I. Call to Order/Consent Calendar – Chair Rachael Goodhue
   • Approval of the Agenda
   • Approval of the December 6, 2011, January 3 and February 7, 2012 Meeting Minutes

   **ACTION:** The agenda was approved with minor re-ordering. The approval of the minutes of
   the minutes was taken-off of the consent calendar and tabled until the next meeting. Chair
   Goodhue asked members to please review the minutes in the interim.

II. Chair’s Report/Announcements/Updates – Chair Rachael Goodhue
   • Feb. 15 Academic Assembly Meeting: The primary item of business was the Memorial to
     the Regents for Increased State Support for the University that will be sent forward to all
     Senate faculty for a vote; the M.P.Ac. degree title was also approved for use at UCR.
   • Feb. 22 Academic Council Meeting: Three main items were discussed: open access to
     academic research and status of proposed legislation; and the **Fidelis** proposal.
   • Feb. 29 Council of Graduate Deans Meeting: CCGA rep. Ruth Mulnard, UCI was not in
     attendance. In her stead, COGD representative **Tyrus Miller** reported on two major items
     of discussion: the usage of the infrequently used GSAR (Assistant Researcher) job title on
     some campuses and the status of **Senate Bill 259** (Hancock) Higher education: employees,
     and the bill’s implications for UC graduate students and faculty.

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

   **Steven Beckwith,** Vice President, Office of Research and Graduate Studies
   **Pamela Jennings,** Director of Graduate Studies, ORGS
   **Hilary Baxter,** Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination
   **Todd Giedt,** Associate Director, Academic Senate Office

   • **Pamela Jennings** reported on plans for the upcoming UC Data in Sacramento; a new
     brochure on UC graduate education, and redesign of their website.
   • **Hilary Baxter** discussed issues associated with faculty efforts directed toward SSP online
     courses and UCEP’s concerns about faculty workload and the recovery of resources spent
     on non-matriculated students. Several CCGA members questioned the motives driving the
     pilot UC online education initiative as well as the role of technology in sustaining the
     instructional model. Chair Goodhue will confer with UCEP Chair Jose Wudka about
     possibly crafting a statement expressing CCGA’s concerns about taking on non-
     matriculated students and the aforementioned effects of the online pilot on graduate
     education. Hilary also led a discussion on the post-CPEC environment and a recent **LAO**
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- Todd Giedt reported on three recently introduced bills: Senate Bill 1138 (Liu)
  Educational data: State Department of Education: CA Postsecondary Education Commission; Assembly Bill 2190 (Pérez) Postsecondary education: oversight and coordination commission; and Senate Bill 721 (Lowenthal) Postsecondary Education Statewide Goals. He will forward the bills to CCGA for comments.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership – Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair Robert Powell, Academic Council Vice Chair
Chair Bob Anderson contributed to the Committee’s earlier discussion of the Memorial, the various legislative bills, and the pilot UC online education initiative. He also suggested members read the article on the on-line initiative in the current issue of The Senate Source.

V. CAGSS Task Force and Joint Administrative-Senate Workgroup on Graduate Education – Chair Goodhue
Chair Goodhue reported on recent meetings of the task force and the joint workgroup. She had emailed the head of Institutional Research to request permission to circulate and share with Senate committees, the materials that went to the task force and work group. Chair Goodhue had hoped that CCGA could have a substantive discussion of these materials but unfortunately had not heard back from IR.

VI. WASC – Chair Goodhue and Hilary Baxter
Hilary Baxter reported on that the Commission voted to suspend the resolution on graduation proficiencies and, accordingly, will not move forward (at least at this point) on external validation/benchmarking of such proficiencies. The Chair of the Redesign Steering Committee and WASC President Ralph Wolff both expressed a very deliberate intent for the Commission to “structure a dialogue” with institutional representatives from around the region over the next few months about how best to move forward on the public accountability agenda. The dialogue will likely include meetings of small groups in addition to discussions at the WASC conference this spring. Apparently, WASC wants “as much discussion as possible” before June and will plan to consider in June whatever emanates from those conversations. It is possible some sort of revised proposal could be circulated in the summer and considered for action in November. Further, the Commission emphatically stated that the piloting of the DQP does not represent a step toward eventual mandating of this tool. The aim is “to learn from the experience of engaging the Profile on a voluntary basis.” In fact, it was suggested that it should not even be referred to as a “pilot” any longer but rather “voluntary engagement.”
VII. **Self-Supporting Programs** – *Bruce Schumm (UCSC) and Andrew Chisholm (UCSD)*

A. **SSP Subcommittee Report:** Prof. Bruce Schumm reported consultation efforts with UCPB. Chair Goodhue will check with the UCPB Chair on the issue of capturing the unlisted costs associated with SSPs. Prof. Mike Vanderwood volunteered to work with Prof. Schumm and Prof. Andrew Chisholm on crafting guidelines on ways CCGA thinks that advice from UCOP would be useful to the campuses in preparing SSP proposals. Looking down the road, CCGA also discussed where this advisory language would ideally reside. Chair Anderson suggested that CCGA should instead state its intentions, informing the campuses what aspects it will look for in new SSP proposals from the campuses.

B. **Berkeley Proposal for M.Eng., part-time SSP discussion:** Chair Goodhue updated CCGA on her communications with the Berkeley Division and noted that the issue has since been resolved. Going forward, she suggested that as a method of auditing the inadvertent occurrence of similar instances (of programs new programs being approved on the campuses without CCGA review), CCGA annually request from the Administration a list of newly approved programs for SSP-status and PDST fees and that these be added to the Senate’s annual calendar of data requests from UCOP.

C. **Other issues, beginning with discussion of notes from February:** Chair Goodhue and the CCGA members picked-up last month’s SSP discussion: 1) Do CCGA members wish to issue formal guidelines based on the above points, or continue to develop the discussion further, and 2) Does CCGA wish to revisit its state-to self-supported conversion policy statement?

VIII. **UCLA Anderson School Proposal** – *Chair Goodhue, Karen Gyllys (UCLA)*

Chair Bob Anderson reported that Provost Larry Pitts had indicated he planned to advise the UCLA Graduate Council that the Administration had not agreed to CCGA’s procedural instructions on the conversion of existing graduate programs to self-supporting programs. Chair Anderson pointed out, however, that the Administration had agreed to the four criteria established for SSPs (see SSP policy dated 9/13/11 and the Pitts’ memo dated 10/29/11). He suggested that that CCGA should address in its report whether the Anderson School proposal conforms to those criteria. Karen Gyllys forwarded responses to the Appendix V Proposal from the Anderson School.

IX. **Requests for Consultation** – *Chair Goodhue and Members*

A. **BOARS Transfer Proposal:** DUE May 16

   **ACTION:** CCGA elected not to opine on the proposal.

B. **Faculty Salaries Task Force Report:** DUE April 19

   **ACTION:** CCGA elected not to opine on the report.
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C. APM-430 Visiting Scholars: DUE March 27

**DISCUSSION:** CCGA discussed the proposed policy and establishing a basis of comments for review/management consultation. Members identified four concerns. First, CCGA suggests that the policy differentiate between visiting scholars who have obtained their doctorates and visiting graduate student researchers. UC Berkeley has a campus policy that does so, and it could potentially serve as a model. Second, CCGA suggests making explicit that campuses not only should “establish authority and procedures to appoint and reappoint” (430-4), but should have the authority to establish additional policies and requirements, including payment of costs associated with the individual’s visit. Third, there does not appear to be a minimum length of time for an appointment in this title. Perhaps a minimum length should be specified, as in the Berkeley policy. And finally, the definition of “on leave” is unclear, as is the reason it is included in the definition in 430-4. If a Visiting Scholar appointment is a short-term appointment and one that prohibits receiving compensation from the University, what difference does the individual’s leave status make? If it does make a difference, then what is the applicable definition of “on leave”?

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

X. 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 to add a M.S. Degree in Experimental Pathology to an existing Ph.D. Program at UC Irvine – **Chair Goodhue**

**ACTION:** CCGA determined that the proposal met three of the four criteria for no additional review by CCGA. Chair Goodhue will confer with the Prof. Ruth Mulnard on the missing criterion, namely that the master’s requirements fall within norms typical for UC master’s programs (Plan I/Plan II master’s, etc.) prior to putting the proposal up for a vote by CCGA.

B. Proposal to add an Online Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) in Integrated Circuits at UC Berkeley – **Chair Goodhue**

**ACTION:** Sharon Farmer (UCSB) and Karen Gylys (UCLA) were assigned as Lead Reviewers. They will utilize the abbreviated process that CCGA adopted last year for reviewing M.A.S. proposals (see new Appendix I from CCGA Handbook).

C. Proposal to add a Master of Translational Medicine at UC Berkeley – **Chair Goodhue**

**ACTION:** Andrew Chisholm (UCSD) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

D. Proposal for a M.S./Ph.D. Program in Chemistry and Chemical Biology at UC Merced – **Lead Reviewer Alan Buckpitt (UCD)**

**REPORT:** Prof. Buckpitt was not in attendance but reported by email that has two external reviewers confirmed and is working on finding two more.
E. Proposal for a Part-time, Self-supporting Master of Engineering (M.Eng.) Program at UC Berkeley – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)

REPORT: The review will move forward following same abbreviated format for reviewing similar proposals, such as proposals for new Evening M.B.A. Programs (see earlier discussion).

F. Proposal for a Master in Bioengineering (M.Eng.) Program at UC Berkeley – Lead Reviewer Mike Vanderwood (UCR)

REPORT: Prof. Vanderwood reported that he has two external reviewers confirmed and is working on finding additional reviewers.

G. Proposal for Fully Employed M.B.A. (FEMBA) Program at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Ruth Mulnard (UCI)

REPORT: Prof. Mulnard was not in attendance.

H. 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 was not in attendance but reported by email that he has three of four external reviews in-hand and is waiting the forth review before preparing his report/recommendation in time for the next meeting.

I. 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 is working on finding external reviewers.

J. 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)

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA voted (8-0-1) to approve the proposal.

K. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. Degree in Biotechnology Management at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Donald Mastronarde (UCB)

REPORT: Chair Goodhue announced that Donald Mastronarde (UCB) has graciously agreed to pick-up her previous work on this review. Prof. Mastronarde reported on communications with the campus and expects to have a revised proposal in-hand and a recommendation prepared by the next month.

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: There was nothing new to report since the last meeting. Chair Goodhue asked that Prof. Arovas, Prof. Schumm and Prof. Sue Carter confer amongst themselves on next steps that Prof. Carter might provide feedback to CCGA on proposal in April.
XI. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils and Inquiries from the Divisional Senates – Chair Goodhue and Members

A. UC Davis: CCGA discussed an inquiry regarding alternatives to UC seal for certificate programs that don’t meet Compendium requirements for GACs.

B. Other Divisions:
   San Francisco: Prof. Raffai provided an update on the proposal presented by UCSF Chancellor Susan Desmond-Hellmann to the Regents in January that a small working group be formed to help UCSF explore options to secure its financial future so it can realize its vision to become the world’s preeminent health sciences innovator. Desmond-Hellmann and her leadership team believe that UCSF must create a financially sustainable enterprise-wide business model to reach the campus’s aspirations of preeminence. The working group will explore alternate financial relationships between UCSF and the UC system, as well as alternate governance strategies that reflect UCSF’s status as the sole UC campus with a scope that is limited to graduate health sciences; evaluating new and enhanced growth opportunities for UCSF; examining UCSF’s financial relationship with the UC system; and exploring alternative governance models. The plan is for working group to present its findings to the Regents in July 2012.

XII. New Business

Planning for April 3 CCGA meeting via iLinc: Chair Goodhue asked members to please hold open the standard time window from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and suggested that the meeting might be broken-up into two shorter segments vs. one long session.

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:

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