

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday, April 8, 2008
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320

Telephone: 510-587-6138 Fax: 510-763-0309

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>

I. Chair's Announcements – Chair Schumm

- Chair Schumm welcomed new CCGA members Glen Mimura from UC Irvine and Michael Urban from UC Santa Cruz.
- **Compendium Committees' Recommendations on the Proposed UC Davis School of Public Health:** The recommendations have gone forward from Academic Council with one change, asking UCD to respond. CCGA has not approved the proposal and so it will come back for consideration.
- **CCGA/UCEP/ITTP 'Dialectic' Paper:** Chair Schumm said that he was generally pleased with the dialogue it opened up and recommended that a special ad-hoc committee be formed to write a white paper, research best practices and the upsides and downsides of residency, and develop guidelines for decision-making. A discussion followed with a few members questioning what a white paper would accomplish and how a paper could be written that would not soon become obsolete given that technology is such a moving target. Others noted that it is imperative to establish a context for the review and that the review should consider the questions of what constitutes residency in a modern world; the value placed on peer-to-peer interaction; and the process of undergraduate and graduate education? Chair Schumm suggested that CCGA could: 1) acknowledge that this is complicated issue and do nothing; 2) do a minimum amount, leaving each campus on its own; or 3) form a Senate Special Committee to research the issues and standards associated with online instruction, with the findings disseminated to the campuses. Members tentatively agreed that a Special Committee might be appropriate, given a well-conceived charge.

ACTION: Chair Schumm will follow-up with CCGA/UCEP/ITTP on developing a charge for a Senate Special Committee that incorporates these comments and also on generating a request to Academic Council for establishing the committee.

CCGA/UCEP Revised Proposal on Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction:

Following systemwide review, the Academic Council decided to back off on the change that was proposed that would have allowed campuses to forego Senate review of upper division courses for which graduate students are the instructor of record; the campuses felt that the regulations in place were sufficient. It was decided not to bring this back for review because the changes were minor. This will come up for a vote in the form of a recommended change to the APM when the Council meets at the end of April.

- **GSAC Follow-on Committee Request:** Council approved and forwarded our request to establish a joint follow-on committee to the Provost. Chair Schumm said that we will want to ask VP Beckwith where this is. He also said that this raises a question about the continued interest of CCGA or UCPB in developing funding models and asked members to please let him know if they are interested in working on this.
- **Academic Assembly Update:** No update; the assembly has not met since last CCGA.
- **Academic Council/Chancellors' 3/5 Meeting Update:** The Graduate Support Presentation (Enclosure #2) was included for informational purposes only.
- **Monitor Report:** Chair Schumm commented that the report raises questions about Senate's roll in thinking through the UCOP reorganization and how the Senate will be kept in the loop.

II. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs –

Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Suzanne Klausner, Principal Analyst

REPORT: VP Beckwith discussed his major goals for the near-term which include 1) doing a better job of showing how graduate support funds are spent; 2) developing scenarios, financial models for the campuses; 3) drafting an internal NRT document that shows causality; and 4) developing an advocacy plan that demonstrates to the Legislature why more international students are good for UC. Other future goals include: ensuring that all ten campuses have “flagship” quality and determining what kinds of uniform policies are required to accomplish this. Chair Schumm asked about the request to establish a GSAC follow-on joint Senate/Administrative committee. VP Beckwith indicated that he was open to but hasn't seen request yet. Chair Schumm asked about legislative research initiatives and at what point does the connection between the entity and the initiative come to an end? VP Beckwith said that this is an issue that he wrestles with everyday and that it will require revamped review processes.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Approval of the Minutes from the March 4, 2008 Meeting

C. CCGA Comments on ITGC Report: UC Cyberinfrastructure

D. CCGA Informal Comments on Preliminary Proposals for UCI School of Nursing Science, UCM School of Medicine and UCSF School of Global Health

E. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140 (Affirmative Action)

ACTION: The consent Calendar was approved with minor edits to the minutes.

IV. Expedited Review of a Proposal for a new School of Medicine at UC Riverside –

Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA (along with UCPB and UCEP) reviews new School proposals. Members were asked to review the proposal. Due to the tight timeline, Chair Schumm will be the lead reviewer. CCGA will need to have a substantive discussion of the proposal at this meeting, so that our response can be finalized at our May meeting.

DISCUSSION: Members questioned what CCGA is being asked to do. Chair Schumm responded that we're being asked to vote on this without much dialogue. A member questioned the assumptions made about Medicare changes and the NIH 'largesse' and said that it would be helpful to know what the experience has been of other medical schools built on this 'distributed approach' and the extent to which the partner commitments have endured. Others members asked if the estimate of grant dollars potentially available to medical school faculty was a realistic number and if it was wise to base so much of the proposal on soft money? Others noted that the though the proposal makes a compelling case for the need to deliver care in that community, there is no way for the learning environment to guarantee that students will stay and practice in area. Members also expressed concern about the uncertainty of the budget and the level of faculty that will be recruited.

ACTION: Chair Schumm will draft a letter summarizing these comments, as well as making that point that formation of the School cannot proceed without a concrete commitment of “new” funds from the State or a benefactor.

V. Proposal for a new School of Nursing at UC Davis – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA (along with UCPB and UCEP) reviews new School proposals. Members were asked to review the proposal.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, Professor Liz Watkins was assigned as the Lead Reviewer.

VI. Draft CCGA Review Letter re: a new School of Public Policy at UC Riverside –

Elizabeth Watkins (UCSF)

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA (along with UCPB and UCEP) reviews new School proposals. Members were asked to review the draft CCGA review letter.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, the Committee approved the letter with one abstention.

VII. PDPE Subcommittee's Interim Report on Professional Doctorates (new item) –

Chair Schumm and Consultant Carol Copperud (Director, Planning and Analysis, UCOP)

ISSUE: The PDPE report on research-based and professional-based doctorates concluded that, among State institutions, research-based doctorates really belong only at UC because only UC is funded to conduct research. It also questioned under what circumstances professional practice doctorates would be appropriately offered by CSU, and the emergent principles guiding discussions between UC/CSU.

DISCUSSION: Chair Schumm referred members to the Council on Graduate Schools Task Force Report on the Professional Doctorate, which provide much guidance to the PDPE subcommittee as it drafted the report. The PDPE report raised several key issues including: 1) the process for making policy changes in areas governed by in the Master Plan, 2) how to ensure that this discussion occurs in the academic and not legislative process; 3) funding formulas for doctorates at CSU, UC; 4) how best to frame the need for professional doctorates; 5) under what context can UC meet this need; 6) how firm a stance UC should take on this issue; and 7) the extent to which UC wants to expend its political capital on this issue. A member pointed to the need for differentiating what constitutes a research-based vs. a professional-practice doctorate, setting standards for both types, and determining how to apply standards. Another commented that as an institution/academic community, UC has not explicitly stated that in rare instances, exceptions *can*, in fact be made to the Master Plan, nor has UC stated what the criteria and process ought to be for evaluating such changes. Other key suggestions included mentioning of the Master Plan earlier and more prominently in the report; that UC needs to argue on the basis of standards, with concrete examples; and that CSU ought to demonstrate their ability to meet a need for doctorates in a way that UC can't or elects not to do. Chair Schumm asked members whether, as a rule, UC should strive maintain sole authority to award all doctorates, as currently stated in the Master Plan; there was unanimous consent that it should (Chair Schumm, as an author of the Report, which provides criteria under which CSU should be supported in gaining specific doctoral degree titles, abstained). Members were evenly divided as to whether a sole exception should be provided if clear State need can be demonstrated that UC is unable or unwilling to meet.

ACTION: Chair Schumm will take CCGA's suggestion to the PDPE subcommittee for its consideration.

VIII. UC Riverside Environmental Sciences and Soil & Water Sciences Graduate Programs/UCR Response to CCGA 10/07 Letter – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA reviews the Transference, Consolidation and Discontinuance of Graduate Degree Programs. Members were asked to review the response and supporting materials submitted by UCR in response to questions raised by CCGA in October 2007. Specifically, CCGA had questions about the impact of the consolidation on affected students and department members; reasons cited in the request and why the UCR Graduate Council felt these were justified, and the extent which the broader academic community was made aware of the proposal and given an opportunity to comment.

DISCUSSION: The committee determined that in view of new information submitted by UCR, sufficiency attention had been paid by the campus academic Senate, and no further review is required by CCGA.

ACTION: Committee Analyst Zárate will draft a letter for Chair Schumm advising UCR that CCGA is comfortable with the degree of review done by the divisional Senate and that CCGA sees no need to look further into the issue.

IX. Certificate Programs – Vice-Chair Chehab

ISSUE: Professor Chehab submitted a request to Consultant Gale Morrison (Dean of Graduate Studies, UCSB) asking Graduate Deans/Graduate Councils for their assistance in cataloguing SR735-GACs on their respective campus. Determine next steps.

DISCUSSION: Vice-Chair Chehab circulated a summary of survey responses and recommended that given the minimal impact to CCGA, that CCGA send a memo to Graduate Deans that it will start enforcing SR-735. The question remains however about whether CCGA wants to do anything retroactively. Members discussed whether or not an amendment is needed to SR-735 that provides more clarity for the campuses.

ACTION: Vice Chair Chehab will draft a memo to Graduate Deans, Graduate Councils, Divisional Chairs informing them of our interpretation of SR-735, that CCGA will review SR-735s that meet these criteria and that all others not meeting these criteria would fall to local Graduate Council for review. Dean Morrison offered to share this with the Council of Graduate Deans in May.

X. Announcements from the Graduate Deans –

Gale Morrison, Dean of Graduate Studies, UC Santa Barbara

REPORT/ACTION: Dean Morrison will send the remaining responses from the Survey of Certificate Programs to Vice-Chair Chehab. (See Item IX for discussion on Certificate Programs.)

XI. UCOP Report: Professional Degree Programs Compliance with Requirements Related to Fees and Affordability – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: The 2008-09 fee levels approved by The Regents for nine of UC's 32 professional degree programs will result in total fees that are inconsistent with the new requirement that total fees not exceed those of "comparable degree programs at comparable public institutions." A proposal for a smaller fee increase for these programs (except for Pharmacy) will be submitted for approval by The Regents in May. Members were asked to review the report.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, Bruce, Ira, Ken, Katherine, and Patricia volunteered to set aside time to discuss the report and determine CCGA's response.

XII. Draft Summary Letter on Survey of 1-Year M.P.H. Programs – Patrick Linder

ISSUE: It was suggested at the March CCGA meeting that a synthesis of the comments received from three reviewers on a few recent program proposals might be useful for future reviews of 1-year programs. Members were asked to review the draft synthesis and determine next steps.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, the committee unanimously approved to send a letter to the three reviewers asking for their permission to make their reviews available for limited circulation at UCOP and among systemwide Senate committees along with Patrick Linder's synthesis.

XIII. Reconsideration of CCGA's Purview over the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and (in at least one case) the J.D. – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: The proliferation of professional doctorates has cast new light on the role of Senate review on professional degrees however. Members are asked to review the historical background re: CCGA's prior election to not review M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. program proposals.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed whether CCGA should reconsider this, and what the parameters of that reconsideration would be. Chair Schumm feels that CCGA should review any new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., and Pharm.D. proposals. The historical documents suggest that these fall within CCGA purview and that CCGA never ceded oversight, making a "reversal" unnecessary. Chair Schumm invited Vice-Chair Chehab to review this along with the Council of Graduate Schools Report and to share his comments with CCGA at a future meeting. The committee discussed how this issue came about and who is best qualified to do such reviews.

ACTION: Vice Chair Schumm proposed that we return to this item next month.

XIV. Review Process for a combined 5-Year B.Sc./M.Sc. degree in the College of Engineering at UC Riverside – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA reviews new Graduate Degree Programs. The UC Riverside Graduate Council has raised a question about the approval process for B.Sc./M.Sc. degrees in the College of Engineering at UCR. Members are asked to review the communication from Professor Dumer which raises a question about the process for reviewing this type of combined program.

DISCUSSION: The Committee discussed the question raised by Professor Dumer as well as broader issues raised by this request. CCGA determined that it need not review the joint B.Sc./M.Sc. degree at UCR since the M.Sc. had already been approved, and the small changes to the Masters degree requirements that UCR proposed to attach to the Bachelors were within the purview of the local Graduate Council to effect. CCGA confirmed that it definitely does review new Masters that are offered within joint Bachelors/Masters programs – it just happened that, in the Riverside case, we had already approved the Masters. The question of CCGA's role in reviewing proposals for dual degrees that consolidate two graduate degree programs, such as two Masters' degree programs was raised. The Compendium section on the *Consolidation of Academic Programs* delineates CCGA's role in the review of such proposals.

ACTION: CCGA affirmed its role in reviewing proposals for joint Bachelors/Masters degrees in instances where the attached Masters is a new/non-existing graduate degree program (one not previously reviewed by CCGA). Analyst Zárate will draft a letter for Chair Schumm that responds to the UCR question (5-Year B.Sc./M.Sc.). CCGA will develop language for inclusion in the CCGA handbook that clarifies these points.

XV. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for new Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Computational Science, Mathematics, and Engineering leading to M.S. degree (Computational Science) at UC San Diego – Chair Schumm

DISCUSSION: One member noted a Berkeley program that was just approved and suggested that we might want to refer to that proposal for language and leads with finding objective reviewers.

ACTION: Matt Farrens was tentatively assigned as the Lead Reviewer with Ken Rose as the back-up if Matt is not able to do.

B. Proposal for a new Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Management leading to M.A./Ph.D. degree at UC Riverside – Chair Schumm

ACTION: After a brief discussion, Mike Urban was assigned as the Lead Reviewer.

C. Proposal for a Master of Science in Science and Technology in Medicine at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Matt Farrens (UCD)

REPORT/ACTION: Matt Farrens was tentatively assigned as the Lead Reviewer with Ken Rose as the back-up if Matt is not able to do. (The proposal has since been put on hold by UCSF.)

D. Proposal for a new M.S. and Ph.D. in Bioinformatics at UC Los Angeles – Lead Reviewer Anne Myers Kelley (UCM)

REPORT: Professor Kelley was not able to attend today; she reported by email that her concerted efforts have yielded three reviewers (two UC, one external); she is working on finding an additional 1-2 external reviewers.

E. Proposal for a Master of Public Policy at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Gary Jacobson (UCSD)

REPORT: Professor Jacobson has received reviewer letters from UCLA, Berkeley and Chicago and indicated that he may have some difficulty getting a letter from the fourth reviewer. Chair Schumm said that he was ok with the three letters if all three are consonant.

F. Proposal for a Master of Science in Nursing Science at UC Irvine –

Lead Reviewer Janice Reiff (UCLA)

REPORT: Professor Reiff reported that she is working on obtaining one more review. One reviewer had concern about UCI's ability to sustain the program and its stated intention to begin admitting students this fall. Professor Reiff has raised these issues, as well as other concerns about the available candidate pool; the program's ability to meet its recruitment goals; and the wisdom behind starting with a Masters when a Ph.D. is what is required by most of the industry.

G. Proposal for a Master of Science in Global Health Sciences at UC San Francisco –

Lead Reviewer Ira Tager (UCB)

REPORT: One member suggested toning down harshness of letter (in reference to a reviewer comment). Chair Schumm asked for edits from members in the next day; he will finalize and send out with a copy to Professor Tager. Professor Tager will proceed with a site visit.

H. Proposal for a Master of Science in Environmental Policy and Management at UC Davis –

Lead Reviewer Patricia Springer (UCR)

REPORT: Professor Springer went over a handout summarizing concerns and the response from UCD on the issues raised by CCGA. She asked if a site visit was still needed and for CCGA's thoughts on where to go from here. She also said that the proposed time to degree remains a problem. Chair Schumm said that a site visit shows more gravitas but suggested that as an alternative, she could set-up a phone conference to discuss cross-divisional aspects and connect with relevant deans, faculty to gauge excitement and commitment to. She will proceed with a site visit.

I. Proposal for a Master of Public Health at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab (UCSF)

REPORT: Vice-Chair Chehab summarized key revisions and recommended that CCGA approve the proposal. Chair Schumm suggested that as a standard procedure, we check to see that CVs of lead faculty are included whenever a new proposal is received. Analyst Zárate will add this to the checklist in the handbook. Associate Director Giedt also recommended adding the Bylaws for IDPs to the handbook.

ACTION: The committee voted to approve the proposal. Vice-Chair Chehab will draft a summary letter and send to Committee Analyst Zárate.

XVI. New Business

There was no new business.

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

Attest: Bruce Schumm, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst