are necessary to make interdisciplinary programs successful.

II. Announcements from the President's Office – Joyce Justus, Vice Provost -- Academic Affairs; Steven Beckwith, VP for Research & Graduate Studies

REPORT: Vice Provost Justus reported that the long-range enrollment planning have been successful; in general, campuses have agreed to increase their graduate enrollments. One problem related to funding is the fact that graduate students are no longer funded differently than undergraduates. Therefore, the funding of graduate students remains a priority. UCOP is also moving forward with restructuring. The reason that the 'Roles' report does not mention the Senate is that its intent was an examination of the role of UCOP, not the University as a whole. While student applications are up for 2008-09, the budget will not be positive. At issue is how to accommodate enrollment growth without increased funding while moving the University's priorities forward at the same time.

VP Beckwith reported that he is currently visiting the campuses; he is also meeting with the respective Graduate Deans. He reported that his office is working on gathering data on the relative burden of non-resident tuition (NRT) on UC campuses. VP Beckwith will make a presentation to The Regents in March or May.

DISCUSSION: Chair Schumm announced that CCGA and UCPB are requesting a joint Senate-Administration GSAC follow-up committee; this group will look for a broader optimization and it will evaluate UC's relative stance to comparator institutions with regard to NRT. However, the data collection and analysis needs of this group will be large and significant enough that the assistance of UCOP will be needed. VP Beckwith remarked that he hopes to call on the scholars in the Senate and the Graduate Deans—especially social scientists, who can provide analysis to assist UCOP advocate for graduate support. Chair Schumm clarified that joint Senate-Administration committees typically provide the kind of deep analysis that VP Beckwith is referring to. He also emphasized that NRT is not CCGA's sole priority, and that CCGA is

concerned with graduate support overall. He identified the CCGA draft letter as a good document that clarifies CCGA's stance on this issue.

Vice Provost Justus clarified that the March presentation to The Regents will be the first in a series of presentations. UCOP is going to The Regents with an enrollment plan that stresses growth in its graduate programs and enrollments at the expense of some undergraduate enrollment growth. There is also an ongoing discussion about whether UC should focus its growth at the doctoral level or at the master's level. It is easier to argue for growth in doctorates because of the Master Plan; the CSUs have grown their masters' programs significantly. Chair Schumm remarked that CCGA has looked at some data on the enrollment in the different types of graduate degrees at UC relative to its comparator institutions. These data show that UC roughly compares to the publics but it is behind the privates; however, it lags in first professional degrees and masters' degrees. If UC solely emphasize Ph.D. programs in its future growth, the University will be making a statement. Vice Provost Justus remarked that there are some parallel conversations within the University regarding growth in its graduate programs. While she does not hear Chancellors arguing for UC to become a Ph.D. institution only, there is a recognition that UC has not grown in some areas. Some campuses think that there should be more growth at the masters' level; others believe that there should be more growth at the doctoral level. Graduate student support will also influence campus decisions about which areas to grow in; doctoral students are rather expensive, while masters' students can be resource generating. Some campuses have made the decision that master's students are not eligible for support, but not all campuses are doing this. UC is gradually improving its working relationship with the CSU under Provost Hume's tenure; this is beginning to pay off in budget advocacy.

Members remarked that it may be useful to look at certain degrees, such as the MFA, for their relative growth potential. They asked what data is available about how the campuses view the issue of growing their academic masters. Vice Provost Justus responded that there are two different groups within UCOP that have addressed this question—PDPE and the group that is conducting the enrollment planning exercises. There is a general sense among the Chancellors and some of UC's supporters in the Legislature that UC has allowed graduate enrollments to remain static while undergraduate enrollments have grown though. With the receipt of these campus enrollment plans, UC is now planning for future graduate growth. Chair Schumm noted his concern that if all the campuses want to pursue Ph.D. programs, this would be impractical given the significant resource demands of doctoral programs. Members also remarked that many of these enrollment planning exercises held certain political dimensions; some seem to be designed as arguments for additional resources. Vice Provost Justus added that Provost Hume also tours the campuses every year to talk about academic planning. At the end of the year, he summarizes the data that he has collected from the campuses through these visits and makes a presentation to The Regents. Chair Schumm mentioned that CCGA may draft a succinct paper on the graduate profile of the University that would be intended for Provost Hume.

ACTION: 1) Obtain VP Beckwith's and/or Provost Hume's presentation to The Regents' on graduate education as soon as it is available; 2) Ask Graduate Deans if there are areas for which their view of graduate education differs from that of CCGA.

III. Announcements from the Graduate Deans – Gale Morrison

ISSUE: There were not any announcements from the Graduate Deans.

IV. Consent Calendar

- A. Approval of the Agenda
- B. Draft Minutes of the January 8, 2008 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar.

V. GSAC Follow-Up Request – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Chair Schumm is looking for support from UCPB, which meets next week. He is hopeful that they will be a co-signatory on this document, but it is important that it goes forward to Council this month.

DISCUSSION: Members made a few small wording suggestions, which will be sent to Chair Schumm. One member remarked that the paragraph at the bottom of the first page seems to ascribe the relatively lower numbers of international graduate students exclusively to the effects of NRT; however, there have been some other real factors associated with this decline—e.g., changes in the political scene and developments in the EU, which makes study elsewhere in Europe much more attractive. Members also mentioned that there are not any fiscal impediments in hiring post-docs vis-à-vis graduate students. It was moved and seconded to adopt the draft letter as CCGA’s formal statement.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the draft letter to go to Academic Council; Chair Schumm has the prerogative to make minor changes.

VI. Academic Masters Degrees in a Research Setting – Chair Schumm

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that at some campuses, such as Berkeley, programs/departments with available resources are starting academic masters’ programs; those without similar resources cannot initiate such programs however. Interdepartmental programs (IDPs) are also creating joint BA/BS MA/MS programs, along with other campuses-initiated academic masters’ programs. However, this type of growth seems to be more organic than planned in nature, and there does not seem to be a compelling interest in moving towards academic masters’ programs en masse. CCGA would be interested in looking into this issue further if there was evidence that a number of departments (perhaps ten or more) were interested in developing masters’ programs; this does not seem to be the case. Chair Schumm suggested removing this from the agenda, as it seems that CCGA does not need to weigh in on this issue as a matter of policy.

ACTION: CCGA is suspending its investigation into this issue.

VII. Review of the Proposal for a School of Public Policy at UC Riverside – Elizabeth Watkins

ISSUE: Professor Watkins reported that the proposal indicates that the School will only offer a master’s and a Ph.D. program. She has researched a number of schools of public policy across the country, and their program offerings vary significantly at both the master’s and Ph.D. levels. There is already a BA, and the proposal lays out a master’s degree. The School will also be planning for an executive master’s program and a certificate program. CVs for the core faculty in the School are missing however. There is a task force of 15 faculty members, but none have a background in environmental science. The School also has aggressive plans for fund-raising, which may or may not be realistic. The general sense from the proposal is that this School is integral to Riverside’s long-term plans to expand. However, the proposal does not make clear why these goals could not be accommodated by a department, nor does it differentiate between the purpose of a ‘School,’ such as the Berkeley School of Public Policy, and a vibrant department, such as UCLA’s department of public policy.

DISCUSSION: Members observed that governance is really not addressed; the ‘mission’ of the proposed School is not fully articulated either. The question was raised as to why the proponents wanted a school as opposed to a free-floating department, given that the envisioned School would be so small. Developing a vibrant ‘center’ would be one justification for a school. However, if the idea is to create a school only for these FTE faculty, then this really does not justify the creation of a school. The only UC example of a School of Public Policy is Berkeley, which is much different than what is presented in the Riverside proposal. While the proposal envisions a School in size similar to that of Berkeley, there is no real discussion of what the faculty in this School will be doing. The department of Public Policy at UCLA (within the School of Public Affairs) has 25 FTE, which is equivalent to the size of this proposed School.

ACTION: CCGA will consider a draft letter at its March meeting.

VIII. Certificate Programs – Vice Chair Chehab

ISSUE: Vice Chair Chehab has updated the draft memo on certificates. Issue #5 has been eliminated and incorporated into a separate paragraph, which encourages the creation of Plan II master’s programs from certificate programs by increasing course units to 36 with the addition of a capstone. The issue of the official seal still needs to be resolved however. Technically, the use of the official seal is the prerogative of The Regents, and the President approves the use of the unofficial seal. It was noted that at Berkeley, only academic certificates receive an official seal. Professor Chehab asked fellow members to find out which types of seals are being used on graduate academic certificates (GACs) on their respective campuses.

