

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – FEBRUARY 7, 2006**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey*

REPORT: Chair Lindsey did not have any announcements.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz reported that the new Director of the UC Washington Center, Bruce Cain (UCB), will spearhead an effort to increase the graduate student presence at the Center. Consultant Karen Merritt reported that the Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education Task Force (PDP) has established a Legal Education Advisory Subcommittee (LEAS) to look at the future need for legal education in the State of California, which is chaired by Christopher Edley, who is the Dean of Law at UC Berkeley. UC Irvine and UC Riverside have informed LEAS that they are interested in moving forward with their respective tabled law school proposals. Consultant Merritt mentioned that since the Academic Senate had originally approved both proposals independently, the President and Provost have decided that a comparative review of both proposals is a necessary first step before action on either proposal can be taken. To that end, the President and Provost asked the LEAS to accept a second independent charge, which is to act as an ad-hoc committee to review these two proposals. LEAS is currently working on a set of criteria by which to evaluate both proposals. Once LEAS has completed its review, their review will be forwarded to both the Senate and the President for comment. Given the pending comparative review, UCR may wait until a comparative review is completed before submitting their updated proposal.

DISCUSSION: Members expressed their gratitude to Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz's for his service to CCGA over the years and they wished him well as he returns to his faculty position at UCSB. Members were particularly interested in the comparative review of the two law school proposals, especially in the role that CCGA would play in this review. Chair Lindsey said that it seems that CCGA is being excluded from the process of curriculum development, which is one of the responsibilities of the Senate. He stated that CCGA should play a principal role in this review. Consultant Merritt responded that law is actually one of those fields where CCGA has ceded its authority to the American Bar Association (ABA) and the California Bar Association (CBA) for final approval of the curriculum. She described the comparative review process as very similar to a MRU review, where the Senate conducts a review of a review from an expert committee. Chair Lindsey objected that he does not view this process as a MRU review; instead he sees it as program development. Consultant Zelmanowitz further clarified the issue by saying that the comparative review is simply a report that will be forwarded to both the Senate and the President. At that point, CCGA can intervene and even demand that both proposals be resubmitted. Other members commented that the original proposals are most likely obsolete anyway. Chair Lindsey stressed that it is not the committee's intent to be combative, but rather support these law schools while maintaining CCGA's responsibility to curricular development. Consultant Merritt informed members that the committee may need to consider rescinding a CCGA action (the ceding of curricular authority over law education as mentioned above) if it wants to become involved in the process before or during the comparative review process. One

member cautioned that he would be reluctant to support such a rescission unless there was a clear reason to do so.

Members also discussed the criteria that is being developed by LEAS for the comparative review, and felt that CCGA should have a chance to review the criteria. Consultant Zelmanowitz responded that that may be possible. The committee also inquired into the reasoning behind the rationing of law school across the UC system. Consultant Zelmanowitz responded that there is also a powerful political element. The CBA and other regional associations have an interest in the types and locations of new law schools that are developed in California. At the same time, there is reluctance on behalf of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and the Department of Finance to develop a new public law school. Karen Merritt added that part of the strategy to persuade CPEC to grant approval to one or both of these law schools (CPEC originally rejected the UCI proposal in 2001) is the assembly of an expert committee in the form of LEAS.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the January 10, 2006 Minutes

ACTION: The January 10, 2006 minutes were approved with minor edits.

B. UCSC M.E.S. Discontinuance

ACTION: This item was approved.

C. UC Merced Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics

ACTION: This item was moved off the consent calendar.

D. Formal Review of APM 220-18-b(4)

ACTION: This item was moved off the consent calendar.

IV. UC Merced Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics.

ISSUE/REPORT: Members clarified the language for the masters' thesis requirement contained in the Policies and Procedures document, which was submitted for CCGA approval at the January meeting.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the differences between Plan I and Plan II masters' requirements. Plan I requires a masters' thesis. Plan II requires completion of 36 units of upper-division and graduate coursework with satisfactory performance on a final comprehensive examination. Some members had concerns with the language of the masters' Plan II capstone requirement, as currently written in the UCM Applied Mathematics Group's Policies and Procedures document on page 11. At issue is the fact that it currently does not explicitly require either a thesis or a comprehensive examination. However, other members felt that the capstone fulfills the requirement of a comprehensive exam, as this requirement is usually interpreted fairly generally (additional coursework, seminar paper, etc.). After further discussion, members agreed that the capstone does fulfill this requirement.

ACTION: Members approved the language of the UCM Applied Mathematics Group's Policies and Procedures document unanimously.

V. Formal Review of APM 220-18-b(4)

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Lindsey presented this issue as an information item for members.

DISCUSSION: Academic Council Chair Brunk clarified the proposed changes to APM 220-18-b(4). He said that in the last two decades, the distinction between Step 6 and above scale has converged. The proposal modified the Step 6 requirements to make that differentiation clear. However, these modified requirements enhanced teaching in one part and deleted teaching in another part. The Council felt that this sent the wrong message, and restored the teaching element from where it had been deleted. UCAP is currently working on this document.

VI. Academic Senate Memorial to the Regents on Graduate Student Non-Resident Tuition

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Lindsey presented the Memoriam on Non-Resident Tuition. This memorial argues for elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students. Chair Lindsey explained that this memorial originated from UCPB recommendations, which called for the (1) Ending of nonresident tuition for all doctoral students after the first year beginning in 2006-7; and (2) the elimination of nonresident tuition for all first year doctoral students beginning in 2007-8. Proponents of the memorial argue that UC is really competing for the best graduate students, which are critically important to the teaching and research missions of the University. The net effect of having high non-resident tuition rates discourages the best international graduate students from applying to UC. A number of the campuses have also discussed this issue with the main concern being unanticipated and unknown costs.

DISCUSSION: Academic Council Chair Brunk clarified that the memorial simply states that the Regents structure the UC budget in such a way that it eliminates non-resident tuition for academic graduate students. The language of the memorial indicates that there is no phasing-out of non-resident tuition fees; there is also no distinction between masters' and doctorate students. The Davis member reported that the memorial passed overwhelmingly at his campus (where the memorial originated). Members briefly discussed the actual costs associated with this memorial and noted that the costs are not significantly large when compared to the total UC budget. A distinction was also made between UCPB's analysis (enclosure 8) and the actual memorial itself. Some thought that the specific costs noted in the UCPB analysis may not be exactly accurate, but most members believed that they were correct in their order of magnitude. Members also took issue with the arguments against the memorial, as they felt that these arguments did not address the fundamental problems associated with non-resident graduate tuition. One member mentioned that the main controversy concerns the money that is returned to the State of California in the first year—particularly that state residents take precedence over non-residents. Therefore, it would be politically easier to make a case for the elimination of non-resident tuition from the first year onward with the state legislature. That said however, members felt that this memorial is too important not to support despite the political arguments that might be made against it. Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz added that GSAC, the committee currently working on the analysis and the implementation details of the UCPB recommendations, is not ready to make a final recommendation at this time. The only potential downside of delaying the passing of the memorial now is that the GSAC recommendations may not be made in time to influence next year's budget proposals, which are due in the fall.

ACTION: A motion was made by CCGA Chair Lindsey for support of the proposed Memoriam on Non-Resident Tuition to the Regents with the proviso that this is the first

step towards increased graduate student support at UC. It was seconded and passed unanimously.

VII. UC Davis Dismissal Case

ISSUE: Academic Council Chair Brunk asked CCGA to consider the case of a graduate student, who was dismissed from the Davis division in 1992. Since that time, the student had made numerous attempts to be reinstated to graduate school. The Davis division just recently reinstated this student, but the Dean has refused to implement their decision. He has also petitioned the Parliamentarian, who notified Chair Brunk per bylaw 311(c)2. This issue will have to be decided by the Assembly.

ACTION: Bruce Schumm and Nadine Lambert were charged with reviewing the report and they will make their recommendations to the committee at the March meeting.

VIII. The Special Committee for Scholarly Communication (SCSC) White Papers

ISSUE: CCGA Chair Lindsey provided an overview and the context for these white papers.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the recommendation on copyright, which allows UC to a perpetual right (not ownership) to make the scholarly work accessible. Some members felt that given UC's institutional size, the copyright recommendation may be tenable.

ACTION: Chair Lindsey asked members to discuss this issue at their divisional Graduate Council meetings. It will be placed on the March meeting agenda for further discussion.

IX. Independent Course Responsibility

ISSUE: The Independent Course Responsibility subcommittee made their report to the committee. In doing so, they made special note that they used the following background materials for their review: the Academic Policy Manual (APM), the report from Robert Post, and a survey of current campuses practices. Their initial review reaffirmed the current policy contained in the APM with one possible modification that teaching assistants play a larger role than that provided for in the APM 410-20. They submitted new language to this policy that relieves the restriction on teaching the entire enrollment of a class, which would allow graduate students to teach the entire class enrollment. They also suggested removing the term "regular faculty member", thereby allowing visiting professors to serve as the instructor of record with graduate teaching assistants. Finally, it is the subcommittee's interpretation that the faculty (as defined in the APM) must uphold the code of conduct and should enjoy academic freedom. On the other hand, neither teaching assistants nor teaching fellows enjoy complete academic freedom, and their responsibility to the code of conduct rests with the supervising faculty member (as the instructor of record). Finally, the subcommittee is also proposing that graduate student instructors formally adhere to one of two titles, either a "teaching assistant" or a "teaching fellow".

DISCUSSION: Members discussed whether all instructors of record are bound by the code of conduct. A key question is whether faculty are authorizing graduate teaching assistants to have a sole instructional role, who would not be bound by the faculty code of conduct. The subcommittee clarified that teaching assistants are under direct supervision, and the code of

conduct is imposed through the instructor of record. One member asked if a regulation exists that does not allow a graduate student to teach other graduate students (in cases where a graduate teaching fellow is allowed to teach a graduate course). The subcommittee will look into this.

ACTION: The subcommittee will follow-up on the issues raised in the discussion, and they will submit a final report at the next CCGA meeting.

X. Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education Committee (PDP) Update, Guest – *Quentin Williams*

ISSUE: Professor Quentin Williams updated the committee on the recent activities of the Doctoral and Professional Education Committee (PDP). He said that the PDP was established late last year in tandem with the graduate support task force with the intent of decoupling UC's educational vision/goals from the funding and fiscal issues (which is the charge of the graduate support task force). Its explicit charge is to identify those professional and doctoral fields in which UC should play a role over the next couple of decades and make long-term recommendations to UCOP. As a first step, PDP made campus visits to all ten campuses (along with Acting Provost Rory Hume) to survey campus concerns. The primary concerns voiced by the divisions included the difficulties of engendering and importance of interdisciplinary graduate programs, the complexity and uncertainties in the allied health fields, revenue streams, international graduate students, and non-traditional graduate student constituencies (older adults, etc.).

The PDP utilized a UCOP study of medical workforce needs in California, which concluded that there will be a significant shortfall of qualified professionals in many traditional medical disciplines over the next two decades. To meet this need, UC can either expand its existing medical schools or establish new ones. California can also continue to try to attract medical professionals from other states, which is a strategy that has been used from time to time in the past. Legal education is another area that the PDP is addressing. Professor Williams reminded members that the LEAS subcommittee is looking at (1) the current challenges to UC law programs and the ways to strengthen them; (2) emerging trends in legal education; and (3) California's expected need for JD's over the next 20 years. A report on legal education is due in May. The PDP is also focusing on UC's future interaction with the CSU, as well as what UC can do effectively and with excellence in serving the future needs of the State of California. Professor Williams cited the recent work of the task force on audiology as a successful example of this kind of effort. He also made the distinction between "degree creep" and actual advances and changes in the educational requirements of certain allied health fields, such as audiology and physical therapy.

DISCUSSION: Members were interested in UC's role in other emerging fields, such as bio-engineering and nanotechnology. Professor Williams responded that there is an awareness of nanotechnology, however it is the point of view of this task force these fields should be addressed via a campus-driven process. The Cal-ISI's should also play a major role in nucleating these fields. In answering this question, he drew a distinction between those programs/departments that are typically developed on a campus level and those that are developed on a systemwide basis. The PDP believes that it would be difficult for the individual campuses to launch a set of coordinated programs that would address California's future needs in

allied health (without seeding from UCOP), but the campuses are well-suited to cultivate some of these other emerging fields. Members also stressed that continued consultation with campuses is important for the work of this committee.

Members also asked if the PDP is addressing the low percentages of graduate students within the UC system (about 17% across the disciplines). He said that the PDP was established more as a symptom of that problem rather than to come up with a solution to that issue, and that the task force had other specific charges. He did acknowledge that UC is out-of-balance in terms of graduate and undergraduate education and he sees the non-resident tuition proposal (memorial to the Regents) as a first step towards correcting this imbalance.

ACTION: CCGA invited Professor Williams to the April meeting.

XI. Guest – Acting Provost Rory Hume

ISSUE: Provost Hume reported on his recent campus visits and noted a number of common messages from the various campuses. First and foremost (and not surprisingly), many campus conveyed that they are facing financial challenges and struggling to attract the best and brightest graduate students. The importance of cross-disciplinary programs was also highlighted by a number of campus representatives, who said that such programs often attract the highest caliber of graduate students. Some junior faculty members also told him that they turned down other offers to come to UC departments that offered such programs. He reported that while professional education remains an important component of UC's graduate offerings, only about 10% of the faculty that he talked with spoke about professional programs, while 90% of the faculty engaged him in discussions about doctoral education. He did not think that this meant that professional programs are not valued. Rather, he felt that most faculty members think that professional programs are the most stable at the moment, and doctoral programs are the ones that need the most attention right now.

He also spoke about the activities of the PDP. He said that this task force is engaged in a very structured approach to enrollment planning in the health sciences, and is specifically looking at the allied health sciences for fields where UC can take a leading role. Legal education is another area of interest. As noted earlier, a special subcommittee has been formed to deal with this issue. Irvine has resubmitted a proposal for a new law school, and Riverside is considering resubmitting a proposal as well (both proposals were rejected six years ago). Finally, UC continues to develop its educational leadership programs. He is charging PDP to make a studied view about what UC can contribute to this field going forward.

DISCUSSION: Members asked Provost Hume about the low graduate enrollment rate that UC faces. Members noted that the current enrollment percentage of about 17% is dramatically lower than the 29% graduate enrollment that UC enjoyed in the 1960's; it is also much lower than the graduate student enrollment percentages found at many of UC's competitors. He acknowledged that this is a serious concern and responded that there is a long-range guidance team in place that is looking at the shape and form of the University by the year 2020. He said that there will probably be an opportunity to address these low enrollment percentages after 2010, when it is estimated that the number of high school students will plateau. He also noted that over the past couple of years, UC has been focused on undergraduate admissions and Tidal Wave II. He said

that there is evidence that the Regents are becoming increasingly aware of graduate issues, as they nearly voted against increasing graduate fees at a recent Regents' meeting. Members also asked about the high cost of living that affects almost all of the UC campuses. Provost Hume responded that stipend levels need to be increased, graduate student housing must to be expanded, and there should be more industry partnerships with UC to better support graduate students. Members inquired about the current status of the UC-CSU relationship. Overall, he feels that this relationship is improving and he is encouraged by recent developments. Following the UC compromise over the Scott bill that allowed the CSU to offer the Education doctorate independently of UC, Provost Hume stated that the CSU Senate are concerned that they simply don't have the resources to pursue independent Ed.D's at this time. He also reported that UC is taking a leading role in the discussion about offering a joint doctorate in audiology. Finally, members requested the appointment of a new Council of Deans' to CCGA. They reminded Provost Hume that CCGA has regularly enjoyed the attendance of such a representative to brief the committee on developments from that group, but this practice has lapsed this year.

ACTION: Provost Hume said that he would follow-up on getting a replacement for Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz as well as representative from the Council of Graduate Deans to regularly attend CCGA meetings.

XII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *Final Action*

A. Proposal for an on-line Master of Science (MS) in Engineering at UCLA – *Lead Reviewer Reen Wu (UCD)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wu presented his final report. He noted that there are three outstanding issues. The first is the design project (597A), and specifically how this project would work in an on-line environment. Second, CCGA members had general concerns over the quality of the on-line courses and specifically if the compensation levels were appropriate for the increased workload often associated with on-line course work. Contact hours remained another key issue, as members felt that the number of contact hours should be equivalent with the number typically found in traditional face-to-face classes. Professor Wu directed members' attention to the proposers' response, which he felt addressed these concerns.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the issues raised in Professor Wu's report. One member asked if it were possible for a student to earn the degree without every seeing a faculty member face-to-face. Professor Wu responded that this was indeed possible, however there would be heavy email and phone contact. If students were not local to take final exams at UCLA, remote test sites would be established. Other members addressed the design project, and asked if this should be considered as part of a Plan I or Plan II masters' plan. Since the design project is not really a thesis per se, members felt that the project fell somewhere between a Plan I and Plan II capstone, but were comfortable calling it a Plan II masters' project. The prospect of a five-year sunset approval was also discussed. After further discussion, members agreed to vote on approval of the program with an understanding that a report from the Los Angeles divisional Graduate Council would come back to CCGA after four years.

ACTION: Members voted in favor of the program with 8 in favor and 2 abstentions with the understanding that a report from the Los Angeles divisional Graduate Council would come back to CCGA after four years.

B. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Developmental Biology at UC San Francisco for the Ph.D. and M.S. Degree – Lead Reviewer Anne Wuerker (UCLA)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wuerker summarized her review of the program and said that the program is ready for a final vote. She reported that she has received two external reviews and three internal reviews. All reviews were enthusiastic about the proposed program, and they thought that the proposal presented a solid program with excellent faculty that offered graduates excellent job prospects. One reviewer felt that the curriculum might be too broad with not enough focus on developmental biology. However, the other reviewers thought that the curriculum is well-designed for the fast changing nature of this field. Another concern is the length of time to complete the degree. Although the proposers state that it should only take about five years to complete, a number of students in the program now are taking much longer (between six and seven years). Reviewers also stated that as the field of developmental biology becomes even more complex, the trend is towards longer time to completion of the degree, not shorter. Finally, the proposal is missing a bio-ethics course. Since this is a standard course in developmental biology programs, reviewers thought that this must be a simple omission from the proposal.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that a bio-ethics course should be included.

ACTION: Members voted in favor of the program by a vote of 9 in favor and two abstentions. The requirement of a bio-ethics course will be noted in the acceptance letter.

C. Proposal for a M.A. in East Asian Studies at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab (UCSF)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Chehab received a response from the program proposers, which tries to address many of the concerns that members raised. Professor Chehab reminded members that reviewers had expressed doubts that students could achieve foreign language proficiency after only two years of language training. Regarding adequate graduate student support, they stated that most students would be enrolled in the Ph.D. program, and therefore be eligible for departmental support. Addressing concerns of adequate library facilities and materials, the proposers have recently “successfully applied” for a library grant of \$150,000 for a three-year period (CCGA members assumed that this meant they had received the grant). In response to reviewers’ criticisms that the curriculum is too rigorous, proposers responded that such a rigorous program is necessary for the field of Southeast Asian Studies, which is complex. They did modify the program so that it is possible to either complete a thesis based on fieldwork or write a series of articles. He also reported that the proposers claim that it is impossible to create a budget for a non-existent program. Finally, the proposal does not include bylaws, which the proposers claim are not required.

DISCUSSION: Members were not satisfied by the proposers' response. They had outstanding concerns regarding the language training and requirements, budget, and bylaws. They also felt that some letters of commitment should be required from the Riverside administration.

ACTION: Professor Chehab will ask for a more detailed response to the outstanding CCGA concerns listed above.

D. Proposal for a Ph.D./M.A. in Education at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Thomas Patterson (UCSD)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Patterson made his final report to the committee. He said that reviewers were unanimous in their praise of the proposal. He also noted that the remaining CCGA concerns regarding the faculty, research methodology, and the curriculum have been satisfied.

ACTION: Members voted in favor of the program with ten votes in favor, and one abstention.

XIII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – In Progress

A. Proposal for a Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures at UCSB – Lead Reviewer Nadine Lambert (UCB)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Lambert presented her report to the committee. She noted that she has encountered difficulties obtaining sufficient external reviews. Her report is based on one external review and two internal reviews. The program offers nine specializations with intensive work in language studies as well. One of the main issues is the support for students, as the program intends to use teaching assistantships as fellowships. She argued that this strategy could result in poor instruction if unprepared graduate students are hired for teaching assistantships. One reviewer commented that UCSB graduates typically have poor Chinese language skills, which might be the result of using teaching assistants who have insufficient language skills themselves. While the program has well-qualified faculty, many are senior faculty members. Therefore, the proposers should draft a recruitment plan in order to deal with anticipated retirements. The external reviewer also said that the library budget is inadequate.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that Professor Lambert should request the following from the proposers: (1) the pedagogy should be covered by appropriate language instruction; (2) a long-term plan for faculty recruitment and retention; (3) a statement on how to resolve the issue of student support to ensure that the language instruction is of high enough quality to reflect positively on the program; and (4) a letter of administrative commitment to the program. One member inquired about the high number of specializations listed, and she wondered if there were too many. She thought that it might be hard to maintain these specializations as faculty members retire and new ones are hired. Professor Lambert responded that the faculty expertise is quite broad, making it possible to support these specializations, but acknowledged that the list of specializations might be variable. Members requested that Professor Lambert obtain

more information on the specializations and how these will be incorporated into the curriculum. Finally, members asked that Professor Lambert delete any reference to the perceived rank of the proposed program in her letter to the proposers.

ACTION: Professor Lambert will respond to the proposers.

B. Proposal for a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Writing at UC San Diego – Lead Review Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Sharrer reported difficulty in obtaining a second internal review. He has also received another external review, which is positive but lists a number of suggestions. Professor Sharrer also noted that an apprentice teaching course is required, which is a level 500 course. This seems to be a violation of policy; as such courses should not be counted towards the degree.

DISCUSSION: Given the nature of the reviews received thus far (the two external reviews are positive and the internal review is negative), members suggested that one more internal review is necessary before the committee can vote on this proposal.

ACTION: Professor Sharrer will follow-up on a second internal review.

C. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Horticulture and Agronomy at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)

ACTION: Professor Patterson has agreed to take over this review from Professor Stralka, who has accepted the UCD Statistics proposal (see below).

D. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Music at Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Stralka reported that this proposal will be ready for a final vote at the March meeting.

E. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) Degree Program in Health Law at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Shawn Kantor (UCM)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Kantor received one external review, which is positive, but does corroborate CCGA's initial concerns about whether the courses will be suitable for the kinds of students that will be enrolling in the program. He would like to see a response from the proposers that addresses this issue.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed with Professor Kantor that a site visit may be necessary to obtain further clarification on CCGA's concerns. One member also thought that the certificate requirements might need to be further specified. Professor Kantor said that he would look into that and report back to the committee.

ACTION: Professor Kantor will follow-up on another external review and investigate the possibility of a site visit.

F. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Human Development at UC San Diego – *Lead Reviewer Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Heckhausen reported that she has sent a review summary to the program proposers. She is awaiting a response from the campus.

G. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and Joint Doctorate in Criminal Justice Sciences (Ph.D.) with CSU Fresno and UC Davis – *Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Schumm reported that he has just received an email from the proposers, and it seems quite likely that they are in the process of reworking the proposal.

XIV. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *Initial Discussion*

A. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Statistics at UC Irvine

ACTION: Professor Stralka (UCR) volunteered to serve as the lead reviewer for this program.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Attest: Duncan Lindsey, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst