

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING— MARCH 8, 2005**

**I. Chair's Announcements – *Quentin Williams***

Health Sciences Committee

UC will be issuing a report on the future of health sciences within UC. Over the next 15 years, there will be an effort to increase enrollments in the health sciences fields (except dentistry and optometry—their current and future market demand is fulfilled). There is also a recommendation for one or more new comprehensive educational programs in medicine and nursing, and one in veterinary medicine over the next 15-20 years.

Restriction on Research Funding

CCGA's letter on this issue was well accepted at the last Academic Council (AC) meeting, but the AC is waiting upon divisional comment (March 14).

CalSpace Review

UCEP and CCGA concurred with the recommendations of the review committee that CalSpace should be rebid, however UCPB argued that it should be disbanded. AC voted in favor of the UCPB position.

Senate Regulation 600(B)

The CCGA-proposed changes to this regulation are being forwarded for divisional and systemwide comments.

SB 1452 (Nunez)

This bill would amend the Donahoe Higher Education Act to “consider culture, race, gender, ethnicity, national origin, geographic origin, and household income, along with other relevant factors, in undergraduate and graduate admissions, so long as no preference is given.” Chair Williams noted that this legislation seems to violate Proposition 209.

SB 445

This legislation would supplant CPEC with the California Commission on Statewide Postsecondary Education Policy and Planning. The changes to CPEC include narrowing the Commission goals to: (1) Articulating a state-wide higher education policy agenda and assessing its progress; (2) Advising the legislature, Governor, and policy makers in the postsecondary education segments regarding state priorities “dictated by current trends and evolving needs”; and (3) Coordinate policy efforts among each postsecondary education segment in order to advance the State's higher education policy agenda. It is unclear whether this new commission would have oversight over new programs (there is not any specific language pertaining to such a role in this legislation).

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

### Graduate Planning Task Group

It was noted that this task group was delayed due to the fact that not all of the necessary consultation had been completed. The formal charge will be sent to CCGA members.

### Reorganization of the Provost's Office

The reorganization is currently proceeding with a final deadline of July 1, 2005. It is anticipated that the reorganization will include three initial functional area groups that will cut across the different boundaries within the Office of the President (OP). These groups will provide a focus to graduate education, undergraduate education, and international education issues.

### Audiology Task Group

This group will look at the possible models to offer a doctorate in Audiology. The joint doctorate at San Diego provides a good example of such a doctorate. This program is located within the Ear, Nose, and Throat (ENT) department. UCSD has discovered that putting ENT and audiology students together in classrooms has been quite beneficial. It has also allowed them to offer clinical settings through ENT. There is current ongoing discussion between ENT Chairs at various UC campuses about doing this sort of joint-program. The existing Masters programs within the CSU are also very small. For example, the five Masters-only programs in the CSU are run by three to five faculty per program (these programs include not only a Masters program, but also undergraduate and credential programs). Therefore, the additional workload (the increase in clinical hours and courses that will be required by the audiology accrediting association) may be difficult for the existing CSU faculty to take on by themselves. This task group will meet on March 24<sup>th</sup>, and it is anticipated that a framework for possible options will be available in late March.

### Joint Doctorate/Ed.D. Update

Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz briefed the committee on the current political climate regarding joint doctorates. He encouraged CCGA to continue to be receptive to joint-doctoral program proposals. It was noted that UC has significantly decreased the "hurdles" that joint doctorates must pass through since 2001, and they are now much more realistic so that these programs can be based on their true academic merits.

## **III. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans**

*Dean Mason did not have any updates or announcements.*

## **IV. Consent Calendar**

A. Approval of the February 8, 2005 Minutes

**ACTION: The February 8, 2005 minutes were approved.**

## **IV. (B) Senate Regulation 694**

*Chair Williams moved this item off the consent calendar for further discussion.*

**ISSUE:** Chair Williams reworded this regulation in response to the discussion at the last CCGA meeting that "the Graduate Council will be responsible for informing CCGA of all approvals of off-campus graduate instructional programs." He admitted that more comprehensive review and revision is needed however. To that end, he reported that a UCLA ad-hoc committee (in

response to a on-going review of its proposed Masters of Science in Engineering for Professional Employee Engineers program) has been meeting to discuss this regulation in the light of on-line and systemwide courses, as well as international programs (where the coursework is completed at a foreign university such as the National University of Singapore). Another outstanding issue with this regulation is the role that university extension plays in courses not completed in residence. Finally, 694(D) calls for annual reviews by the divisional Graduate Councils of all off-campus programs. This is something that is typically not done.

**DISCUSSION:** Several members debated the current language as it pertains to the role that University Extension plays. At least one member felt that the current wording requires University Extension to be involved in the offering of any off-campus course or program. However, other members felt that the language was much more ambiguous and thought that future drafts should either (1) modify the role(s) of University Extension; or (2) eliminate the sections relating to University Extension altogether. One of the main issues with participation by University Extension is the Senate faculty oversight over such courses/programs. Besides on-line courses and international programs (those offered in conjunction with foreign universities), any revision to SR 694 should also deal with systemwide courses, many of which are currently being proposed. Finally, the University Extension issue also needs to be addressed. Members discussed creating a special subcommittee to revise SR 694.

**ACTION:** Chair Williams established a subcommittee to revise SR 694. The subcommittee would be formally charged with revising SR 694, improve its dealings with off-campus offerings, and prospectively incorporate legislation related to on-line and systemwide offerings. Vice Chair Duncan Lindsey agreed to chair the subcommittee, and William McDonald (UCLA), Don Wayne (UCSD), and Bruce Schumm (UCSC) volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

## **V. CSU Applied Doctorate Legislation**

**ISSUE:** Chair asked the committee for comments regarding the proposed legislation (SB 724) authorizing independently awarded professional/clinical doctoral degrees by the California State University (CSU) system.

**DISCUSSION:** It was noted that the prospects for CSU legislation are generally pretty good (given that the CSU is represented by more legislators/more districts than UC). The time frame for this legislation is late June 2005. UC is currently putting a lot of effort into informing the California Department of Finance/Legislative Analyst's Office/Governor's Office about the implications of this legislation. The financial arguments for joint doctorates continue to be strong. For example, both systems have already invested (or committed) \$4 million into the joint-Ed.D. programs, which are something that the State of California continues to have a stake in. On the subject of joint-Ed.D.'s, AC Chair George Blumenthal has recommended to the Legislature that they commission an independent report (rather than relying on the current report put out by CSU) to evaluate whether the joint-Ed.D. programs have been a success. Such a report would be much more persuasive than simply CSU's or UC's statements alone.

Members also raised the question of evaluating the Ed.D. programs on a systemwide or comparative basis, especially in regards to the distribution of UC and CSU faculty on the

dissertation committees. Currently, the CCGA-imposed requirement for new programs is a 2:2 ratio, although the UCD/Fresno Ed.D. program does not have that requirement (many of their committees only have one UC faculty member). Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz noted that CCGA has the authority to establish such a review if it wishes to do so. Chair Williams remarked that when the framework for these joint-Ed.D.'s were originally being developed, CCGA wanted to ensure that there was an equal commitment from both CSU and UC, which is the reason that the 2:2 faculty dissertation committee ratio was established. This ratio is also in accord with the pedagogic designs of the new programs.

## **VI. Graduate Education Taskforce(s)**

**ISSUE:** Chair Williams reported that he spoke with AC Chair Blumenthal about the establishment of a task force on graduate education. The CCGA recommendation for an informational website for international students was also forwarded to the Office of Academic Initiatives. Since UCPB has also proposed a committee on graduate education, Chair Williams clarified both the number and definition of the taskforces/committees that have been proposed:

- CCGA/Provost Task Force on Graduate Education: The charge for this task force is: (1) Identify existing fields where workforce studies are needed to assess authentic state needs for graduate and doctoral training. A process for directing these studies also needs to be developed including harnessing UC and other higher education expertise, looking for professional association assessments, and contracting with consultants external to the university. (2) Identify emerging fields where UC is expected to play a leading role in preparing the work force of doctoral training in order to sustain the State of California's lead as an international economic force. An examination of the allied health fields will be one of the initial projects.
- UCPB Graduate and Professional School Financial Aid Steering Committee: Given that there is no well-defined and transparent funding model for graduate education (as there is for undergraduate education), UCPB has proposed a steering committee that would review the present funding formulas (primarily return-to-aid) as well as looking at graduate student instructor (GSI) fees.

AC Chair Blumenthal recommended that instead of creating a new task force on international graduate education, CCGA make a specific recommendation. At the suggestion of Dean Mason, that recommendation could be the remission of tuition fees for GSI's after their second year.

**DISCUSSION:** Members were especially concerned that the crucial issue of international graduate education funding be addressed within these committees/task forces. These funding concerns include out-of-state tuition costs, which typically hit international students especially hard. As noted above by Chair Williams, the main recommendation(s) from the members revolved around remitting the fees international graduate students when they serve as GSI's (especially from the second year on). It was also suggested that CCGA invite Gretchen Kalonji to a future meeting. Dr. Kalonji is one of the new Faculty Associates for Special Projects, who will be working on international projects. Tuition remissions for graduate student researchers (GSR's) were put forward as an additional topic of discussion down the road.

In regards to the UCPB steering committee, members discussed broadening its agenda to look at the entire funding of graduate education, including examining not only financial aid issues but

also the costs to both students and UC. The suggestion was made to form a small group or sub-committee whose members would sit on both committees/task forces to inform both UCPB and CCGA as experts. A focus on doctoral education (rather than applied doctorates) was noted as a good starting point for such a committee.

**ACTION:** (1) CCGA will advocate for tuition remission for graduate GSI's after the second year; (2) Chair Williams will invite Gretchen Kalonji to the April CCGA meeting; (3) Chair Williams will write to UCPB Chair Parrish regarding the establishment of a UCPB/CCGA subcommittee as described above.

## **VII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review**

### **A. Proposal for M.A. in Global and International Studies at UCSB – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Schumm mentioned that three external reviewers had been chosen and reminded the committee that due to a grant/funding deadline of April 1, CCGA is under pressure to expedite this review. At this point, Professor Schumm has not received any reviews. He noted the outstanding issues with the current proposal:

- Graduate support is not adequately defined.
- Although the governance of the program is discussed briefly, the proposal is missing a set of bylaws, which is required.
- The proposal briefly mentions the benefits of APSAI membership, which is the principal professional organization for international studies programs. However, there is not much detail as to the actual benefits of this membership, nor does the proposal indicate if this program plans to become a member.
- Although the proposal mentions that students will do internships abroad, there is very little in terms of the specificity of these internships. The proposal also does not explain how the program will develop its international presence.
- Professor Schumm wanted to know why the proposal included a Plan 2 Masters (exam only) in addition to the traditional Masters requirements (thesis).
- The proposal briefly notes distance learning, but does not thoroughly discuss how it will be implemented or integrated into the rest of the program.
- The library needs have not been worked out in great enough detail (although a small request has been made).
- Professor Schumm wonders about the breadth of the curriculum, and whether it is adequate.
- In regards to the budget, there is no explicit letter of support.
- The salary of the support staff is rather low. For example, the salary for the internship placement position is only \$31,000 a year.
- There are concerns about the faculty who will be teaching in the program, given that the program is very dependent on visiting faculty, with only three FTE's devoted to the program.
- Although space is not a critical issue, it should be mentioned nonetheless.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Williams reiterated the need to process this review quickly and working proactively with UCSB to speed the review through the process. Several members noted that the typical hold-ups are the external reviews. In order to facilitate

these reviews, Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz authorized doubling the honorarium to \$500 (\$250 of which would come from Academic Initiatives).

Members felt that in light of an expedient review process, the proposers need to address the following basic issues:

- Bylaws
- Hiring/staffing plan
- Graduate student support
- International placement
- Library support

**ACTION: Professor Schumm will write a letter to the Dean, EVC, and the proposers with a March 24 deadline. Consultant Suzanne Klausner will work with Academic Senate staff to process the extra \$250 honorarium.**

**B. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and the Master of Advanced Study (M.A.S.) Degree Program in Clinical Research at UC Davis**

**ACTION: Michael Hanemann (UCB) was selected as the lead reviewer.**

**C. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Media Arts and Technology at UC Santa Barbara**

**ACTION: William McDonald (UCLA) was selected as the lead reviewer.**

**D. Proposal for M.A. and Ph.D. Programs in Religious Studies at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Michael Hanemann (UCB)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Hanemann said that he has nothing new to report at this point. Further discussion on this program proposal was tabled until the April meeting.

**E. Proposal for a Ph.D. Program in Health Economics at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Reen Wu (UCD)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Wu reported that both the external and the internal reviews are in, and they have been forwarded to UCLA. CCGA is currently awaiting a response from the program proposers. He noted that while the reviews are generally positive, they highlight the following issues:

- Primary advisor's relationship to the program: When is the primary advisor identified and what is the relationship to the student and the rest of the program?
- Qualifying examinations
- Bylaws: A small revision is necessary (adding one sentence).
- Curriculum: (1) Health curriculum is light. Reviewers suggest additional electives in health care. (2) Another reviewer suggested expanding the "health policy" study to include international health care in addition to the domestic curriculum.
- Administrative support: Since the program is an interdepartmental one and the administrative support will be provided by the Department of Economics, it is unclear how it will work for students and the faculty at the Department of Health Services in the program.
- Student Support: Most of reviewers felt the current proposed stipend is too low. Although the proposers have indicated that students will be able to earn more by

engaging in funded research projects, it is unclear how much this support would be. There also seem to be at least two different levels of graduate student support in one graduate program.

- Student recruitment: Reviewers have indicated that the program may have trouble attracting enough students to the program. Student recruitment pool may also be limited due to the high mathematical requirements, and the program may want to consider enlarging the curriculum to include international health issues to attract international students.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed enlarging the curriculum to include international health issues. One member pointed out that any international student wanting to study health economics would come to the United States regardless of whether international health issues were covered in the curriculum. In other words, a solid standard health curriculum is what matters.

**F. Proposal for a Masters of Financial Engineering at UCLA – Lead Reviewer**  
*Stephen Ritchie (UCI)*

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Ritchie completed a site visit and reported that the proposers have answered CCGA's remaining concerns:

- Faculty: There will be a number of visiting faculty—mainly from the Hass School of Management at UCB and UCI. Additional FTE will not be hired for a couple of years.
- Graduate Support: Graduate support is not an issue, because students primarily use loans to finance their education since typical salaries are relatively high after graduation.
- Library Support: Library facilities are adequate for the program.
- Timeline: The program is slated to start in 2008. This gives the proposers time to gear up for the first cohort of students—hire an executive director, executive assistant, and establish the advisory boards.

**ACTION:** A motion was made to approve the program upon the receipt of a report from Professor Ritchie. Members voted to approve the program with nine votes in favor and two abstentions. Chair Williams will write a letter to AC/Assembly approving the program pending the final report. The program would be a new degree title at the UCLA campus.

**G. Proposal for a Ph.D. Program in Culture & Theory at UCI – Lead Reviewer**  
*Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)*

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Sharrer noted that the lack of the disestablishment of the Comparative Culture program remains problematic. He brought a letter from the Dean of the Social Sciences, Barbara Doshier, to the attention of the committee. The letter indicates an unwillingness to officially discontinue this program due to the fact that it may be of some future use to the Chicano/Latino, Social Sciences, or the International Studies departments.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the letter from Dean Doshier. They were especially concerned that a reactivated dormant program may not have to go through the CCGA approval process even if the new program is substantially different from the old dormant program. If UCI did not agree to disestablish the dormant Comparative Culture program, CCGA sees a need for an integrated plan for the social sciences and humanities at UCI. Such a plan would specifically define the relationship between the Comparative Culture program and the proposed program (as well as any other programs that may be proposed at a later date per Dean Doshier's letter). Above all, the committee did not want to approve a new program that could overlap with a dormant program.

Professor Sharrer also reminded the committee that there are still other outstanding issues, such as the possible conflict between the English/Comparative Literature departments and this new program. Specifically, the program proposers claim that the new program will not have a very strong literature component, however English/Comparative Literature graduate students feel that there may be a potential conflict. Such pending issues reflect the fact that regardless of the outcome of the dormant Comparative Culture program, CCGA is not ready to approve the program at this point.

**ACTION:** Professor Sharrer will write a letter requesting a conference call to discuss the dormant Comparative Culture program. The teleconference would be between Barbara Anne Doshier, Dean of the School of Social Sciences, Karen Lawrence, Dean of the School of Humanities, William Parker, Dean of Graduate Studies, Michael R. Gottfredson, Executive Vice Chancellor, Chair Williams, and Professor Sharrer.

**H. Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group & Ph.D. Program in Animal Biology at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Grayson Marshall (UCSF)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Marshall did not attend the meeting, so this item was tabled until the April meeting.

**I. Proposal for a M.S. Program in Neuroscience at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Quentin Williams (Chair)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Chair Williams noted that this would be a very small program. He has received one external review that while positive, lists the following concerns:

- Neuroscience Course: A course in clinical neuroscience should be required.
- Masters' degree standards need to be quantified (the proposal states that masters students would be subject to lower standards than the Ph.D. students).
- Student Financial Aid: Quentin will get clarification on this issue, but it seems that students will be supported through the Ph.D. program.
- Bylaws: The proposal is missing a set of bylaws.

**ACTION:** Chair Williams will send a letter to the proposers that will clarify outstanding issue and pose queries.



**J. Proposal for a Joint UCSC/CSU Monterey Bay/San Jose State Ed.D. – Lead Reviewer Don Wayne (UCSD)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Wayne noted that CSU has still not appointed its lead reviewer. He reported that he has already received commitments from two external reviewers, whose reports are due later in March. He is currently looking for a third external reviewer. Professor Wayne also received one internal review. While the internal review is quite positive, it lists the following concerns:

- Faculty Coordination: Coordination between core and affiliated faculty from UCSC, CSU Monterey Bay, and San Jose State, as well as coordination between the dissertation advisor and the supervisors of the dissertation writing course.
- Substance of Course Work: Substance course work is limited, and is needed to balance out the fieldwork courses.

**ACTION:** Professor Wayne will continue to gather reviews and prepare a summary for the program proposers to respond to.

**VIII. Executive Session - Members only**

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

Attest: Quentin Williams, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst