

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – APRIL 4, 2006**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey*

REPORT: There were not any Chair's announcements, as Duncan Lindsey was absent. However, the Berkeley member reported that she had spoken with Graduate Dean Mary Ann Mason about securing a Graduate Dean liaison from the Council of Graduate Deans to CCGA, who could regularly attend CCGA meetings. Dean Mason said that she is unable to serve due to her current commitments; however she is trying to get another Graduate Dean to serve as the liaison to CCGA. Members encouraged each other to ask the Graduate Deans at their home campuses to serve. Consultant Karen Merritt reported to the committee that she has asked UCOP about a replacement for Professor Zelmanowitz (as a consultant to CCGA), but she has not received a response yet. She noted that the Planning and Analysis and the Academic Initiatives' units are being reorganized, which will be placed under a single "Vice Provost for Strategic Planning." Recruitment for that position is currently on-going, and Consultant Merritt believes that this position would most likely report to CCGA.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Karen Merritt informed members that the Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education (PDPE) has formed a "Study Group on the UC's Current and Future Role in Graduate Education in the Field of Education," and she distributed its charge. She noted that this study group is preparing a tentative report, which will be ready on April 20th with a final report due out this fall. The group is studying three principal areas: educational leadership, special education, and early childhood education. The study group is being chaired by Harold Levine, who is the Dean of Education at UCD. Other members include George Blumenthal, Joyce Justus, Sharon Duffy (Associate Dean of Education at UCR), Marcy Whitebook (UCB Senior Researcher), Deborah Vandell (Chair of the UCI Education Department), and David Pearson (Dean of the UCB Graduate School of Education).

Karen also reported that substantial progress is being made on audiology, and three pairs of campuses have been selected to host joint UC-CSU audiology programs: UCLA-CSU Northridge, UCSF-SFSU, and UCSD-SDSU (expanding enrollment in its existing program). Physical therapy is the next area that the health sciences work group will be addressing.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the study group's membership. In light of the CSU Ed.D. legislation passed last year, they stressed that it is essential to have study group members who are familiar with the UC-CSU joint doctorate degree system. One member remarked that it is likely that eventually every CSU campus will have an independent Ed.D. program. They also stressed that it will be important for UCOP to safeguard the resources for the existing joint Ed.D. programs in order to ensure their quality. Members recommended adding a CCGA representative, as well as current program directors of UC-CSU joint doctorate Ed.D. programs. Specifically, members named Bernard Gifford at UCB and Paul Heckman at UCD, who are both Directors of such programs, as good candidates for membership in this study group.

ACTION: CCGA requests representation on this study group. Members nominated Nadine Lambert (UCB) as the CCGA representative, with Bruce Schumm (UCSC) as the CCGA alternate. They also recommended adding Bernard Gifford (UCB) and Paul Heckman (UCD) to this study group.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the March 7, 2006 Minutes

ACTION: The March 7, 2006 minutes were approved with minor amendments.

B. CCGA Communication Protocol

ACTION: This item was moved off the consent calendar due to a lengthy discussion.

IV. CCGA Communication Protocol

ISSUE/REPORT: Vice Chair Reen Wu raised the issue of communication between the lead reviewer of a program proposal and the program proposers. He said that the proposers of a program may misinterpret the initial correspondence from the lead reviewer as a rejection of their proposal, especially if this correspondence requires the proposers to make substantive changes to their proposal. In order to avoid this type of confusion in the future, he suggested that a cover letter from the CCGA Chair accompany the initial correspondence between the lead reviewer and the proposers. He also suggested that a cover letter template with specific wording be used to streamline the process. Finally, this correspondence would be sent through the CCGA Analyst.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that it would not be difficult to have a cover letter from the CCGA Chair accompany the initial correspondence from the lead reviewer. The San Diego Alternate commented on the confusion created by the CCGA correspondence that was sent to the San Diego Human Development Ph.D. program proposers. He said that the program proposers misinterpreted the letter from the lead reviewer as a CCGA rejection of their proposal. Additionally, this letter was not initially sent to the correct contact person. The San Diego Alternate also argued that the proposers will eventually ask their local Graduate Councils to clarify what CCGA wants, so it makes sense to copy the respective Graduate Council Chair on this type of correspondence. After a short discussion, members agreed that the Chair of the appropriate Graduate Council should be copied on this correspondence. There was also some discussion as to whether the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) should be copied as well, with members deciding it was best to limit the correspondence to the lead proposer and the Graduate Council Chair.

