

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 6, 2007**

**I. Chair's Announcements**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Vice Chair Bruce Schumm is chairing the meeting until noon, as Chair Wu has been delayed. He announced that SR 694/695 has been removed from the agenda. After he arrived, Chair Wu remarked that Academic Council recently met with the executive vice chancellors (EVCs). The budget and non-resident tuition (NRT) were the two primary issues discussed.

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

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Joyce Justus described her background with President Atkinson, as well as her experience with UC diversity issues. She is currently the interim Vice Provost for Educational Relations at the Office of the President (UCOP). One of the prominent issues facing California is state of K-12 education. UC cannot do this alone, but needs the cooperation of the other post-secondary segments (CSU and the California community colleges). Provost Hume has also been heralding the 'Power of Ten', or the strength and importance of UC as a whole of its ten campuses. This does not diminish the diversity of the individual campuses however.

UCI Law School

CPEC staff has recommended to the CPEC Commission for a vote of non-concurrence on the law school proposal. While the Regents have recommended approval of the law school, they did want to be notified if CPEC does not support it. While non-concurrence does not mean that UC cannot move forward with the law school, it may have budgetary implications in the future. She noted that there is not a real historical example of non-concurrence. The Regents will meet next week, but this item will not be acted upon at this meeting. Joyce is advising the Provost that this is now a UCOP issue. Provost Hume will go to the CPEC meeting on March 20, 2007. The Regents have given UCI the authority to continue to plan for the law school, which is what they should continue to do. She does not foresee the CPEC commissioners voting against the recommendation of their executive director. She also does not see the independent colleges supporting this issue either.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the stated need for more lawyers. Joyce reminded the committee that there are a number of law school graduates who do not practice law. Other members said that a law school is part of the intellectual fabric of the campus. Joyce stressed that UCI wants to do a particular kind of law school; it would be different from the law schools on other campuses. She added that she would like to begin a different kind of conversation with CPEC—mainly program review and needs analysis, rather than evaluating new professional schools. She said that CPEC has experienced budget cuts, which has weakened the agency over the years. Members also asked about the UCR medical school. Joyce responded that the data supported the establishment of two new medical schools; therefore, CPEC cannot argue against it from a data standpoint. Also, given the fact that the Riverside proposal does not include the establishment of a university hospital, it will be hard to argue against it on that basis.

### **III. Consent Calendar**

#### **A. Draft Minutes from the January 9, 2007 Meeting**

**ACTION:** Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

#### **B. Name Change Request for the Atomic and Molecular Science and Engineering (AMSE) Graduate Group, UC Merced**

**ACTION:** Members approved the name change unanimously.

### **IV. Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians**

**ISSUE:** Analyst Todd Giedt noted that the actual proposal has been amended. He added that Academic Council has agreed to allow one response letter rather than two separate letters. This letter is due by April 10, 2007.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed that the changes in the proposal did not merit a different opinion from CCGA. Members requested a quick review of the response in April.

**ACTION:** Members requested that the draft letter be placed on the April agenda.

### **V. Advisory Board on Multi-Campus Research**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Vice Chair Schumm reminded members that CCGA has submitted its comments on this policy, and now the Administration is asked for a representative to serve on this advisory board.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed that Michael Hanneman and Cathy Constable would be good candidates, as they both seemed well-informed and interested in this issue. Members asked about the length of service required. Members also held a brief discussion about whether this representative had to be a current member of CCGA, agreeing that current members are better; therefore, members who are serving a two-year term would be better candidates.

**ACTION:** Bruce Schumm will follow-up and send CCGA's final selection to Analyst Todd Giedt.

### **VI. Interdepartmental Program Bylaw Requirement**

**ISSUE:** Analyst Todd Giedt received a request from the Los Angeles division to formalize a requirement for the inclusion of bylaws for interdepartmental program (IDP) proposals.

**DISCUSSION:** The UCI member explained that these guidelines are necessary both to establish these programs and to prevent administrative problems later on. These bylaws were developed as a module or template that could be built upon. UCLA has experience problems with some IDPs, especially those that are under-funded, which tend to be under-funded and rather unclear with respect to self-governance. Therefore, it seemed appropriate to require the IDPs to have bylaws. A UCLA workgroup was established to move towards this end. Members provided a description of how IDP policy towards bylaws varies by campus. At Davis, all programs and graduate groups (interdepartmental) must have bylaws in order to be approved. At Berkeley, there are 35 graduate groups across departments. These are the orphans of the system because they have no permanent faculty and resources (these are lent to them by the various departments). Much of the growth in graduate programs at Berkeley has taken the form of these

graduate groups. Responding to that phenomenon, A number of years ago the Berkeley Graduate Council conducted an internal two-year review of all graduate groups; every 4-5 years, these groups are re-reviewed. Similarly, the UCLA IDPs are reviewed on an eight-year cycle. At UCSF, there are very few programs that are department-based; most are interdisciplinary. The Santa Barbra Graduate Council recently drafted a set of guidelines for submission of programs. Members agreed that each division's Graduate Council has the authority to impose a requirement that all IDPs submit bylaws at the time of program proposal or review; however CCGA can make a policy statement regarding an IDP bylaws requirement. Members also expressed the notion that the committee should take care when drafting set of requirements.

Members agreed that the definition of an IDP is a graduate degree granting program that is not offered by a single department, but administered by a group of faculty who are constituted for that purpose, and whose governance lies outside that of any single department. In defining an IDP, they did not make any distinction between 'interdepartmental' and 'interdisciplinary'. Members also said that department-based programs do not need bylaws because they are governed by the department's bylaws. Another member said that the bylaws should apply to the faculty, not to the program. Vice chair Schumm observed that, over the past few years, CCGA has not required departmentally-based programs to submit bylaws. Members also posed the question of why only IDPs are required to submit bylaws; they anticipated that this will be the first objections from faculty within IDPs. However, they emphasized that without bylaws that define voting privileges, there is not any real governance structure. Other members said that the initial group constituting the IDP may not need bylaws, over time bylaws are needed as new members come on board and other members leave or retire. Subsequently, one member recommended that all new graduate groups/IDPs have bylaws; relatedly, existing IDPs should have bylaws in place by the time of their review. Another member modified that statement by stating that CCGA finds it desirable for IDPs to have bylaws; in fact CCGA would not approve programs without bylaws. Towards that end, members opined that CCGA can make a policy statement that we look for bylaws when we review new programs.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the motion the following statement: “Based on past experience, CCGA believes that all graduate groups/IDPs need bylaws. For this reason, CCGA will not approve graduate group/IDP degree proposals that do not contain adequate bylaws.” The requirement to retroactively institute bylaws for already-established programs will be placed on the April agenda.**

## **VII. Certificate Programs' Subcommittee Update**

**ISSUE:** Vice Chair Schumm reported that the subcommittee held a meeting earlier this morning. He reminded members of the charge of this group, which is to establish procedures for reviewing certificate programs. It is becoming clear that certificate programs mean many different things. There is certainly a class of certificates that should undergo Senate review (those associated with departments and academic credit), however, the subcommittee has not been able to define this class definitively yet. For example, some certificates are very rigorous but do not include a capstone (generally the requirement for a masters program). To that end, [Senate Regulation 735](#) authorizes a certificate in the completion of graduate curriculum. The subcommittee is interested in looking more closely at this class of certificate. On the other hand, the subcommittee is not interested in extending CCGA purview over those certificates offered by

Extension, which are governed by [Senate Regulation 811](#). Subcommittee members remarked that these certificates may or may not carry the unofficial seal, which carries a distinction from the official seal that is used on diplomas and the like. Use of the official seal is controlled by a set of strict [regulations](#), while the use of the unofficial seal only requires the authorization of the respective Chancellor. Once the subcommittee understands how to define these certificates, the next step is to make an inventory of these certificates (John Richardson at UCLA would be the main point of contact). The subcommittee has identified UCLA as a test case to take this inventory. It is anticipated that other divisions will eventually need to make an inventory of their certificates, once classes of certificate programs have been defined.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed whether CCGA should review certificates, noting that there is a fine line between a one-year MA/MS and a rigorous certificate program—mainly the difference lies in the number of units along with an inclusion of a capstone. Members recalled that the MAS degree filled this area, but certificates may not have been considered when this type of degree was developed. Therefore, CCGA should understand which certificates are somewhat close to degrees. The certificate of completion of graduate curriculum is about 80% of a MA/MS program. Members said that if CCGA decides to review certificates at a systemwide level, then certificates might need to be elevated. The Davis member noted that UCD has developed a set of guidelines for certificate programs; he will send them to the group.

**ACTION:** The Davis member will send a set of guidelines for certificate programs to Analyst Todd Giedt.

#### **VIII. Comparison of Students in Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs with Students in State-Supported Graduate Degree Programs**

**ACTION:** This item was postponed until the April meeting.

#### **IX. Academic Council Feedback on UCEP/CCGA's Proposal on the Role of Graduate Student In University Instruction**

**ISSUE:** Vice Chair Schumm briefed members on the process for the revision of this proposal, and asked permission from Chair Wu to take the lead in renegotiating this document. He will be making the initial contact with UCEP; CCGA may wish to consult other experts on this issue. As a first step, Chair Schumm suggested a phone meeting with UCEP Chair Dick Weiss. Vice Chair Schumm also reported on a conference call between UCAF Chair Fox, UCEP Chair Weiss and himself regarding UCAF's Statement on Academic Freedom. UCAF may want to come in as a third sponsor of this memo, as UCAF Chair Fox felt that central issues of academic freedom are addressed by this proposal. Regarding issues of academic freedom, Vice Chair Schumm summarized that the academic freedom of graduate students is derived from that of the faculty; it follows that graduate students do not enjoy the same level of academic freedom as does the faculty.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the input from the various divisions. One set of comments concerned the labor issues. One opinion is that this proposal should be revised independent of these issues, as the Senate is the authority for setting academic policy. Other members expressed concern about breaking existing contracts with the United Auto Workers (UAW), which represents graduate students on some campuses. Members also expressed the desire to consult

directly with the Graduate Deans. There also seems to be some misperception among the comments received from the divisions. There is also the sentiment at some campuses that the ‘system’ works well and is supervised by the divisional Senate, even if it is not codified. The impact of a change in rules will have a major impact on the social sciences and humanities, while the life and physical sciences will feel very little impact. Members agreed that a final proposal would not be ready by April; most likely, a revised proposal would not be ready until the fall.

Members discussed the supervision of graduate students by faculty along with academic freedom. Some member voiced the opinion that academic freedom is more of a value judgment; however they all agreed that having graduate students acting unethically or even inappropriately would not be a desirable outcome. Vice Chair Schumm noted that while faculty are judged by their peers, graduate students are judged by a superior. One member remarked that while it is true that graduate students are under supervision of faculty members in research, the same cannot be said for a graduate student teaching a French language course. Vice Chair Schumm reminded members that this policy proposal would clarify this issue.

Members were also interested in the graduate student perspective. Towards that end, they looked to the CCGA graduate student representative. She said that having a group of graduate students comment on this could be very productive. She reported that there are two key issues: (1) the experience of working as an ‘instructor of record’ is considered an asset in the job market; and (2) compensation. The graduate student representative said that there is a lot of variability of opinion on this issue. Vice Chair Schumm clarified that the memo basically allows a hands-off approach towards teaching assistants. Compensation needs to be raised however. He added that the memo does require that a faculty member be aware of what the teaching assistant is doing. Other members commented that the very things that graduate students are most concerned about are technically not allowed by the current bylaws, manuals, etc. That said however, the current environment is one that does not enforce these rules.

**ACTION: Chair Wu authorized Vice Chair Schumm to renegotiate this document with UCEP. Analyst Todd Giedt will talk with Maria about proper procedure and the due date/timeline, which will need to be extended.**

**X. Non- Academic Council Feedback on Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations 694 and 695**

**ISSUE: This item was removed from the agenda.**

**XI. Non-Resident Tuition Data Request**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu handed out distribution one, which showed that stark differences between the campuses in not only the amounts of non-resident tuition (NRT) that is collected, but also NRT as a percentage of the total budget. He reminded members that beginning next year, NRT will be traced by campus. He also reported that UCOP has also made \$10 million available for graduate support.

**DISCUSSION:** Members assessed the reasons for these varying amounts of NRT distributed back to the different campuses. Chair Wu explained that UCSF receives only a little NRT money because of its low undergraduate population; by the same token, UCLA receives a

relative large amount of NRT funding because of its large undergraduate population. Other reasons include different populations of international students. Members noted that NRT money gets co-mingled; however Chair Wu said that all NRT money is indeed returned to the campus of origin. Consultant Justus clarified that the NRT is dependent on the number of non-resident students on the campus. The Legislature has placed a cap on the number of international undergraduate students, and the campuses do not violate the cap. The allocation of tuition is based on the number of students on the campus. Therefore, campuses with smaller student populations receive smaller amounts of NRT. Historically, the percentage of state support has declined; however it has not declined as a percentage of funding allocated to the campuses; it has declined as a percentage of the total amount generated. She also reported that NRT figures as a prominent issue on The Regents' agenda. Regent Blum has encouraged UC to try to increase funding for graduate support (i.e. the replacement of NRT funds) through alumni giving.

Members were concerned that these numbers did not agree with some of the data that they collected from their divisions. They wondered if this means that not all NRT monies were coming back to the campuses. Consultant Justus suggested obtaining clarification from the budget office on this. Chair Wu reported that for graduate education, the amount of NRT generated is anywhere between \$40-60 million. However, other members cited last year's [\*Memorial to The Regents on Non-Resident Tuition for Graduate Students\*](#), placed that figure closer to \$80 million. Members commented that of the additional \$10 million being allocated for graduate support, only a fraction would go towards replacing NRT; most of it would be used for block grants for general graduate support. The Davis member mentioned that his campus already has a buy-back program in place (see distribution two). If a faculty member pays (though an extra-mural grant) for the NRT and/or fees for a graduate student, that faculty member receives 25% back from the Provost. However, it is designed not only for out-of-state students; it can be used for all graduate students whose fees are paid out of extramural grants. The committee also applauded the divorcing of the NRT associated with graduate students and undergraduate students. This could be a first step in allocating the graduate NRT towards graduate support. Certainly the State is not interested in paying for out-of-state undergraduate students; the State does have an interest in supporting international graduate students, who are likely to contribute to the Californian economy. Towards that end, Consultant Justus noted that The Regents are now talking about differentiating professional school fees among the different campuses.

Members also reviewed the recent history of the NRT issue over the last two years. The 25% NRT after advancement to candidacy has been eliminated; sole-sourcing money will be identified and funneled into graduate education; and an additional \$10 million is being allocated for graduate student support. Some members argued that this money could be used to eliminate NRT for four years, however others said that the instructional costs associated with graduate students in their first two years could be factor as to why this cannot be done. They also re-emphasized that UC either needs to obtain new money from the State, or money needs to be reallocated in order to eliminate NRT. The University could virtually eliminate NRT by simply returning it to the campuses from where it came. Politically speaking however, some of this NRT money is most likely currently used to pay faculty salaries, etc. Consultant Justus added that VP Larry Hershman would say that the University could reallocate the money. It is clear that the State Legislature has felt pretty strongly about not eliminating NRT. Members agreed

that \$40 million is the amount of money that is needed; however the University could charge all students a set fee. However, Consultant Justus explained that there is a fee-setting process in place (UC is set at 7% and CSU is set at 10% by the Department of Finance). Other members opined that the most serious impact is on international students, which undercuts UC's ability to compete as a research institution. It may be politically that UC can never get the Legislature to care about foreign graduate students. Part of this could be about developing metrics that show how UC has changed in its ability to recruit foreign graduate students. For example, at Berkeley there has been a substantial reduction in the number of international graduate student applications. Another member argued that perhaps the correct tact is simply to get more money from the Legislature in support of enhancing graduate education as a whole, thereby eliminating disincentives for international students at the same time. It doesn't seem that UC is that far away from evening the playing field (less than one year in the sciences). Consultant Justus added that The Regents have seen evidence of both the decline in international students as well as the corresponding decrease in UC's competitiveness. Finally, members expressed concern about the clause in the handout, which states that "the State will no longer provide state support (marginal cost of instruction funding) for enrollment increases for students paying NRT." One interpretation of this statement is that the Legislature does not favor an increase in the number of international graduate students. While this may not be a problem for Berkeley (as its numbers are capped), it may well be a problem for other campuses.

**ACTION: The Davis member will send the Davis 'buy-back' program description to Analyst Todd Giedt for distribution to the committee. This issue will be placed on the April agenda. Chair Wu will investigate the discrepancies between the NRT numbers produced by UCOP and those produced by the individual campuses.**

## **XII. Systemwide Review of The Regents' Proposed RE-89 – Adoption of Policy Restricting University Acceptance of Funding From the Tobacco Industry**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu presented the history of this issue; he explained that Academic Council has requested comments systemwide by April 13, 2007.

**DISCUSSION:** One member commented that sometimes corporations give money to lock up research in order to hide research findings. Similarly they sometimes distribute research funding under the condition that the researcher does not accept money from other companies. Members opined that it would be helpful if the Senate took a strong stand on the contract requirements of research for the sole purpose of strengthening the position of faculty members involved in this research. However, the outright refusal of money from tobacco corporations is another issue. Both the UCB School of Public Health and the UCSF Senate have passed resolutions against taking money from tobacco companies. The Vice Chancellor for Research, Larry Coleman, is opposed to such a ban. Some members opined that they did not feel that CCGA, or the faculty in general, did not have any greater moral authority over this issue than The Regents do.

