

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday, February 7, 2012
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. Call to Order/Consent Calendar – Chair Rachael Goodhue

- Approval of the Agenda
- Approval of the November 1 Meeting Minutes

ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed; the November 1, 2011 meeting minutes were approved with minor corrections.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership –

Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair

Robert Powell, Academic Council Vice Chair

Chair Bob Anderson provided updates on the online education initiative and discussions with the President regarding APM 668. He also discussed the “weights” assigned to types of students that are being considered in Rebenching decisions. **Chair Bob Powell** discussed advocacy and funding issues.

III. Announcements from the President’s Office, Academic Affairs –

Pamela Jennings, Director of Graduate Studies, ORGS

Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

Pamela Jennings provided updates on the UC-HBCU Initiative and on the implications of proposed state legislation (SB 259) to amend the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act. See http://www.ucop.edu/state/legislation/read_doc.php?id=1512 for more information.

Hilary Baxter discussed the status of PDST requests with the Regents and the likelihood that the Regents will not consider these until their May or July meetings at the earliest. She also provided updates on the WASC redesign and a recent LAO report on the continued collection of information previously collected vis-à-vis the old CPEC form for new program proposals.

IV. Chair’s Report/Announcements/Updates – Chair Rachael Goodhue

- **Jan. 25 Academic Council Meeting:** The Regents are unlikely to consider PSDT proposals before their July meeting; the data used for making decisions on Rebenching; SR 610 (residency); UCSF Chancellor’s presentation; Systemwide review of UC police response; UC online education initiative; proposed Memorial to the Regents; and APM 668 (Negotiated Salary Plan).

Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates *(continued)*

- **CAGSS Task Force:** CAGSS has developed three themes for its work going forward and a data wish list. Data starting to come-in; early observations suggest importance of reputation as a factor in attracting applicants to UC; the role of financial considerations in an applicant's decision to accept.
- **Joint Administrative-Senate Workgroup on Graduate Education:** The workgroup had a broad discussion at first meeting and several themes emerged including: data analysis and tracking; NRT; loans; preparation for jobs outside academia; impact of increasing fees and tuition. The workgroup will focus next time on the collection of campus data on points of concern and best practices on the campuses with regard to graduate student support.
- **Feb. 1 Academic Council iLinc Meeting** (Vice Chair Sharon Farmer, UCSB)
- **Jan. 25 Council of Graduate Deans Meeting:** **Ruth Mulnard** (UCI) reported that much of the meeting was spent on a presentation from VP Steve Beckwith. COGD discussed its focus and compliance with NIH rules related to the minimum salary for Post-docs.

V. Continued Discussion of Request for Expedited Review: Proposed Affiliation Agreement between UCSD and California Western School of Law – Chair Goodhue

DISCUSSION: **Chair Bob Anderson** reported earlier that the San Diego Executive Committee has since voted down the proposal. **Executive Director Martha Winnacker** summarized her research on previous UC affiliation agreements and noted that she was unable to find a precedent. The Committee discussed the campus response to a list of questions previously submitted by CCGA as well as the UCAP letter and recommendation not to approve the agreement. Members raised a range of concerns including concerns about the quality reputation of CWSL and the seemingly uneven nature of the partnership; advantages to UC for partnering with CWSL insufficient for moving forward; the LAO's past opposition to the need for new UC law school; motives behind CWSL aspirations; lack of substantive information on how the affiliation would further UCSD's long-term goals and benefit UC; campus interest in improving legal education in its local area; and that it would not like to see the agreement move forward without the support of the UCSD faculty.

CCGA members were strongly opposed to any mention of the University of California or the University of California, San Diego on diplomas issued by CWSL, for three reasons: 1) the notable discrepancy in the quality of existing UC law programs and the CWSL program; 2) the program and school have not followed standard procedures for Academic Senate and UCOP involvement in program and school approval – accreditation is not a substitute for formal review; and 3) the lack of precedent for including UC's name on a non-UC degree.

CCGA, like UCAP, expressed concern about the lack of evidence of active UCSD faculty interest in the proposed agreement or, for that matter, in the previous one. CCGA members had reservations about the lack of faculty involvement via the normal channels of shared governance and noted that if the long-term objective is the absorption of the law school into UCSD, proper procedures must be followed as specified in the Compendium and elsewhere.

ACTION: CCGA unanimously voted to convey the above points in letter to Academic Council and it will wait to the Administration's responses to concerns of the divisional Senate and Academic Council before making a final determination on the proposal.

VI. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

All program proposals are now posted on the CCGA SharePoint site; contact the [committee analyst](#) if you would like a proposal e-mailed to you.

- A. Proposal for an M.Eng. degree program in Bioengineering at UC Berkeley – Chair Goodhue**

ACTION: Mike Vanderwood (UCR) was appointed as lead reviewer.

- B. Proposal for Fully Employed M.B.A. (FEMBA) degree program at UC Riverside – Chair Goodhue**

ACTION: Ruth Mulnard (UCI) was assigned as lead reviewer.

- C. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Feminist Studies leading to the Ph.D. degree at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Alan Buckpitt (UCD)**

REPORT: Prof. Buckpitt reported that he has received all four external reviews and will prepare a report for next time.

- D. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Computational Biology leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees at UC Berkeley – Lead Reviewer Andrew Chisholm (UCSD)**

REPORT: Prof. Chisholm reported that he has received a couple of reviews and waiting for the others to arrive soon.

- E. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Computer Engineering at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)**

REPORT: Prof. Schumm discussed concerns raised by the external reviewers and the campus response to these. He recommended approval at this time and will prepare his summary report and circulate it by email to members for review.

ACTION: CCGA will vote by email following its review of the lead reviewer's report.

- F. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Online M.S. degree in Engineering at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Robert Raffai (UCSF)**

REPORT: Prof. Raffai discussed concerns raised by the external reviews which were largely supportive. He recommended approval at this time.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (11-0-1) to approve the proposal.

- G. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Master's of Professional Accounting (M.P.Ac.) degree at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Will Shadish (UCM)**

REPORT: Prof. Shadish summarized the main points raised in the external reviews. He recommended approval at this time.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (11-0-1) to approve the proposal.

H. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.A. degree in Theater Arts at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Rita Raley (UCSB)

REPORT: Prof. Raley summarized the main points raised in the external reviews. She recommended approval at this time.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (11-0-1) to approve the proposal.

I. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Latin American and Latino Studies at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Sharon Farmer (UCSB)

REPORT: Prof. Farmer discussed the main points from the external reviews which were overall very positive. She recommended approval at this time and will prepare her summary report and circulate it by email to members for review.

ACTION: CCGA will vote by email following its review of the lead reviewer's report.

J. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Biotechnology Management at UC Irvine – Interim Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UCD)

REPORT: There was nothing new to report since the last meeting.

K. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Nursing Science leading to the Ph.D. degree at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Donald Mastronarde (UCB)

REPORT: Prof. Mastronarde discussed concerns raised in the external reviews which overall were positive. He recommended approval at this time.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (11-0-1) to approve the proposal.

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

REPORT: Prof. Arovas discussed the campus response to concerns previously raised by CCGA. He expressed some worry about finances and the absence of external letters. At this point, he is somewhat on the fence about recommending approval at this time. CCGA discussed sending the proposal back to the Davis Graduate Council in light of the change in the funding model and the use of block-grant funding and the conditions under which the proposal was initially approved by Graduate Council. In the end, CCGA decided that it would be worthwhile to follow-up on these outstanding concerns before making a final determination.

ACTION: Prof. Arovas will request the external letters of support from the proposers.

ACTION: Chair Goodhue will send the proposers a status update in response to their letter from Jan. 29.

VII. Self-Supporting Programs Subcommittee Report – Bruce Schumm (UCSC), Andrew Chisholm (UCSD)

DISCUSSION: CCGA discussed the types of categories potentially missing in the accounting of SSPs including: effort by ladder-rank administrators (Dean, associate Dean); IT support; Library costs; Graduate Division support; temporary Academic Staff costs associated with instruction by Teaching Assistants and Teaching Fellows; audit costs; cost of Senate’s business (personnel actions, curricular review, etc.); and possible Systemwide costs. Other issues discussed included: general philosophy for basing estimates of SSP costs (marginal or extra incurred costs vs. pro-rated costs); assessment of the cost of participation by adjunct (non-ladder-rank) faculty; costs associated with TA/TF support; tracking return-to-aid; and the nature of conducting audits of SSPs. Members also expressed concern about student access to SSPs; the utility of MOUs in program design; quality/oversight issues and prescribing review of SSPs commensurate with campus review cycle; and the particular learning objectives of each program as factors to be considered in the review of SSPs. Moving forward, Prof. Bruce Schumm suggested that CCGA could recommend the “proportionality” principle for student participation/access to courses proportionately assigned to programs to cover instructional costs. Chair Goodhue suggested, and the Committee agreed, to craft a general set of guiding principles and policy over the next few meetings that would eventually be shared with the campuses.

Among the basic points discussed by the Committee: First, that SSPs should have MOUs regarding courses with joint enrollment of SSP and regular students. If there is not an MOU and students are denied access, then there is a structural problem with the design of the SSP. Faculty in either program should be advocates for their students. Problem is not different in principle from current cross-program enrollments. There is the possibility of issues due to quality because students in the two types of programs have different objectives (research vs. other). And second, that review processes should properly assess possible implications for program quality of joint enrollments, including specifically the effects of having students with different educational objectives in the same course.

VIII. UCLA Anderson School Proposal – Chair Goodhue, Ian Krouse (UCLA Alternate)

DISCUSSION: Prof. Ian Krouse, in consultation with Prof. Karen Gyls (UCLA) reported that the Graduate Council has not yet voted on the proposal. He summarized various findings in response to prior concerns including: comments from local Planning and Budget; donor prospects lined-up; the program’s motives for moving to SSP status and the need to respond to market issues; contextualized that responses to their proposal have been based on residual opposition to prior similar proposals; and the questionable relationship between prospective donors and the program and its faculty. At this point, the GC is not ready to make a final determination on the proposal but expect that they will be ready for a vote by their next meeting. Chair Goodhue shared highlights from the initial analyses of the proposal by UCPB. Members suggested flagging the above concerns for Chair Anderson and UCEP.

ACTION: Chair Goodhue will follow-up with Prof. Gyls, et al. on the two outstanding questions from CCGA.

IX. UCSF Chancellor's presentation to Board of Regents – Robert Raffai (UCSF)

DISCUSSION: Prof. Robert Raffai and Vice Chair Bob Powell reported on the UCSF Chancellor's presentation at the last Regents meeting, in which she reported that UCSF is looking at options that include: evaluating new and enhanced growth opportunities for UCSF; examining UCSF's financial relationship with the UC system; and exploring alternative governance models.

X. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils and Inquiries from the Divisional Senates – Chair Goodhue and Members

This item was postponed due to constraints.

Adjournment:

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

Attest: Rachael Goodhue, CCGA Chair
Prepared by Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst

CCGA 2011-12 Remaining Meeting Schedule:

March 6, 2012 – 11326
April 3, 2012 – iLinc
May 1, 2012 – 11326
June 5, 2012 – 11326
July 3, 2012 – 11326