#### COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting Tuesday, February 1, 2011 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 Jim Carmody

- January 26 Academic Council Meeting
- Systemwide review of proposed revisions to Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Programs: There was agreement that the policy as is not ready and that the qualifying criteria too vague. CCGA's comments taken to heart, particularly concerns about financial support for doctoral programs which were shared by divisional chairs as well Chair Carmody has started drafting review principles and guidelines for local GCs to consider in their review of PDFs and SSPs and circulate to CCGA members for input. He suggested that CCGA's chief focus ought to be on the integrity of the review (and less so on academic content) and ensure that programs are indeed self-supporting and not draining resources from existing programs. Chair Carmody asked for CCGA concurrence to 1) request that proposals for new SSPs be shared with local P&Bs and; 2) request that new SSPs be submitted to CCGA and UCPB for review. CCGA members agreed and Chair Carmody will incorporate these points in the draft guidelines.
- State budget ramifications for existing and proposed graduate programs: Chair Carmody suggested that CCGA will want to make a formal statement on the future of graduate education.

#### II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the Agenda
- Approval of the December 7, 2010 Meeting Minutes

**ACTION:** The agenda and the minutes were approved as noticed.

#### III. Announcements from the Academic Senate Leadership

Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair Robert Anderson, Academic Council Vice Chair

Vice Chair Bob Anderson provided a brief update on the January Regents' meeting and reported on probable cuts to HIV and breast cancer campus research; campus Labor Centers; DANR and Cooperative Extension programs. Any savings from these cuts will be redistributed to the campuses. He raised the issue of, and asked for CCGA to consider the benefits of offering special program for graduate students to work in a capacity similar to Post-docs (with a higher pay scale and limited teaching load) targeted to students who might otherwise be hired as lecturers. Members agreed that such a program would be a positive idea but recommended that it be implemented across the campuses, possibly modeled on the Presidential Scholars Programs.

<u>ACTION</u>: As a next step, CCGA will discuss drafting a formal proposal at its next meeting.

#### IV. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs

Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

**VP Steven Beckwith** shared his views on why UC should continue to run the national laboratories for the DOD. He noted that the lab fees go back into scientific research and because the University is not in it for the money, it can provide a more independent, objective voice than the aerospace industry might, for example. He also noted that there is tremendous symbolic value to UC operating the labs as a public service and also as a means of attracting graduate students to UC. Chair Carmody extended an invitation to VP Beckwith to attend a future Academic Council meeting to speak in support of funding for multi-campus research efforts and advocacy in general.

**Director Pamela Jennings** fielded questions regarding the UC-HSBC (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) Initiative.

**Assistant Director Hilary Baxter** announced that the revised Compendium is now posted on the Senate website. She noted the new pre-proposal requirement and that the Five-Year Perspectives are due on March 1. Associate Director Todd Giedt also noted that the MRU section is still undergoing revision.

### V. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) degree in Wireless Embedded Systems in the Departments of Computer Science and Engineering and Electrical and Computer Engineering at UC San Diego – Chair Carmody

<u>ACTION</u>: Chair Carmody asked CCGA members to review each of the following new SSP proposals for their impact on existing programs. For the purposes of reviewing these SSP proposals while formal review guidelines are being developed, he proposed adopting a process whereby CCGA evaluates the proposals independent of customary external reviews. CCGA will identify concerns and follow-up with the proponents accordingly prior to determining final disposition on the proposal. CCGA will rely on the local campus review of the academic content while its focus will be on the integrity of the review and ensuring that the programs are indeed self-supporting and not draining resources from existing programs.

<u>ACTION</u>: Morris Maduro (UCR) and Rachael Goodhue (UCD) volunteered to co-lead CCGA's review of the proposal.

B. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) degree in Simulation-Based Engineering in the Department of Structural Engineering at UC San Diego – Chair Carmody

<u>ACTION</u>: Christopher Kello (UCM) and Sue Carter (UCSC) volunteered to co-lead CCGA's review of the proposal.

C. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) degree in Structural Health Monitoring in the Department of Structural Engineering at UC San Diego – Chair Carmody

<u>ACTION</u>: Alan Buckpitt (UCD) and Sharon Farmer (UCSB) volunteered to co-lead CCGA's review of the proposal.

D. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) degree in Medicine Device Engineering in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at UC San Diego – Chair Carmody

 $\underline{ACTION}$ : Ruth Mulnard (UCI) and Michael Beattie (UCSF) volunteered to co-lead CCGA's review of the proposal.

E. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Master of Professional Accountancy (M.P.A.c) degree at UC Davis – Chair Carmody

<u>ACTION</u>: Dan Arovas (UCSD) was assigned as Lead Reviewer (Eric: Send Dan PDF of proposal)

F. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Software Engineering at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Sharon Farmer (UCSB)

**REPORT**: Prof. Farmer reported that she is waiting for a couple of reviews to come in.

G. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Biomedical and Translational Science at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Morris Maduro (UCR)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Maduro reported that he has confirmed four external reviews and is waiting for these to come in.

H. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the J.D. and Ph.D. degrees in Law and Graduate Studies at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Dorothy Hale (UCB)

REPORT: Prof. Hale summarized highlights from her program review and walked members through her draft Summary Report. The external reviews were all supportive of the program. She discussed the particularities of administering the concurrent program and campus commitment for the program. She believes that the campus has been incredibly conscientious in responding to requests for clarifications and recommended CCGA approval at this time. It was suggested that this proposal could serve as a model proposal and as a good example of the review process, exchange of information, positive tone, and prompt review timeline.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (10-0-1) to approve the proposal.

I. Proposal for the UCLA Anderson School of Management to establish a new Executive M.B.A. Program in cooperation with the Universidad Adolfo Ibañez in Santiago, Chile – Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UCD)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Goodhue reported that the proponents resubmitted the proposal in response to several questions raised by CCGA. She will follow-up with the campus on any outstanding issues and determine next steps for CCGA.

J. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Public Health at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Alan Buckpitt (UCD)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Buckpitt reported that he one external review on hand and is working on finding additional reviewers. He discussed substantial concerns raised in the review and will discuss these with the proponents.

## K. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Epidemiology at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Karen Gylys (UCLA)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Steven Nelson reported that Prof. Gylys has received two external reviews to date.

# L. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. Degree in Biomedical Imaging at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Ruth Mulnard (UCI)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Mulnard reported that she received three external reviews and discussed the reviewer comments. She will follow-up and share these comments with the proponents.

## M. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. in Biological Sciences and Educational Media Design at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Sue Carter (UCSC)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Carter discussed issues that have come up in the reviews including important concerns about the adequacy of facilities; competition with on-line programs; conflict of interest issues; number of, and variety of instructors. She will summarize these concerns and send a letter to the proponents requesting clarification and response to these issues.

## N. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Psychological Sciences at UC Merced – Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UCD)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Goodhue summarized her draft Summary Report. She recommended CCGA approval at this time subject to requiring follow-up by the local Graduate Council on the issue of updated affirmation of campus support.

<u>ACTION</u>: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (11-0-1) to approve the proposal as amended.

## O. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. Degree in Quantitative and Systems Biology at UC Merced –

Lead Reviewer Morris Maduro (UCR)

REPORT: Prof. Maduro summarized the proposal and walked members through his draft Summary Report. He noted that the review was carried over from last academic year. He discussed some of the comments that came up in the external reviews. Prof. Maduro believes that the proponents have satisfactorily addressed the concerns of reviewers and the Committee and recommended CCGA approval at this time. Members expressed concern about the potential for abuse and recommended revising the wording in the proposal requiring the candidate's submission of at least one scientific manuscript for publication in peer-reviewed journal. It was suggested that we might want to include language in the CCGA Handbook about the optimal time for submitting proposals,

<u>ACTION</u>: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (10-0-1) to approve the proposal as amended.

## P. Proposal for a Graduate Program in the Study of Religion Leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degree at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Christopher Kello (UCM)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Kello had no new updates at this time.

### Q. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Energy Leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Dan Arovas (UCSD)

<u>REPORT</u>: Prof. Arovas reported that he has received three external reviews, including one provided by Prof. Sue Carter. He discussed issues that have come up in the reviews. Prof. Arovas will summarize these concerns in consultation with Prof. Carter and send a letter to the proponents requesting clarification and response to these issues. Prof. Carter and Prof. Arovas discussed the possibility of conducting a site visit if needed.

### VI. On-line Graduate Degree Programs – Chair Carmody

<u>ISSUE</u>: CCGA members will consider the various issues associated with on-line graduate degree programs including teaching load questions; new modalities for existing programs; review of on-line iteration of an existing program; and others. With all due haste, craft a set of guidelines for the review of on-line graduate degree programs. These guidelines should be developed in such a fashion as to empower local Graduate Councils, with CCGA providing assistance as necessary.

<u>DISCUSSION</u>: There was uncertainty expressed about where best to start. It was suggested that CCGA members survey their campuses (UCI and UCLA) on their review of on-line program proposals; for salient issues encountered in reviewing; estimation of student and faculty satisfaction with existing on-line programs; success of graduates; work load issues/overload.

### VII. Systemwide Review: Funding Streams Proposal – Chair Carmody

ISSUE: Provost Pitts has invited the Academic Senate to opine on the attached proposal to change the way funds are allocated across the campuses. The current methodology for allocating funds is complex and not transparent, and the Office of the President has undertaken a two-stage restructuring project that first addresses funding streams other than State General Funds and will subsequently address the allocation formula for State General Funds. The attached proposal represents the first stage of the project. The second stage of the project will begin later this month when a task force begins to meet to discuss principles for distributing State General Funds. That proposal will be sent for Systemwide review when it is completed. The Office of the President proposes as a basic principle that all funds generated on a given campus be retained by that campus with a flat assessment on all funding sources to support central functions, including UCOP, centrally administered academic and research programs, and non-campus expenditures by the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Although funds for undergraduate financial aid would continue to be distributed as needed in order to maintain the same level of loan/work expectation for students across the system, funds for graduate financial aid would not. The proposal also includes changes in methodologies for distributing undesignated State funding augmentations and cuts. Comments are requested by February 17.

<u>DISCUSSION</u>: Chair Carmody asked for initial thoughts from members on the proposal. A few cautionary notes were voiced by CCGA members about the opacity and fluidity connected with implementing the new principles and recommendations going forward. Some members felt that not enough is known at this point about how the overall budget picture and economic climate will play out in the near-term, making it tough to comment further in any specific way on the proposal, with one exception: CCGA members expressed unease with the wording of the recommendation on Graduate Financial Aid. CCGA's concern here had to with the uncertainty

of "revenue neutrality" into the future that is central to the new model. The Committee also expressed concern with current system used for setting of Nonresident Tuition revenue targets and the distribution of nonresident enrollments by campus. A few members suggested campuses that fail to meet their nonresident student enrollment targets should have to shoulder more of the burden of addressing their own revenue shortfalls. Lastly, CCGA felt that the proposal should include a strong statement warning against the further erosion of support for graduate fellowships; as a matter of policy, campuses should be directed to do everything in their power to maintain competitive levels of graduate student support.

**ACTION**: CCGA agreed to submit the above comments to Council.

#### VIII. Revision of CCGA Handbook – Vice Chair Rachael Goodhue

<u>ISSUE</u>: CCGA kicked-off its review of the CCGA Handbook and, as necessary, propose changes to better reflect current practices and implementing policies including recent updates made to the Compendium.

<u>DISCUSSION</u>: Vice Chair Goodhue reported that she has been keeping track of needed changes. She asked for volunteers to review these changes. Prof. Morris Maduro, Prof. Ruth Mulnard, and Hilary Baxter volunteered.

### IX. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils – Chair Carmody and Members

CCGA discussed the allocation of revenues from UC's management of the national laboratories at Livermore and Los Alamos and the continued funding of the Lab Fee Research Program, particularly in the context of the budget shortfalls faced by the University. CCGA members strongly favored keeping "as-is" the current allocation policy and opposed diverting lab fee revenue to subsidize the University's operational needs. CCGA generally agreed that any net fee revenues derived from the University's participation in the management of the labs be specifically earmarked to support either graduate research programs on the campuses or to fund systemwide, multi-campus research initiatives.

<u>ACTION</u>: CCGA agreed to draft a letter regarding that funding from lab fees be left alone.

#### X. New Business

There were no new business items.

### **Adjournment:**

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

Attest: Jim Carmody, Chair Prepared by Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst

### **CCGA 2010-11 Remaining Meeting Schedule:**

March 1, 2011 – Room 12322 April 5, 2011 – Room 5320 May 3, 2011 – Room 12322 June 7, 2011 – Room 5320 July 5, 2011 – Room 12322