

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MINUTES OF THE MEETING— APRIL 12, 2005**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Quentin Williams*

CSU Applied Doctorate Legislation (SB 724)

This legislation has been revised fairly extensively. It now explicitly targets professional degrees such as the Ed.D. and DPT. However, the legislation is still worded in such a way that it leaves open the possibility for additional doctorate degrees in the future.

Science Math Initiative

This initiative is designed to encourage science/math undergraduate students to pursue careers as high school/secondary teachers. It would set up a four year undergraduate training block for students interested in careers as secondary school teachers, followed by a fifth year of paid training in an actual school. Enrollments in existing masters' education programs could be hurt by such a program.

UCPB

UCPB has submitted a proposal for a graduate student aid steering committee to the Academic Council (AC). The AC agreed with UCPB that the present system for the allocation of graduate and professional school financial aid lacks transparency and effective collaboration between faculty and administration. AC recommended that this committee be established on a trial basis as an ad hoc advisory group, which may become permanent sometime in the future.

Restrictions on Research Resolution

The AC approved and forwarded to the Assembly a version of the "Restrictions on Research" document that is very close to what CCGA proposed (see [December 2004 minutes](#) and [January 2005 minutes](#)).

AC/Executive Vice Chancellors (EVC) Meeting

- Graduate Education: Chair Williams reported that his presentation (with Dan Neuman, UCLA EVC) on graduate education was generally well received by the EVC's.
- Diversity: Diversity in graduate education in terms of Chicano/Latino students has been relatively flat since 1995, while the percentage of African American graduate students has declined slightly over the same time period. Chair Williams said that he would forward the statistics on diversity to members at a later date.
- Long-Range Enrollment Planning: UCOP is doing a long-range enrollment planning exercise. The last long-range enrollment planning exercise took place in 1995. Traditionally, the long-range enrollment planning process has treated graduate enrollments as a certain percentage of total undergraduates. Over the last couple of decades, UC has missed such percentage targets. Although UC undergraduate enrollments are determined by California demographics to some extent, a key concern is whether it is appropriate to use a certain percentage of undergraduate students as a target for the UC graduate student enterprise. Chair Williams noted that there is a need to put more thought into this process as it pertains to graduate education enrollment targets (rather than settling on a simple

percentage of undergraduate students). In this regard, it was suggested that a better ratio might be the number of graduate students to the number of faculty members. One member noted that a key difference between undergraduate and graduate enrollments is that graduate enrollments are mainly market driven and inherently decentralized. Therefore, not only is a completely different algorithm required (rather than the algorithm used in determining undergraduate enrollment targets), but incentives for certain graduate programs (to attract quality graduate students) must also be in place.

Miscellaneous

- CCGA submitted a proposal to AC Chair George Blumenthal regarding graduate student fee waivers for graduate student instructors (GSI's) from the second year on (see March 2005 minutes).
- Charles Li, the UCSB Graduate Dean, put forward a similar proposal that recommends a waiver program for out-of-state tuition and fees for graduate students in their first year.
- Senate Regulation (SR) 904: UCR&J has ruled in accordance with SR 904 that the Graduate Dean is responsible for disqualifying graduate students. The background to this ruling is a recent case at UCD in which the divisional assembly overruled the disqualification/dismissal of a graduate student. The local divisional Elections, Rules, & Jurisdiction Committee (R&J) initially ruled that SR 904 (the disqualification of graduate students by the Graduate Dean) was not in accord with faculty rights. Therefore, the systemwide UCR&J ruling overrules the UCD divisional decision/ruling.

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

Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education

The emphasis of this task force is on doctoral education, however the establishment of divisional law schools, for example, is also of interest to Provost Greenwood. The broad charges for this group are: (1) Examine the most immediate/dire needs in graduate education, especially in regards to professional/applied doctorates; (2) Evaluate long-range needs in graduate education.

Audiology

The subgroup on audiology has produced an interim report and will be coming out with a final report shortly. The pressure for an audiology doctoral degree is acute and well defined (as opposed to the more generalized pressure for Ed.D. degrees) due to a number of reasons. First, audiology programs are relatively small. Second, the need stems from a change in the degree requirements by the national accreditation association for audiologists, which are well defined by this body. Third, extensive planning has already been conducted for two proposed joint programs in audiology (between UCSF and CSU San Francisco as well as UCD and CSU Sacramento). Unfortunately, both programs have been shelved for lack of resources. Currently, the faculty members involved in this planning at these institutions are very eager to establish these programs in light of the new accrediting requirements for audiologists. It is anticipated that both of these proposed programs could be launched in time to meet the audiology accreditation association's deadline of 2007. The joint doctoral program between San Diego State University and UCSD also has the potential to increase its size. A board member from the audiology accreditation association advised UC that a limited number of audiology programs would be sufficient to serve California's needs for audiologists.

CCGA Consultant Karen Merritt also noted that there are also significant costs associated with converting a masters program in audiology to a doctoral program. For example, Louisiana State University shut down their audiology program because moving to a doctoral program was simply too expensive. Cost figures from the University of Texas—Dallas indicate that the current cost for the audiology masters per degree is \$16,000, while the cost per degree for the doctorate will be about \$95,000. These costs stem from the addition of a requirement for a supervised clinical residency, something that is absent in current masters programs. The doctorate requires an additional two years to complete than the masters degree. Given these costs, it would be difficult for a university to convert an existing masters program in audiology to a stand-alone doctoral program without a partnership with a medical school or research-oriented hospital.

III. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans

Dean Mason was abroad. There were no announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans.

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the March 8, 2005 Minutes

ACTION: The March 8, 2005 minutes were approved with minor amendments.

B. Name Change for the UCD Graduate Program in “Rhetoric and Communication” to “Communication”

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the name change did not represent any associated fundamental change in the nature of the program, nor any need for substantial new resources. They felt that the name change better reflects the current field of communication.

ACTION: Members approved that the name change of the UCD Graduate Program in “Rhetoric and Communication” to “Communication” fit the definition of a simple name change.

C. Name Change for the “Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA)”, a Joint Ed.D. Program with UC Davis, CSU Fresno, and Sonoma State University” to “Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL)”

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the name change did not represent any associated fundamental change in the nature of the program, nor any need for substantial new resources. Members agreed that the new name better reflects the geographic region that this program is trying to serve (capital region north to the Oregon border).

ACTION: Members approved that the name change of the “Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA)”, a Joint Ed.D. Program with UC Davis, CSU Fresno, and Sonoma State University” to “Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL)” fit the definition of a simple name change.

IV. Review of a MRU Review – Institute of Transportation Studies (ITS)

ISSUE: ITS is centered at Berkeley, Irvine, and Davis. The report notes that it would be beneficial to have a more systemwide MRU with ITS centers at Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and Riverside. The ITS graduate education component is quite large with 260 graduate students associated with it. ITS receives about \$1.2 million from the Office of the President (UCOP) with approximately 74% going to Berkeley, 24% to Irvine, and 6% to Davis [equals 104%--percentage error in the report noted]. There is an additional \$35 million going to ITS for faculty

research funding with 65% of that coming from CalTrans. The principal recommendations of the review committee include more systemwide activity, increased funding, and the establishment of funds for a committee of directors. The report noted that even though the Davis ITS center received the least amount of money, they seemed to be leveraging it the most effectively.

DISCUSSION: *[This discussion relates to both MRU's—ITS and IGPP.]* Discussion centered on possible ways to improve inter-MRU collaboration and communications, such as organizing regional conferences for members of the MRU (both ITS and IGPP), as well as inviting researchers from outside that particular MRU to participate in such conferences. Such activities are typically low-cost, but also generally productive. Members also identified the competitive grants process as one area where efficiency might be improved. They suggested that activities relating to bidding for competitive grants be moved to UCOP, thereby freeing up the MRU (at the campus/lab level) to engage in other activities. The establishment of a UCOP working group was also suggested—not only to look at these two MRU's, but also to examine the role of MRU's in the UC system generally. However, Chair Williams cautioned that such a workgroup would most likely need a multi-year time-span to examine such profound issues. That said though, it would be appropriate to identify such systemwide MRU issues (i.e. “best practices”) in the reviews of both of these MRU's in the recommendations. With that task in mind, Chair Williams suggested that either one person or a sub-committee of two committee members review both of these MRU's.