DISCUSSION: The differences between a ‘diploma’ and a ‘certificate’ were also discussed; after a reading of the regulations, it seems that a certificate is not a diploma, but a diploma could incorporate a certificate under certain conditions. CCGA has the option of requesting that a certificate for a GAC be made more ‘diploma-like’ without changing the definition of a diploma, which is strictly regulated by The Regents. Members also argued about whether it would be prudent to encourage GACs to develop into full-blown master’s programs as well. Raising certificates to a master’s degree would be problematic because many students in other degree programs would want to obtain a certificate without getting a second master’s degree in that subject. Chair Schumm noted that the UCSC Science Writing certificate review committee advised against making it a master’s program, even though it is considered one of the best programs of its kind in the country. The issue of the official seal was also discussed; it was noted that campuses do not have any authority over the use of the official seal. The view was expressed that the Senate may be overextending its reach in looking at the official seal for use in certificates; it is used for degree diplomas. However, other members argued that GACs need to be differentiated from extension program certificates by the use of the official seal. Another issue is that many people within the system do not even know what the official seal looks like and what it is used for.

Members were interested in the CCGA review requirements for the GACs. These include the 12-unit residency requirement and an independent admissions process. In a GAC, students must take 12 separate units dedicated to the certificate (e.g., they could be taken as part of another degree program). In that vein, it was noted that ‘add-ons’ to other degree programs would not be counted as GACs. There was some confusion over what an ‘independent review process’ actually means. Chair Schumm tabled this discussion until the March meeting.

ACTION: Members will inquire with their respective registrars regarding which seal is used for certificates and diplomas. CCGA will address the issues of an independent admissions process and the use of the official/unofficial seal at its March meeting.

IX. Setting Conditions for Professional Degree Fee (PDF) Increases Proposal – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Under The Regents' action, the President must determine that the additional conditions included in the fee item have been met by March 1, 2008. At the end of November 2007, Provost Hume wrote the Chancellors requesting the additional information needed and offering guidance on what should be provided from each program in terms of its financial aid policies, programs, and marketing plans; a comparison of each program's in-state fee levels with those at comparable public institutions; available information on student and faculty views of each program's PDF increase; and each program's strategy for inclusion of underrepresented student groups. Chair Schumm indicated that some kind of annual reporting by UCOP will be necessary. The Senate could play a proactive role by reviewing what UCOP reports to ensure confidence that the data being collected will be adequate to allow the appropriate trends to be monitored into the future. He suggested the creation of a subcommittee that would review the report coming out of UCOP, and make a recommendation on future actions.

DISCUSSION: Bruce Schumm, Ken Rose, Patricia Springer, Katherine Carpenter (student member), and Ira Tager volunteered for the subcommittee.

ACTION: A special subcommittee was formed that will review UCOP's annual reports and make comments. The subcommittee membership is Bruce Schumm, Ken Rose, Patricia Springer, Ira Tager, and Katherine Carpenter.

X. Report of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Chair Schumm remarked that drawing in an appropriately represented student body and faculty is extraordinarily challenging. As of now, UC is a marginally diverse university, but its student body does not look demographically like the State of California. What would it take to reverse this? Does this memo/report suffice?

DISCUSSION: A member commented that 1) raising of the issue of diversity within the approval process of graduate programs needs to be assessed; and 2) while the University gives lip service to diversity, outreach to secondary schools and community colleges, or even summer 'boot camps,' is the only area where the University have any hope of changing this process. It was noted that program reviews always try to address the issue of diversity. Another issue is the admittance of students who are not adequately prepared in essential skills, such as math. Any attempt to solve the problem at this point is very difficult, if not impossible. There is also a limit to what UC can legally do at this stage. UC actually loses the most-qualified minority candidates because of the relative lack of support as compared to the privates.

Chair Schumm asked if programs, and by extension program proposals, should be changed in such a way to make them more 'friendly' to minorities. Members noted that some program proposals do not address diversity at all. That said, many programs are working hard to increase diversity, but there is a limit to what they can do. In engineering, the minority pool is so small that all of the universities are fighting over the same few students. It is certainly not the case that UC is not trying to get these students. It may also be a question of what the faculty are willing to

sacrifice to reach these goals. Chair Schumm remarked that if the University wants to take this on, it needs to ask the faculty what they would be willing to sacrifice. For instance, would it be appropriate to include ‘outreach’ in faculty review for promotion? At least one member opined that it would be misguided to make outreach the responsibility of individual faculty members.

Chair Schumm opined that this memo does not have enough teeth to make any real changes. In its current form, the report does not demand sacrifice from the faculty to reach its stated goals. Members remarked that individual graduate programs are doing their best to attract minorities; there is not much more that individual departments can do. Chair Schumm responded that CCGA does have authority in this area, and it could make suggestions. CCGA could do a couple of things at this juncture—either endorse this report as a whole or highlight specific things. Another option is making a statement that this report does not go far enough. One member observed that it is really difficult to assess what existing programs are actually doing in this area. While CCGA can look at new proposals, it can not assess what is really happening on the ground. Members also opined that the creation of a diversity office on each campus to coordinate faculty efforts to increase diversity is a good idea. That said, it is not only a question of an appropriate reallocation of resources; it is also a question of increasing diversity through the efforts of the faculty. Climate is also a key component in any efforts towards increasing diversity. The problem is that the report’s emphasis on focused efforts is that its assumptions are too simplistic. For example, it is not necessarily the case that there is discrimination just because the student body does not demographically represent the population of California. Long-term implications of reallocating these resources should also be considered. On the whole, while members expressed general support for the goals of the report, there was also some concern about advocating unreachable goals in the face of a general lack of financial resources, mechanisms, and support to actualize these goals. That said, the committee was not able to reach consensus on the specific recommendations contained in the report.

ACTION: Chair Schumm will draft a response based on the CCGA discussion.

XI. Systemwide Senate Review of the Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education – Chair Schumm

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the draft response.

XII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Master of Science in Science and Technology in Medicine at UC San Francisco

ACTION: Matt Farrens was selected as the lead reviewer.

B. Proposal for a Master of Public Policy at UC Irvine

DISCUSSION: External letters of support are missing from the proposal, which is unusual; such letters are independent of soliciting external and internal reviewers. Generally, these support letters come from prospective employers, local political leaders, etc. It was noted that this program will have ties to the new law school, and is an interdepartmental/interdivisional program between political science and sociology. One important question is how these two departments will govern this program (e.g., will there be a lead department?).

ACTION: Lead reviewer Gary Jacobson (UCSD) will request letters of support, which are missing from the proposal.

C. Proposal for a Master of Science in Nursing Science at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Janice Reiff (UCLA)

ACTION: There were not any new actions associated with this program.

D. Proposal for a Master of Science in Global Health Sciences at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Ira Tager (UCB)

REPORT: Professor Tager has received three external reviews; he is also writing an internal review himself. Reviewers have raised the issue of the program's organizational structure, as well as the program's short international (two months) experience with an associated capstone, which does not seem to be enough time to doing anything meaningful. There are also two other issues—the core courses and the support. While there are three pages of new courses in the proposal, it only calls for .15 FTE per person to pull these courses together and maintain them, which is simply not enough given the mentoring obligations in this program. It also seems inevitable that this program will draw substantially from Berkeley. Some of the curricular goals of the proposed courses are not realistic either. While there is general support for the program, it will require some fleshing out. As of this reading, Professor Tager does not think that a one year program of this sort is a good idea.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that while the idea (of the program) is good, the implementation is unrealistic. The one-year time frame of the program is a significant issue.

ACTION: Professor Tager will solicit some kind of a statement of commitment from UCB and/or internal review; he will submit an initial report at the March meeting.

E. Proposal for a Master of Science in Environmental Policy & Management at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Patricia Springer (UCR)

REPORT: Professor Spring reported that she has received two external and two internal reviews. The major issues highlighted by the external reviewers include the feasibility of students completing the program in one year, as well as the actual role(s) of senior faculty in the program. She has not received a response to her letter to the program proposers either. A site visit may be required.

ACTION: Professor Springer is awaiting a response to her letter.

F. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Visual Studies for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Michael Hanemann

REPORT: Professor Hanemann reported that all three external reviewers are supportive of the proposal. The only substantive issue is funding, but UCSC is aware of these issues. There are four points, or concerns, that he mentions on p. 4 of his memorandum: 1) students may have a potential lack of background in a core discipline; 2) the program's adequate integration with the existing landscape of graduate studies at UCSC; 3) the large number of new courses, which will require considerable course development; and 4) the impact on the existing undergraduate program. However, overall Professor Hanemann is not significantly concerned about these points.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the program in Visual Studies with two abstentions.

G. Proposal for a Masters of Public Health at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab

REPORT: Professor Chehab is awaiting a response from the program's proponents.

DISCUSSION: It was mentioned that once again, the one year length of the program could be problematic. Originally, faculty CVs were missing from the proposal; these will need to be obtained to determine the faculty depth in covering the curriculum. Professor Chehab clarified that there is a summer practicum that serves as the capstone.

ACTION: Professor Chehab is awaiting a response from the program’s proponents.

H. ‘Design’ Proposal at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Chair Schumm

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the name change of the ‘Design’ proposal at Davis.

XVI. New Business

ISSUE: Proposal for a M.S. and Ph.D. in Bioinformatics at UCLA.

ACTION: Members selected Anne Myers Kelley (Merced) as the lead reviewer for the program.

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

Attest: Bruce Schumm, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

Distributions

1. Draft Memo from CCGA about Graduate Academic Certificates
2. Professor Hanemann’s Review of Proposal for PhD in Visual Studies at UCSC