Members also recalled CCGA's earlier position from 2005 that stated that The Regents should be left to decide this issue. At the same time, some members said that the committee must respect The Regents' request. They also considered creating a decision tree in which the first step would be to decide if this is an issue of academic freedom. If so, then the Senate could and should address that. That aside, CCGA could also decide not to opine on the moral issue; thereby

leaving The Regents to opine. Chair Wu remarked that The Regents did send a list of five questions to Academic Council in order to clarify this issue. Members thought that a review of these questions might be helpful. Chair Wu said that he would first need to get permission from Academic Council before distributing these questions to the Committee. Members also requested a review of the original comments made by Academic Council on this issue from a couple of years ago.

**ACTION:** Analyst Todd Giedt will distribute CCGA's 2005 position on this issue. Chair Wu will find out if he can distribute these questions to the committee, or even paraphrase these questions for members.

### **XIII. Proposition 209 Diversity Study Taskforce**

**ISSUE:** Kate Jeffery, Director of Student Financial Support at UCOP, spoke to the committee regarding student fellowship data (see distribution 3). First, she presented a slide on the 'per capita net stipend for all academic doctoral students admitted to UC and at least one other institution in 2004', which shows the competitiveness of UC's financial aid offers. Overall, this slide showed that UC offers lagged by \$1,401. This statistic does not include differences in living costs between UC campuses and other universities. The largest gaps occur in the physical sciences, social sciences, and the professional schools. UC is most competitive in the life and health sciences. Expanding this analysis to international students, the UC gap is approximately \$4,000+. However, the health and life sciences do better in this area, primarily because of extramural support. To examine this same effect on underrepresented minority groups (URMs), the data has been split into three groups—URMs, non-URMs, and international students. The data (fellowship awards) shows that in 1994 URMs received more funding from UC than other universities. URMs in engineering/computer sciences and the life sciences receive the most funding. While the overall gap between non-URMs and URMs within UC declined throughout the 1990s, a recovery in URM funding has occurred since 2001. In order to explain what is driving this, she noted that throughout 1994-97 URM numbers were growing. During this same period, URM funding was flat so there is an actual reduction in per capita URM support. From 1998-2000 however, there was a particular decline in URM enrollment, so the amount of funding per capita shows an increase.

**DISCUSSION:** Members noted that the take or yield rate for the physical sciences is relatively low at about 43% (across all three cohorts). Kate Jeffrey said that the physical sciences is less supported in UC than other disciplines. Members summarized that the data seems to show that Proposition 209 has not had a significant effect on funding at the graduate level in terms of fellowships; this is certainly not the case on the undergraduate level. They suggested that perhaps peer institutions may not be competing as hard as UC for URMs.

### **XIV. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *In Progress***

#### **A. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and a Ph.D. in Forensic and Behavioral Sciences with CSU Fresno and UC Davis – *Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (Vice-Chair)***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Vice Chair Schumm reminded members that the behavioral science side of this degree proposal is very close to final approval. However, the forensics side is still open. On a positive note, faculty from both institutions have embraced the entire degree proposal. Towards that end, CSU Sacramento will be hiring another forensics scientist. There are



approximately a dozen letters from Davis faculty committing to teaching in the program. He feels that two months is a reasonable time frame for final approval by CCGA.

**B. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Music for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Roger Savage**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Savage is still waiting for internal reviews for this proposal. There is some confusion as to whether there will be three tracks within one program or three programs, as the proposal makes references to both. Other issues include the funding needs of international students as well as NRT. It will also be important to recruit students from Latin America and Southeast Asia; however faculty expertise on the Caribbean region is missing. Another area of concern is the lack of an ‘advisory exam’, which is typically an exam on musical theory and history. This exam is given to other musicology and composition students.

**ACTION:** Professor Savage will solicit external reviewers.

**C. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Donald Brenneis**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Brenneis is waiting on both internal and external reviews; some of which have arrived. He noted that two external reviewers have committed to write reviews. He remarked that generally it seems like a solid proposal that draws on local strengths.

**D. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Film & Digital Media for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz**

**ACTION:** Shrinivasa Upadhyaya was selected as the lead reviewer.

**XV. Executive Session**

[Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.]

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Members did not hold an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m

Attest: Reen Wu, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

**Distributions:**

1. Non-Resident Tuition Handout from the Academic Council Meeting with the EVCs, 2-27-07
2. UC Davis 2006-07 Extramurally Supported GSR Fee and Tuition Buy-down Program Description
3. Graduate Student Support Data