ACTION: Michael Hanemann (UCB) and Albert Stralka (UCR) were chosen for the two-member sub-committee to review both ITS and IGPP.

V. Review of a MRU Review – Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics (IGPP)

ISSUE: IGPP has a long history of about 60 years, and became an official MRU in the 1980's with branches at UCLA, UCSD, UCSC, UCR, UCI, Los Alamos National Lab (LANL), and Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL). It receives approximately \$3.1 million dollars from UCOP. Its principal impact on graduate education is through its affiliation with the national labs, through which it runs the University Collaborative Research Project (UCRP) that funds most of the approximate 150 graduate students through research grants (mostly employed at LLNL). Much of the funding comes from laboratory management, which is channeled back into the MRU. In its recommendations, the review committee noted that IGPP could improve cross-communication between its campus/lab centers. Like ITS, the review committee also recommended that the IGPP budget be increased (it has been cut in the last couple of years).

DISCUSSION: See the discussion under Item IV--“ITS”, as it relates to both MRU reviews.

ACTION: Michael Hanemann (UCB) and Albert Stralka (UCR) were chosen for the two-member sub-committee to review both ITS and IGPP.

VI. SB 455: Legislation for International Student Visa Reform

ISSUE: Student representative Hannah Aoyagi participated in a Graduate Student Association (GSA) delegation to Washington D.C. to lobby for international student visa reform. They spoke with representatives from both the U.S. State Department and the Department of Homeland

Security, who noted that legislation is needed to speed-up the visa process for international students. Coincidentally, Senator Norm Coleman from Minnesota introduced SB 455, which would amend/update the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. The bill calls for evaluating how well the visa process works, as well as identifying areas where efficiencies can be increased in this process. A second delegation is going back at the end of April to talk with Senators from the Foreign Affairs Committee and some key House members involved in passing this bill. Gaining bi-partisan support is a key component of this lobbying effort.

DISCUSSION: Members suggested that this group should recruit the help of the graduate deans in this effort (especially John Richardson from UCLA, who has developed significant contacts in the Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. State Department). Developing “one-pager’s”, or summaries of the delegation’s position, to leave with Senators/Representatives would also be very useful.

VII. Residency Requirements Subcommittee (SR 694) Subcommittee Update

ISSUE: The subcommittee was unable to meet prior to the start of today’s CCGA meeting due to flight delays. Therefore, the subcommittee did not have an update for the committee. The subcommittee will meet after today’s meeting.

VIII. Graduate Program Proposal Distribution Procedures

ISSUE: Analyst Todd Giedt presented a proposal to codify the distribution procedures for graduate program proposals. These procedures will be noted in the CCGA Handbook. At issue is whether program proposers could forward curriculum vitae (CV’s) associated with the program proposal electronically (on a CD-ROM or by email) rather than distributing them hard copy.

ACTION: Members agreed that printing faculty CV’s is not necessary. Receiving them electronically is fine. Analyst Todd Giedt will add the procedures to the CCGA Handbook.

IX. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and Joint Doctorate in Criminal Justice Sciences (Ph.D.) with CSU Fresno and UC Davis

ISSUE/REPORT: This program will admit 20 students per year until it reaches a cadre of 80 students. There is a large self-supporting component in this program, with four graduate fellowships in the first year and eight additional fellowships in each of the following years. There are three different degree options—victimology, forensic behavioral sciences, and forensic science.

ACTION: Bruce Schumm (UCSC) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Schumm gave his final report on this proposal (the written report has already been distributed by email). One of the major concerns was the international profile of the program as well as the motivation of the Santa Barbara campus. These and other concerns were satisfied via a phone conference. The program is small (there are only a few FTE associated with it), however the hiring plan seems quite solid. The proposers successfully differentiated this program from other similar programs (including ones that have been recently closed). Professor Schumm noted that it has the full backing of the campus. The bylaws still need to be worked out however, and Professor Schumm noted that it might be worthwhile looking at the program in three years. The program was approved via email with a three-year review schedule.

C. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and the Master of Advanced Study (M.A.S.) Degree Program in Clinical Research at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Michael Hanemann (UCB)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Hanemann reported on a number of items in the initial proposal. In terms of market demand, the proposal indicates that there is significant market demand for this program. Faculty members also seem to be committed to the proposed program, and the program would not harm existing programs. This program will be administered out of the Dean's office (the program will be run out of the School of Medicine), so there are no issues relating to either the department itself or any involvement with UC Extension. The admissions component also looks fine. The capstone requirement (p. 9) will be an oral and written presentation of a research project that will take the form of a grant application to the National Institute of Health (NIH). From his first reading of the proposal, Professor Hanemann also feels that the workload is reasonable, but he would like to gather more information on the distribution of the workload. However, he does have some questions regarding the employment status of the students. He would also like to gather more information on advising due to the fact that the proposal does not go into this in detail. Regarding the review procedures, Professor Hanemann feels that this needs to be strengthened. The proposal notes a seven-year review cycle, however he feels that the program should initially be reviewed after three years.

Regarding the financial aspects of the program, Professor Hanemann feels that this information is somewhat lacking from the proposal. Issues include financial aid and whether the program will be completely self-supporting.

ACTION: Professor Hanemann will prepare a memo with an initial list of questions that will go to the program proposers. He will also begin to set up the internal and external reviews.

D. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Media Arts and Technology (MAT) at UC Santa Barbara – Lead Reviewer William McDonald (UCLA)

ISSUE/REPORT: The proposed Ph.D. is built upon an existing successful masters program in MAT. This program is jointly operated by the College of Letters and Science

as well as the College of Engineering, and it functions as a small department. Partner departments include Computer Science, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Music, and Visual Arts. The program's goal is to generate aesthetically trained engineers and technically trained artists. There are three areas of study—electronic music and sound design, visual and special arts, and multi-media engineering. The Ph.D. is directed towards doctoral research with a minimal amount of coursework. Currently there are 38 masters' with some number of these students expressing interest in such a doctoral program. While there has been a commitment of adequate space from the Director of the California Nanosystems Institute, the letter is dated from 2003. The letter does not mention a specific square-footage, so Professor McDonald would like to follow-up on this commitment.

In terms of student support, there is currently a great reliance on NSF grants (currently at \$3 million). While there are many funding possibilities/opportunities, there is at present a lack of stable and predictable funding. Although there are some block grants as well as teaching and research assistantships, there is some speculation that with the addition of a Ph.D. program, this might hurt the program's overall funding prospects (both the masters and Ph.D. programs—due to competition). There are 10-11 faculty members associated with the MAT program currently (varying from 0% to full appointments), and the program intends to add more affiliated faculty in the future. Professor McDonald would like to get more detail on the FTE set-up, especially in regards to the 0% faculty appointments.

In terms of planned enrollments, the program intends to “shift” some of its masters' students into the doctoral program. Professor McDonald noted that the program does not limit entry to any specific bachelor's degree. On the other hand, entry for students with masters' degrees is limited to specific fields. He thinks that this may have just been an oversight, but he will look into it. The curriculum is broken down into three distinct phases—introduction (three seminars); coursework (five core courses in the current MAT program); and conclusion (dissertation). In terms of the individualized curriculum (which is one of the unique feature of this program), the language is unclear as to the way this is set up (including the specific faculty members who coordinate this process). In terms of library support, the Deans have committed \$10,000, however there is not a letter of support or analysis from the Librarian. The proposers note that they will need \$150,000/year to maintain the computer labs/technology, which may be a low estimate. This is an area of concern to Professor McDonald, as they are counting on grants, university support, fund raising gifts, and start-up packages to fund their technology needs. They do have an advisory council on corporate partnerships however, which might be one area to explore for additional funding for technology (given that this program would be especially technologically-dependent). Finally, it should be noted that the proposal is missing a set of bylaws, which Professor McDonald will follow up on.

DISCUSSION: Members brought up the issue job prospects for graduates. In particular, they noted that the proposal was missing letters from prospective employers (both in academia and industry), which might give some indication of future employment opportunities. Coordination between programs/departments may also be an issue.

ACTION: Professor McDonald will look into these issues (noted above), and begin to coordinate the internal and external reviews.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Hanemann presented his final report. He noted that while the department of Religious Studies has existed since 1969 (offering an undergraduate degree in that major), it has doubled the size of its faculty since 1995. The department proposes to offer M.A. and Ph.D. degrees with a focus on the study of religions in contemporary life, cultures and politics. Once the graduate program is approved, the department plans to reduce its number of undergraduate courses to 30 (it currently offers 36), while adding 8 new graduate courses. There will be three core courses for the Ph.D. students, with three masters-level “survey” courses, which will also be useful for the Ph.D. students. The remaining courses will be field courses, as well as drawing on courses from related departments. Undergraduate courses will be restored as new faculty members become available. There are currently six active teaching faculty members and one lecturer available for these courses. The proposers anticipate a cohort of three Ph.D. students each year for the first two to three years. Professor Hanemann is comfortable that the existing number of active faculty members can provide the necessary course work for these initial cohorts.

The letters of support are also solid. Especially in regard to the FTE requests, there is evidence in the support letter from Dean Martin (Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences) to suggest that many of these will be granted in the coming years. Supporting this conclusion is the fact that the proposed program is actually part of a larger UCR thrust in Southeast Asian Studies. The letters from the university librarians are also strong, which note that the library plans to set aside an extra \$50,000 in one-time funds to acquire desired titles/resources. There are also letters from five related departments, some of which will provide affiliated courses as well as employing some of the Religious Studies Ph.D. students as TA's.

Overall, Professor Hanemann feels that this program is worthy of approval. He believes that this program will grow in coming years. Beyond the support for FTE requests (mentioned above), there are opportunities for fund-raising through the program's emphasis on Southeast Asian Studies. Student recruitment prospects are also good. Even at the masters' level, students will be interested in combining other degrees (such as an MBA or a masters in Political Science) with a masters in Religious Studies, as knowledge of Islamic Studies or Southeast Asian Studies would be useful in their chosen career fields. Also, members of local ethnic communities may be interested in pursuing such a degree. Funding is also solid. Students will be supported both by some central fellowships as well as TA/RA'ships. The support of the administration is also there. The program has already received the support of the EVC, the library, and space needs are also not an issue (given that a new building is being built). Job placement opportunities should also be favorable since this program teaches in an area that has a growing political and economic importance in the world.

ACTION: Members voted to approve this program with nine votes in favor and one abstention. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft an approval letter to be forwarded to the Provost.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Following the March meeting, Professor Wu asked the program proposers to clarify five major points/concerns:

- Bylaws: UCLA will add to the Bylaws a provision related to their revision. It will be Part IX, and entitled “Revision of Bylaws”.
- Student Advisor: Students will be assigned an advisor from the “Committee to Administer the Interdepartmental Program” upon entry into the program. After the student has completed all comprehensive examinations (at the beginning of the third year, typically), he/she will be encouraged to choose a dissertation advisor.
- Health Policy Curriculum: The proposers agree that health policy is quite relevant to health economics but they are reluctant to allow health policy courses that do not contain much economic content to count towards the health economics electives. They noted that the curriculum does require two more graduate-level courses, which is probably a better place for the types of policy courses that focus more on political science or sociology than economics.
- International Policy Concentration: The department of Health Economics does not have the faculty at UCLA to support this concentration.
- Light/Heavy Coursework: Reflecting the split opinions of the reviewers as to whether the course workload is too light or too heavy (one reviewer said that is too light, while the other felt that it was too heavy), the proposers responded by saying that the course workload is very reasonable for a Ph.D. program.
- Time to Graduation: One of the internal reviewers asked whether it would be possible to finish within four years. The proposers thought that although some students might finish in four years, most would take five years to complete the degree.
- Economic Theory as a Field of Study: The proposers agree with this suggestion, and they will add that as a possible concentration in Economics.
- More Applied Econometrics: Although the proposers share this concern, they are reluctant to add a 19th course at this time due to the already heavy course load. One way in which this is being addressed is by requiring attendance at the new proposed health economics seminar, where the research being presented will normally involve applied econometrics.
- Administrative Structure--How to get Health Service students involved?: The proposers were required by the faculty executive committees to choose one department for student affairs-related matters. Because the School of Public Health had experienced a recent reduction in staff, the Economics department would be a better home for this.
- Faculty from the Andersen School of Management?: The proposers will do this if there are appropriate faculty members from the Andersen School of Management.

Unfortunately, there are no available ladder-faculty members (with an interest in Health) available at this time.

- Graduate Student Support: The proposers note that they will start with two students in the first year, and then gradually build that number up to four students. Most support will come from T.A.- and R.A.'ships. Regarding the \$17,000 stipend, they feel that this is generous, given that they plan to offer aid to all of their students and have a plan to provide support for a four-year period. They also note that it is a far more generous offer than is provided by either the Department of Economics or Health Services.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the issue of graduate student support. At issue is how can students studying Health Economics get equitable support when compared to students who are just studying Economics or students just studying Health? A significant CCGA concern is the fact that TA'ships in the Economics department are already saturated by Economics students. Likewise, it seems that there are very limited opportunities for TA'ships in the Health Department for Health Economics students. Members suggested asking the proposers if there is a negative differential for Health Economics students.

ACTION: Professor Wu will follow-up with the program proposers (regarding graduate student support). He expects to complete the review by the May meeting.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Sharrer updated the committee on this review since the March meeting.

Professor Grewal Response: On March 13th, Professor Grewal responded to the remaining CCGA concerns:

- Disestablishment of the Comparative Culture Program: She noted that the proposed program did not have any overlap with the old Comparative Culture program.
- Exposure to other Approaches/Methodologies: Professor Grewal simply states that students will be trained in a variety of methods and disciplines.
- Chicano/Latino Faculty Participation: She mentions that at one time, Chicano/Latino faculty members did agree to participate. However later, the CSLP program elected not to participate as a program; but individual faculty members in the program are participating.
- Graduate Student Support: On this point, she refers CCGA to a letter from School of Humanities Dean, Karen Lawrence, and Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, Bill Parker.

CCGA/UCI Conference Call: CCGA Chair Williams, Professor Sharrer, Dean of Humanities Lawrence, and Graduate Dean Parker:

- Disestablishment of Comparative Culture Program: The EVC has asked the UCI Academic Senate to initiate discontinuation of this program.

- **Graduate Student Support:** It was noted that the Graduate Dean allocates the block grants to the individual deans of the various schools. They in turn distribute the block grants. On that point, the Dean Lawrence confirmed that there would be adequate support for Culture and Theory students from these block grants. Both Dean Parker and Dean Lawrence said that they anticipate TA'ships for Culture and Theory students based on new growth in the Humanities at UCI.
- **Chicano/Latino Faculty Participation:** Dean Lawrence also agreed to try to get more Chicano/Latino faculty members to participate in the proposed program (see subsequent letter as an April meeting agenda enclosure).

ACTION: A site visit will be scheduled for late May. Professor Sharrer will copy Dean Parker and Dean Lawrence on upcoming correspondence on CCGA's outstanding concerns.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Marshall presented his final report. He reported that this program is an outgrowth of a long-standing masters program in Animal Science. The unique focus of this group is the development of a program that would allow Ph.D. students to conduct research at one or more of the intersections of traditional or modern biological sciences—allowing the student to understand the animal at the organism level. The curriculum will be individualized to each student from the beginning of the program. The program fills a unique niche within the UC system—it is broader and more interdisciplinary than other related UCD programs, but narrower in focus than zoology.

Reviews: The internal and external reviews were generally positive, but they produced some concerns/suggestions. One concern centered on the program's requirement that students will not be admitted unless there is a match between the student's interest and a major professor. One reviewer felt that this might not be realistic. However, a number of programs at Davis are successfully run this way. However, another reviewer noted that most prospective Ph.D. students interested in whole animal biology actually apply to specific laboratories to work with targeted professors.

Student Demand: The initial anticipated enrollment is four to five students increasing to approximately 15 students over a three-year time span. The faculty in the graduate group presently have about 65 students, and it is anticipated that some of these students may transfer into this new program. Professor Marshall noted that anticipated demand is likely to be particularly strong from the existing M.S. program. Foreign applicants may also be attracted to the program as well.

Job Prospects: Most of the potential job prospects for the graduates of this program are in academia. Careers in government may also be a possibility. One reviewer raised a concern that graduates from this program would be considered a "hybrid", something which might work against them when applying to positions within academia. That said though, Professor Marshall did not think that this was a serious concern.

Course Requirements: Students are required to complete 23 graded graduate units and a minimum of 72 units overall, but most students are expected to have many more than that. The required courses include three units of the new integrative animal biology course and 8-20 units of interdisciplinary courses. One reviewer urged that there be at least two quarters' worth of teaching experience because many of the job opportunities required some teaching experience. Davis responded that they felt that most of their students would have more than one quarter of teaching experience, but that they only wanted to require one quarter of teaching at this point. Another suggestion from the reviews was the establishment of mandatory laboratory group meetings. The proposers responded that this was already a common practice at Davis whenever the group is large enough to conduct such meetings. Normative time for the program is five years.

Student Support/Program Costs: Students will be supported from a mix of research and training grants. Three specific grants are named in the proposal. There will also be fellowships and teaching assistantships. The program will also be applying for a new training grant as soon as it is established. There are not any additional FTE requests associated with this proposal. While there will be some administration costs, these will be covered in the short-run by the Animal Biology department.

Review Procedure: Graduate Council will review the program in five years, after which it will be placed on the usual seven-year cycle.

Conclusion: Professor Marshall recommended approval with the following caveat. One reviewer felt that the Animal Science program at Davis was not doing enough for the animal industry for the state of California. The proposers responded by saying that they feel there would be a small but positive impact on the California animal production industry.

DISCUSSION: Chair Williams noted that this program's contribution to the animal industry in California is important. Professor Marshall said that the program's immediate contributions are its masters' graduates, while many of its doctoral students will eventually contribute to California's animal industry. While there was some trepidation regarding the "matching" of students to professors before they entered the program, most members felt that this program was flexible and that such a "matching" system represented a good mentoring program.

ACTION: Members voted to approve this proposal (ten in favor, one abstention). Analyst Todd Giedt will draft an approval letter to be forwarded to the Provost.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Williams provided an update to the committee. He noted some confusion over the bylaws in that they were contained in the electronic version of the proposal, but not in the hard copy. The proposers will be presenting the following changes to the original proposal before the faculty in the coming weeks:

- Curricular Change: A clinical course (to be required or strongly recommended) will be added.
- Additional Financial Details on Graduate Student Support Packages
- Standards for Dismissing Students

ACTION: Chair Williams anticipates concluding this review by the May meeting.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wayne summarized the external reviews:

- External Review #1: This review raises a fundamental issue and questions whether this program (which emphasizes research) can train students to be leaders. He notes that "collaborative leadership" (the field that these students would be studying) does not really exist in the field of education given the top-down administrative line of command.
- External Review #2: Professor Wayne noted that this review was generally positive, but it was the least detailed.
- External Review #3: This review formulated a number of concerns/questions for the program:
 - (1) A market analysis and question of "deep analysis of other programs in the region".
 - (2) Monitoring quality and fidelity to stated goals in formative years.
 - (3) The standards and accountability movement in school leadership is largely ignored.
 - (4) There is a need for an instructional leadership course.
 - (5) Application & Admissions: (a) GRE score minimum guidelines; (b) Criteria for letters of reference (some evidence that the applicant has some experience with underrepresented communities); (c) Scoring rubric for writing sample? (d) Questions whether expectations of the candidate to have "formulated a research question" is premature--suggests indication of "research interest" instead.
 - (6) Dissertation Project: Identification of research question should emerge after preliminary review of literature.
 - (7) Residency and course requirements
 - (8) Time limits for degree---relation to potential problem of faculty overload.
 - (9) Rigor of the research methods requirement? This reviewer feels that it is more a MA-level course.
 - (10) Is there a taxonomy of knowledge and skills that the program will develop? What will graduates be able to do after completing the degree (related to external review #1)?

DISCUSSION: Professor Wayne noted that he has had some difficulty in getting an internal review from UCLA. Members suggested sending a letter to the Chair of the Department/Dean from Professor Wayne and Chair Williams. He has also not received an internal review from Berkeley.

ACTION: (1) Professor Wayne will send the proposers the reviews and give them the opportunity to respond; (2) Chair Williams/Professor Wayne will send a letter to

the Chair of the UCLA Education Department/Dean to request an internal review for the record. (3) Professor Wayne will send a “reminder” letter Dean Pearson of the Berkeley Education Department. (4) Professor Wayne will schedule a site visit for May.

II. Executive Session - Members only

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

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