

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting**Tuesday, April 6, 2010****10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.****UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 12322****Telephone: 510-987-9466**<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>**I. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates – Chair Farid Chehab**

- March 31 Joint UCOP/Academic Council Budget Meeting retreat.
 - Main objective of retreat was to identify various options for potential budget cuts; long-term UC debt nearing about \$6B; a new idea of leaving the Educational Fee on the campuses rather than having it collected by UCOP has been proposed by the Administration

II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the March 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes
- Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.

New Item **Discussion with WASC Director Ralph Wolff on Issues of Concern to UC Graduate Education – Chair Chehab and Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination**

ISSUE: CCGA has previously discussed WASC's interest in defining graduate student learning outcomes as well as the staff workload associated with providing data and documentation to WASC. WASC Director Ralph Wolff has agreed to meet with CCGA this spring. Members will consider specific topics and questions for the meeting. Hilary Baxter noted the importance of representation from research institutions on WASC; a clearer understanding of what is being asked by WASC; what would be most productive for WASC teams to determine learning outcomes; to provide a bulleted list to WASC, e.g., capstone requirement, thesis, exam, dissertation, etc., to clarify distinctions in the processes entailed during the reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs and possibly to look at learning outcomes rubrics.

DISCUSSION: Chair Chehab briefly summarized CCGA's charge and purview. In turn, Director Wolff described the focus of WASC, which is one of six regional accreditors recognized by the Department of Education (DOE). He expressed issues associated with undergraduate institutions establishing new graduate degree programs, and with the professional degree-granting authority of institutions. WASC is also concerned with the extent to which budget cuts begin to affect quality of education. Chair Chehab questioned the utility of WASC review of new graduate academic degree programs and asked why CCGA's review of new graduate degree programs couldn't be folded into the WASC review instead. Director Wolff noted that for campuses without general degree granting authority as in the case of UC Merced, which is not accredited by WASC, it is the WASC review that is mandate by DOE and recognized by the federal government. One member noted that the UC/CCGA process is more

New Item Discussion with WASC Director Ralph Wolff on Issues of Concern to UC Graduate Education *(continued)*

extensive than the WASC review process, which to a certain extent is largely duplicative. Another member questioned how WASC would interface with the review processes already in place at UC. Director Wolff indicated his willingness to sit down with Merced representatives to address the efficiency issues while satisfying federal requirements. This group would also include those UC campuses without general degree granting authority for graduate degree programs. Director Wolff noted that WASC is seeing a proliferation of professional doctoral degrees and mounting concern over the issues associated with them. He commented on the need for policies to help establish the appropriate evaluative criteria. Chair Chehab asked if there was a way that campus/CCGA review could satisfy WASC requirements. Director Wolff said he doesn't have the authority to make that call but that he is willing to work on improving efficiencies and reducing redundancies in the process that accounts for the rigor of the campus/UC review. Another member asked Wolff for definition and example for graduate student learning outcomes. Director Wolff noted the dissertation rubrics and how these represent the core values of a given discipline as one example. Other members commented on the difficulties of a one-model fits all definition for all disciplines. Director Wolff suggested a less formulaic approach in response to defining learning outcomes. He indicated that he would like to work with CCGA on a definition and that imposing a template would be the last thing he would want to do. He also said he would welcome a CCGA representative to serve on the WASC Substantive Change Committee. Chair Powell suggested that the PDPE Report would be of interest to him. Chair Chehab suggested that WASC might want to distinguish learning outcomes/key indicators for academic and professional graduate degrees. Director Wolff said that he welcomes CCGA's assistance in this area.

ACTION: It was agreed to convene a future meeting with WASC and the appropriate campus/UCOP representatives to further discuss how to address the efficiency and interface issues.

III. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs

Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director

Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

Pamela Jennings noted the upcoming Graduate Research Day in Sacramento on May 12.

IV. Summary Discussion on Policy Implications Associated with Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate/ Professional Degree Programs – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: Last year, CCGA was charged by Academic Council to discuss the policy governing the establishment of self-supporting programs (SSPs). During the course of the year, CCGA discussed the most salient points that pertain to SSP and how they might affect future proliferation of SSPs, especially in the current economic climate of decreasing State support to the University. CCGA's letter to Council, prepared by Chair Chehab, will summarize the most important points relevant to SSPs with the hope that these will be taken into consideration by a Senate-Administration Task Force that will further look into a revised policy to establish SSPs across the UC system.

IV. Summary Discussion on Policy Implications Associated with Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate/ Professional Degree Programs *(continued)*

DISCUSSION: Concerns were expressed about how admissions criteria might differ for SSPs and how fee differentials could impact student-to-student relations within the same program, e.g., the creation of second class of students with limited academic mobility and privileges. Others commented that SSPs should not be geared toward Ph.D.s as evident in some of the professional degree fee proposals before the committee and that the letter ought to make a clear distinction between the two and that the letter include a statement to this effect, e.g., clear provisions for financial support as criterion for program approval. Members noted the inherent conflicts between aspects of SSP and PDF programs. It was also suggested that the letter state teaching faculty should be appointed and reviewed following regular campus procedures. As to the role of UC Extension, one member noted his concern with a recommendation contained in the Commission on the Future report. As to the relationship of SSPs to s State supported programs, members concurred with the wording in the letter. Members also suggested modifying the sentence that some academic SSPs could benefit from state support towards the end of the letter. Others felt that such wording may give the state a way to opt-out and that as a matter of principle, CCGA does not support the establishment of academic self-supporting Ph.D. programs at UC and that the new policy should explicitly state it. One other suggestion was to add a clause clarifying that the definition of SSPs is not a complete definition and to state what we think best defines a SSP.

ACTION: Members approved the draft letter as modified.

V. Proposals for Professional Degree Fees – Chair Farid Chehab

ISSUE: Provost Larry Pitts has requested that CCGA and UCPB review nine proposals for professional degree fees to be levied in 2010-11 and beyond. This is a new review process in addition to the existing Compendium process for approving new programs. The relevant Senate committees are CCGA and UCPB. Council will need to receive CCGA's recommendations in time for its May 26 meeting. Members are asked to note the following in their review of the enclosure materials:

- 1) Two of the programs proposed for new professional degree fees (M.S. programs at Irvine) are new academic programs that have not yet been reviewed or approved through the Compendium process.
- 2) One of the programs proposed for a new professional degree fee (M.Eng. at Berkeley) is proposed to be redesigned to such an extent that it may require Compendium review. CCGA was asked to determine whether the program redesign is above or below the threshold for Compendium review as a reconstitution.
- 3) Provost Pitts requests that, in addition to reviewing the specific proposals, the Senate address three broad policy questions:
 - a) What is the proper definition of a "professional" degree program that distinguishes it from an academic degree program?
 - b) What criteria determine when it is appropriate to charge a professional degree fee?
 - c) What criteria determine whether a program should be self supporting or state supported?

V. Proposals for Professional Degree Fees *(continued)*

DISCUSSION: On the question of what is the proper definition of professional degree program that distinguishes it from an academic program, members commented that there is not a common list of criteria that would apply to all disciplines. Vice Chair Dan Simmons suggested “*occupational degree programs that lead to training students for a specific and singular profession in a field that is not widely recognized for professional schools that do not offer a corresponding doctoral degree*”. Other suggested language: one uses information to create new knowledge; the other applies knowledge and that the definition use the term “occupational” instead of professional.

On the professional fee issue, CCGA members suggested that it be called a supplemental fee instead. It seems that calling it a professional fee is tied to UC’s ability to charge it. *e.* Others recommended calling the degree fees what they are with the stated justification that such a fee is needed due to the loss of state funding and to maintain competitiveness of UC programs. Otherwise, it comes across as just another fee increase. Members felt CCGA should object to any furthering blurring of the line between the two. It was suggested that CCGA recommend that professional fee proposals be approved on a case-by-case basis grounded in policy.

ACTION: Members agreed to include the above comments in the letter to Academic Council and to wrap up the discussion at the next meeting.

VI. Recommendations from the Work Groups of the Commission on the Future – *Chair Chehab*

ISSUE: Academic Council Chair Harry Powell has requested Senate review of the first set of recommendations from the work groups of the Commission on the Future. CCGA comments are requested by May 21, in order to allow for an extended discussion by the Academic Council and the Assembly before Council opines on behalf of the Senate.

DISCUSSION: (See response template for specific comments.) It was suggested that CCGA members take the template back to their Graduate Councils and forward a copy to CCGA before next meeting.

ACTION: Members agreed to include the above comments in the letter to Academic Council and to wrap up the discussion at the next meeting.

VII. Systemwide Review: Proposed Revisions to the Compendium – *Chair Chehab and Associate Director Todd Giedt*

ISSUE: A joint task force of Academic Senate and UCOP staff members presented a report on proposed changes to the Compendium to the Academic Council in February. Revisions to the Compendium are particularly timely as many of the topics to be addressed by the Commission on the Future encroach upon the purview of the Academic Senate. Comments from CCGA are due to Academic Council in time for their June 16, 2010 meeting.

Prof. Tony Norman (UCR) is chair of the Compendium Review Task Force; Todd Giedt is lead staff to the task force. Immediate past Vice Chair of CCGA Ken Rose (UCSB) served as CCGA’s representative on the task force.

ACTION: This item was postponed.

VIII. Proposed Name Change: UCLA Proposal to change the name of the department from the Department of Physiological Science to the Department of Integrative Biology and Physiology – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: An initial request by the Department to the UCLA Academic Senate to change the names of their Bachelor's and Master's degrees to that of the new Department name was subsequently rescinded.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA elected not to opine as departmental name changes are a campus issue.

IX. Proposed Name Change: UCI Proposal for the Split and Name Change in the Ph.D. Program in the School of Biological Sciences – Chair Chehab

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

X. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. Degree Qualitative and Something Biology at UC Merced – Chair Chehab

ACTION: Professor Chehab (UCSF) agreed to get the review started and to serve as lead reviewer to the end of the year. Professor Maduro, who expects to serve next year on CCGA, later agreed to serve as lead reviewer and initiated the recruitment of internal and external reviewers.

B. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. Degree in Cognitive and Information Sciences at UC Merced – Lead Reviewer Michael Beattie (UCSF)

REPORT: Prof. Beattie reported that he is working on finding reviewers and provided a brief overview of the proposal.

C. Proposal for a Graduate Program in the Study of Religion Leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degree at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Christopher Kello (UCM)

REPORT: Prof. Kello reported that he is working on finding reviewers and provided a brief overview of the proposal.

D. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Nano Engineering Leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Sue Carter (UCSC)

REPORT: Prof. Carter reported that she has five reviewers lined up and provided a brief overview of the proposal.

E. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Energy Leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer John Hildebrand (UCSD)

REPORT: Prof. Hildebrand reported that he is working on finding reviewers and provided a brief overview of the proposal.

F. Proposal for a Graduate Degree Program in Architecture-Based Enterprise Systems Engineering Leading to the Master of Advance Studies (M.A.S.) at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Morris Maduro (UCR)

REPORT: Prof. Maduro presented his summary report on the proposal and recommended CCGA approval at this time.

ACTION: The Committee voted (10-0-1) to approve the proposal with the recommendation that the campus should review the program within four years due to its particular attributes.

G. Proposal for a Ph.D. Degree Program in Epidemiology and Translational Science at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UC Davis)

REPORT: Prof. Goodhue reported that she has received two more reviews and is working on drafting a summary report for the next meeting.

H. Proposal for an M.S. Degree Program in Dental Hygiene at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Steven Nelson (UCLA)

REPORT: Prof. Nelson reported that he has all the reviews and that they will be discussed at the next meeting.

I. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. Degree Program in Chicana and Chicano Studies at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Jim Carmody (UCSD)

REPORT: Prof. Carmody reported that he is awaiting campus response to questions raised previously in reviews and by CCGA.

XI. New Business

• **Review of the Legislative Analyst’s Office Report – The Master Plan at 50: Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts – Coordinating Higher Education in California – Chair Chehab**

ISSUE: The state Legislative Analyst’s Office issued a report in January 2010 recommending several legislative actions and strategies to improve coordination of higher education in California and enhance the Legislature’s ability to target resources in ways that would improve the higher education system’s performance in meeting the state’s educational and workforce needs:

- Adopting a clear public agenda for higher education, with specific statewide goals that can serve as the framework for an accountability system designed to align higher education performance with the state’s needs;
- Strengthening several critical mechanisms of coordination, including funding formulas, delineated missions, eligibility standards and enrollment pools for each segment, articulation and transfer mechanisms, approval processes for new programs and sites, and accountability mechanisms; and
- Reforming the California Postsecondary Education Commission or replace it with a new coordinating body to help create higher education policy leadership for California.

XI. New Business (*continued*)

- **Review of the Legislative Analyst's Office Report – The Master Plan at 50: Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts – Coordinating Higher Education in California – Chair Chehab**

DISCUSSION: Chair Harry Powell reported on recent meetings with the LAO where some of the above issues and the Academic Senate's concerns were discussed.

ACTION: **No further action was taken at this time; discussion will be continued at the next meeting.**

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Attest: Farid Chehab, CCGA Chair
Prepared by Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst

CCGA 2009-10 Remaining Meeting Schedule:

May 4, 2010 – Room 12322

June 1, 2010 – Room 12322