In making this recommendation, members did note a difference between minor changes and a request for a substantial redrafting of the proposal however. They felt that this revised protocol should only apply to the latter and not the former. They thought that minor changes (such as minor bylaw changes, etc.) should continue to go directly to the lead proposer from the lead reviewer (without a cover letter from the CCGA Chair or a copy to the Graduate Council Chair). They also discussed the benefits and drawbacks of funneling all CCGA correspondence through the Committee Analyst, noting that typically correspondence on a given proposal is both multiplicative and generally continues for an extended period of time (from a couple of weeks to a couple of months). The other issue concerns the identification of the lead proposer. Members noted that this information is sometimes hard to find within the proposal. One member felt that

the EVC and/or Vice Provost should be the administrative body that provides this information. However, most members thought that in practice the Graduate Council or Graduate Division/Programs' staff members are the ones that typically provide this information. Analyst Todd Giedt suggested creating a template for Graduate Council or Graduate Division/Programs' staff, which would provide both the name and contact information of the lead reviewer.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft wording for a CCGA policy change, which will stipulate that in cases where CCGA requires substantial changes to a program proposal, (1) a cover letter from the CCGA Chair will accompany initial correspondence between the lead reviewer and the lead proposer with a copy to the respective Graduate Council Chair; and (2) such correspondence will be forwarded through the CCGA Analyst. He will also draft wording for the proposed cover letter and create a template to identify the lead proposer, which will be included with the initial proposal.

V. UC Riverside Proposal to Transfer the B.S. Degree in Business Administration to AGSM and Restructure the Curriculum

ISSUE/REPORT: Members reviewed this UCR reconstitution proposal.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that this is an upper-division major, which is currently offered through the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS). They also observed that both the undergraduate and graduate programs involved have already been approved. They agreed that the proposal made logical sense in that the former business graduate school would be transformed into a School of Business (much like a school of engineering), which would offer both undergraduate and graduate coursework.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the reconstitution proposal. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter noting CCGA's approval of the reconstitution proposal.

VI. UC Committee on Latino Research (UCCLR) MRU Review

ISSUE/REPORT: CCGA is charged with completing a review of the review of the UCCLR MRU, with a deadline of May 5, 2006.

DISCUSSION: Members commented that the UCCLR report only briefly mentions graduate education. They also observed that, like many other MRU reviews, this review states that over the past couple of years the budget for the UCCLR has been gradually eroded, and it argues for additional funding for the UCCLR. While members did not discount the important work that the UCCLR has completed since its inception, they felt that although this MRU is important to UC, it is not any more or less deserving of additional funding than other high-quality UC MRU's.

ACTION: Members selected Bruce Schumm as the lead reviewer to write the CCGA response to this review. Members will send him their comments by April 14th. Professor Schumm will send out the report to members over email for approval. Analyst Todd Giedt will forward this report to Academic Council Chair John Oakley by May 5th.

VII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *Final Action*

A. Proposal for a Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures at UCSB – Lead Reviewer Nadine Lambert (UCB)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Lambert presented her final report and recommends CCGA approval. She said that the proposers' response have satisfied CCGA's concerns. One issue concerned the stability of individual faculty members and the student demand for the specializations that they teach. In particular, the specializations of Religious History and Geography and Taiwan Studies could be especially vulnerable, as these specializations rely heavily on single faculty members. The proposers clarified that both of these professors hold endowed chairs, so these positions would remain intact even if they leave the University or retire. Reviewers also raised the question of how best to ensure breadth in the specializations that students choose. Proposers explained that the department will approve the students' choice of three or four specializations to ensure that the program will produce broadly educated professionals. Professor Lambert assured members that demand for graduates of doctoral program in East Asian languages and cultures is high, and the department should not have any problem in placing its students. All reviewers judged the quality of the faculty as excellent. UCSB also has extensive library resources in East Asian studies, which will benefit this program. Another initial area of concern on the part of the reviewers was the concern that the department might use GSI positions for language instruction even if the GSI's are not fully competent in the language. The proposers described the process by which GSI appointments are made, which stipulates that GSI's in language courses should be native speakers. Those students who are not native students must convince the department of their skills and competencies. GSI's are also evaluated and reviewed periodically for their competence in the language. She found that graduate student support is adequate (GSI positions, fellowships) for the program, which anticipates only enrolling three to five students per year. Finally, Professor Lambert received three letters of support from the campus administration (Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, and the Dean of Humanities), which demonstrates the campus-wide backing of this program.

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether the 3.75 minimum GPA requirement is accurate. Professor Lambert confirmed that the 3.75 minimum GPA requirement is indeed correct, noting that this is a very rigorous program. They also asked about the job market for graduates. Professor Lambert responded that this area (Asian studies and Asian languages) is currently undergoing a significant expansion at many colleges and universities across the country, so graduates will be well-suited to take jobs as professors at these institutions. She added that this program is really unique in the sense that it offers a Taiwanese specialization along with Chinese, Japanese, and Korean specializations. Members inquired into whether the M.A. is required for the Ph.D., to which Professor Lambert noted that students are required to take the 24 units of graduate-level work for the M.A before proceeding onto the dissertation for the Ph.D.

ACTION: Members unanimously voted to approve the program (nine in favor; one abstention).

VIII. Independent Course Responsibility

ISSUE: Professor Bruce Schumm compared UCEP's memo on this issue with CCGA's most recent revision of its paper on independent course responsibility for graduate students. First, he

reviewed CCGA's position, which recommends that graduate student instructors (GSI's) should not be given complete independent authority over courses. The CCGA memo outlines two types of GSI titles/positions: a teaching assistant (TA) position with very limited authority; and a teaching fellow position with more extensive authority. However, both positions would retain faculty oversight in the form of the instructor of record. The instructor of record would (1) review catalogue copy (any other materials developed by the GSI) and the curricular content of the course; (2) apprise the GSI of the faculty code of conduct and be available to discuss aspects of its implementation; (3) be available for confidential consultation with students in the class and to receive complaints and criticisms about the conduct of the course; and (4) review criteria for assessing the final grades/evaluation and approval the final grades recommended by the GSI. Exceptions to this instructor of record stipulation would only be made for GSI's who have held previous positions consistent with one of the faculty titles in APM 110. Such appointments should be made according to the standard procedures for the appointment of such titles with the additional requirement of approval by the appropriate Academic Senate committee.

Overall, both UCEP and CCGA agree that there should be Academic Senate review of GSI appointments (excepting Teaching Assistants) for both lower-division and upper-division courses. The CCGA proposal differs from the UCEP proposal in that it only goes so far in terms of allowing for independent oversight by GSI's, as UCEP allows for GSI's to act as instructors of record in some cases. Also, CCGA maintains that the code of conduct should only adhere to the faculty member, while UCEP advocates for the application of the code of conduct to GSI's as well.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the differences between these two proposals. One member thought that it might be prudent to find out what the divisional Committees on Courses think about the CCGA proposal. It would also be helpful to know if this proposal conflicts with current practices and/or policy. Members also discussed the next steps in this process. They felt there are two ways to proceed: (1) CCGA can either survey the divisional committees (Committees on Courses, Graduate Councils) in order to develop a consensus on whether UC should only allow faculty members to serve as instructors of record; or (2) CCGA can work with UCEP immediately to draft one opinion, which can be presented to Academic Council. Other members reminded the committee that per Senate policy there would be a formal consultation process, at which time the local divisional committees would have the opportunity to submit their comments to Academic Council.

Accountability remained a key concern among CCGA members, who noted that GSI's do not receive the same type of Senate review (of their teaching) that UC faculty do. Although the UCEP proposal stipulates that all GSI appointments would require Senate approval, most felt that actual accountability remains a grey area in that some courses would not have UC faculty serving as instructors of record (if the UCEP proposal is approved). Another member made the point that due to budget constraints among other things, UC cannot guarantee that all courses will be taught by UC faculty. Instead, departments/programs must decide between using professional lecturers and incorporating graduate students to teach their curricula. Members also devoted some time to the qualifications and the appropriate level of Senate oversight for teaching fellows. Most members thought that it is necessary for the graduate student to have reached candidacy or have earned a masters' degree in order to be appointed as a teaching fellow.

Overall, members opined that more stringent control is better than less (especially in cases where teaching fellows may have minimal teaching experience) in order to ensure UC quality in its undergraduate instruction. Even with such control, they felt that the individual qualifications/experience of teaching fellows should be subject to review by the Academic Senate. One member also felt that teaching fellows should not be allowed to teach other graduate students. Finally, members agreed that CCGA Chair Lindsey should write a letter (to be drafted by Professor Schumm) to Academic Council Chair Oakley apprising him of CCGA's position on this issue.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will draft CCGA correspondence apprising Council Chair Oakley of CCGA's position on this issue. [NOTE: CCGA HAS SUBSEQUENTLY DECIDED TO CONSULT WITH UCEP TO DEVELOP CONSENSUS BEFORE SUBMITTING A LETTER TO ACADEMIC COUNCIL.]

IX. Law School Comparative Review

ISSUE: Members examined the proposed criteria to evaluate the proposals (UCI and UCR) for new law schools from the Legal Education Advisory Subcommittee (LEAS), which is a subcommittee of the Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education (PDPE). At this point, the PDPE is planning to carry out the comparative review through an ad-hoc committee (and not the LEAS).

DISCUSSION: Members recalled the discussion from the March meeting in which CCGA decided to take an active role in the evaluation of these proposals. Consultant Karen Merritt clarified that although UCR has made some revisions to its original proposal, UCOP has asked that campuses not to forward it because the criteria were still forthcoming. She expects that UCR will be able to complete its final revisions fairly quickly, now that the criteria are finished. She also reminded members that they decided to send both these proposals back to the divisional Graduate Councils for review before a final CCGA review.

Members deemed the criteria as straight forward and reasonable. Members thought that (1) approving the criteria and (2) requesting a CCGA review of the individual proposals were separate issues. All agreed that CCGA still wanted to conduct an individual review of the revised proposals. Within the context of their own CCGA review, members felt that they should review each program on its own merits, avoiding comparisons between the two programs. Consultant Merritt expects that the comparative review will proceed without delay. She also explained that because these are administrative structures (i.e., schools as opposed to academic programs); the Senate has an endorsement role rather than a lead role. Members speculated that the comparative review may well be completed before the CCGA review. To retain an active role in the comparative review, they requested that the two lead CCGA reviewers for the CCGA review of the individual proposals be added to the ad-hoc subcommittee.

ACTION: Members approved the Law School Comparative Review criteria. They also recommended that the two lead reviewers for the CCGA review of the individual proposals be added as members to the ad-hoc subcommittee conducting the comparative review.

X. Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on International Exchanges/Education

ISSUE: The Chair of this subcommittee, Professor Jutta Heckhausen, reported that it has met once by telephone. Members of the subcommittee felt that out of the following three types of international exchange programs: (1) development of a network of researchers and graduate students, (2) student exchange involving course credit, and (3) dual-institution degree/certificate programs; members choose the first in defined areas. Members identified visa issues, payment of fees, and EAP structure/constraints as obstacles that will need to be addressed. Professor Heckhausen has sent Gretchen Kalonji, the Director of International Strategy Development, an initial report/proposal. She also recommends inviting Gretchen to an upcoming CCGA meeting (although she is unable to attend the May meeting).

ACTION: Professor Heckhausen will invite Gretchen Kalonji to the June CCGA meeting and the subcommittee will provide a progress report at that time.

XI. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *In Progress*

A. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Statistics at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Stralka reported that this review should be ready for a vote at the May CCGA meeting. He stated that this program already exists as a concentration in the Information and Computer Science graduate program. The proposal only makes the following minor curricular changes to this concentration: (1) students must complete a Plan II Masters' degree (Plan I is not allowed); and (2) the requirement of one less course (a computer science course). The two external reviewers spoke very highly of the faculty members in this concentration. There is not yet an undergraduate program in statistics at UCI, however there are Statistics courses offered for undergraduates in other majors. The proposed program also appears to be well-supported and well-funded by the School of Information and Computer Sciences.

ACTION: Professor Stralka will write a final report and submit it for a vote at the May CCGA meeting.

B. Proposal for a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Writing at UC San Diego – *Lead Reviewer Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Sharrer reported that he has not yet received an answer to CCGA's initial response to the MFA proposal from the proposers.

C. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) Degree Program in Health Law at UC San Diego – *Lead Reviewer Shawn Kantor (UCM)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Kantor reported that he is still looking for another external reviewer. He also briefed the committee on a consultation that he had with Professor Deftos, who is the lead proposer of the program. In response to CCGA's concern that the program should offer more core courses specifically dedicated to the MAS students, Professor Deftos indicated that the MAS will offer three substantive courses that will be new to the MAS program, along with one intensive week-long introductory course customized for both types of students (health professionals and lawyers). Professor Deftos also agreed to provide detailed descriptions and/or syllabi of these courses to CCGA.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about the course syllabi that were included in the proposal. Professor Kantor explained that these syllabi are for already-existing courses, and not courses especially designed for the MAS program. He reiterated that the MAS has four dedicated core courses along with one intensive mini-course, however this was not made clear in the original proposal. Members expressed their concern that it would be very difficult for a health professional to take courses in law without any introduction or preparation. The opposite also holds true for lawyers trying to take courses in the health sciences/medicine.

ACTION: Professor Kantor will try to obtain a second external review.

D. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Human Development at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Heckhausen reported that she has sent CCGA's concerns to the program proposers, and she is waiting for a response.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed CCGA's concerns. Professor Heckhausen said that in its current form, the proposal describes a broad program in Human Development, but most of its faculty and courses come from one department. She stressed that the revised proposal should capitalize on the inherent strengths of the faculty at UCSD, such as developmental linguistics, developmental neuroscience or cultural development. A stand-alone degree with these specializations would also be more attractive to students. Given that this is an interdisciplinary program, bylaws are also needed.

E. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and Joint Doctorate in Criminal Justice Sciences (Ph.D.) with CSU Fresno and UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Schumm reminded members that he will be submitting the revised proposal for a re-review. To that end, he has already secured one internal reviewer, and he is looking into other possible external reviewers. In order to facilitate the re-review, he requested a complete revised proposal from UCD, which he will send to the internal and external reviewers. At this point, he has not received a response or a complete revised proposal from UCD.

ACTION: The Davis member will make inquiries about the revised proposal and report back to the committee.

XII. Executive Session

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Attest: Duncan Lindsey, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst