

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – MAY 1, 2007**

Present: Michael Hanemann, Roger Savage, Erin Bardin, Reen Wu, Todd Giedt, Tyrus Miller, Albert Stralka, Jutta Heckhausen, Omer Egecioglu, David Kelley, Bruce Schumm, Shrinivasa Upadhyaya, Cathy Constable, and Farid Chehab

I. Chair's Announcements

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Wu reported that members of the Academic Council overwhelmingly voted against RE-89, with only the San Francisco division voting in favor of it (see distribution one). The Academic Assembly will vote on RE-89 on May 9th. He also reported on Vice President for Research position, clarifying that this position would oversee some of the duties that Larry Hershman had previously been responsible for. Members commented that they have no doubt that the Provost needs assistance, but Larry Hershman has not had a role in research up to this point. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Report has been approved by the Academic Council and it will go out for system-wide review. Another issue is support for undergraduate mental health services, which President Dynes has indicated that he wants to increase, important given the recent Virginia Tech tragedy.

He also clarified that a memorandum on interdisciplinary program (IDP) bylaws should go through members' respective graduate councils, as a memorandum from Academic Council would not be appropriate for this sort of thing. The bylaw change will go into the CCGA Handbook however.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultants from Academic Initiatives did not attend the meeting.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda with minor changes. Chair Wu moved items VII and XIII.E. to the beginning of the agenda immediately after the consent calendar.

B. Draft Minutes from the April 3, 2007 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

IV. UCEP/CCGA' Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction Update

ISSUE: Professor Schumm noted that the proposal/memo contains a preamble in the form of a letter to Senate Chair Oakley, which provides the motivation and justification for the proposal. He asked members to evaluate the proposal on its own merits. He also noted that the current version of the memo included input from the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF). While UCAF's statement on 'Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles' (under current system-wide review) does contain language pertaining to the academic freedom of graduate students, he does not think that the proposal is in conflict with this statement. He noted

that the current proposal skirts the issue of academic freedom for graduate students, thus implicitly deferring to the UCAF memo.

He reported that the Teaching Assistant (TA) (under ‘Teaching Assistants (or Equivalent Titles)’)) recommendations have remained mostly unchanged. However, one major change is that the overseeing faculty member must be the instructor of record. A TA can teach the entire enrollment of the course however.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that it is odd for the definition of the TA to begin with a description of what it is not. She suggested that it begin with an actual definition of a TA and his or her responsibilities. While acknowledging that this criticism has been raised before, Professor Schumm emphasized that we should clearly state that a TA is not responsible for the instructional content of a course. However, another member remarked that if this section begins in this way, the reader is immediately struck with the inherent contradictions with regard to TAs teaching in English composition and foreign language courses where graduate student instructors (GSIs) both perform the traditional duties of TAs and teach the entire course. One member pointed out that at UCSC, a TA in English composition would be termed a ‘graduate student instructor’ and not a ‘TA’. Professor Schumm noted that the second paragraph clarifies these roles. Another option is to simply describe the TA as an ‘assistant’ to the instructor of record. The advantage of beginning the section in this way allows the memo to then delineate the specific responsibilities assigned to the instructor of record and those assigned to the TA. Members agreed to change the relevant structure of the text to (1) note that the TA is an ‘assistant’ to the instructor of record at the beginning of the paragraph; and (2) then delineate the responsibilities assigned to the instructor of record and the TA. Some criticism suggested that the defined role of the TA would be one way for faculty members to claim credit for someone else’s work. However, other members stated that providing oversight for TAs would not mean that you receive academic credit for it; the faculty member would only be responsible.

Members also held a short discussion on the meaning of conducting ‘regular classes’ (in the second sentence of the proposed wording for the *Conditions for Employment for the Graduate Teaching Assistant*). Professor Schumm clarified that this means using a pre-defined syllabus to provide delivery of that material for the entire enrollment for the duration of the course. Members debated whether ‘regular classes’ means teaching the entire course. They noted that with language courses, there is not the equivalence of a lecture. Providing specific examples of what TAs do was dismissed as not appropriate for this type of document. They suggested replacing ‘regular classes’ with ‘occasional plenary class meetings’ to illustrate the difference between a TA filling in for a professor from time-to-time (under the active supervision of the instructor of record) and giving all of the lectures in the course, which would not be appropriate. They agreed that the term ‘sections’ should remain however, as the term ‘section’ is a kind of word of art and is widely understood.

Members also discussed the section, ‘*Teaching Positions of Greater Responsibility*’. In the first sentence of this section, they suggested replacing ‘frequently’ with ‘sometimes’, which actually does not convey a statement about the specific frequency. Professor Schumm noted that the duties associated with oversight is now specifically laid out (the third paragraph in this section). Members agreed that ‘regular faculty member’ should be retained, as it differentiates more

permanent faculty members from visiting professors. They also thought it best to remove 'catalogue copy' and add 'syllabi' in the duties of the overseeing faculty member. They emphasized that the student must be apprised of 'relevant aspects' of the faculty code of conduct and make it clear that the GSI is expected to be in compliance with it. Agreements between overseeing faculty members and GSIs would be something that the divisions could implement if they so wished. The onus of compliance is on the student, but the onus of instruction/education about the code of conduct is on the faculty member. If only a subset of the academic personnel manual applies, then the logical thing would be to highlight the sections that do apply; or alternatively, ask each graduate division to do this. In the end, however, members agreed that this was too fine a level of detail for this document; judgment of which applicable sections of the code of conduct should be left to the campuses. They settled on the phrase, 'relevant aspects of the faculty code of conduct' as appropriate for the memo. Finally, members asked about the sentence, "In no circumstance should a graduate student instructor be supervised by another graduate student." Professor Schumm clarified that the overseeing faculty member should be active enough to ensure that the GSI is not subject to a conflict of interest. For example, a graduate student who is grading a course that he or she is enrolled in would be considered a conflict of interest. Members acknowledged that situations where graduate students are enrolled in undergraduate courses that are taught by GSIs would be quite common (such as foreign language courses). Members agreed that the title should be changed to 'Courses Enrolling Graduate Students' because graduate students can already serve as GSIs in undergraduate courses with or without graduate students. Members agreed that the memo should not recommend a prohibition, but it should state clearly that graduate students should not be supervised by other graduate students. They added that some statement should be added that notes that all of the conditions listed in the preceded section apply to courses enrolling graduate students as well.

Under 'Academic Senate Regulation 750', one member asked if "only regularly appointed officers of instruction..." (under Section A) are any different than regular faculty members. He noted that faculty are defined in APM 110. Professor Schumm cautioned that he did not want to revise existing legislation, and told members that regulations need to stand on their own and do not refer to administration documents as a general rule. He added that there were not any formal comments on this particular issue. The specific delineation of faculty titles in Section B also concerned members, who wondered what would happen if additional faculty titles are added in the future. He felt it important to include the language "faculty under APM 110" in Section A. However, Professor Schumm felt argued that regulations should not reference the APM. In the end, one member felt that this regulation should use the terminology of 'prescribed' rather than 'appropriate'.

Under 'Students with Prior University Teaching Experience,' Professor Schumm clarified that this section has been inserted into the memo to satisfy the condition of graduate student who has extensive experience teaching at a community college. As this person could easily be hired as a lecturer based on his or her instruction experience, it makes sense that he or she should be hired in a similar capacity as a graduate student. To make the language clearer, members suggested removing 'that provided by', leaving 'commensurate with one of the faculty titles'. Professor Schumm emphasized that the principle behind this section is not a mandate to follow this practice, but simply a statement that campuses can consider hiring graduate students with

considerable instructional experience as lecturers. In other words, it will be left up to the campuses to decide. Some members advocated including this section as part of ‘Teaching Positions of Greater Responsibility’. However, they drew distinctions between this role and that defined in that section. Professor Schumm said that the primary difference is one of oversight. The oversight of a lecturer is basically done at the time of hiring, while the oversight of a GSI continues over the length of the course. Members emphasized that these are unusual cases and the issue will be one of comparability with what has been the traditional practice. It could require Senate review. Bruce summarized that there are three options: (1) conclude that this is not an issue and drop it from the memo; (2) conclude that it is an issue, and allow the campuses to decide; or (3) conclude that it is an issue, and require that CCGA decide it. He argued for allowing the divisions to decide this issue. At the core of this issue is the question of whether graduate students can be faculty or at least be an instructor of record. The implications include granting students some form of academic freedom. Members briefly discussed requiring Senate approval for any case of a graduate student teaching beyond the level of a TA. However, this was dismissed on the basis on the criticism that the initial of the memo received on that point, which argued that such a requirement would be overly burdensome.

Members agreed that the sections on ‘Graduate Courses’, ‘State-Supported Summer Instruction’, ‘Instruction by Postdoctoral Scholars’, and ‘Closing Remarks’ are fine.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will forward a revised memo, asking for comments by Monday, May 07, 2007.

V. Differential Fees for Professional Programs

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Wu noted that differential fees are related to last month’s discussion on self-supported graduate programs. This month’s discussion was prompted by an email from former CCGA Chair Duncan Lindsey.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that differential fees already exist for some programs. Some fields are not highly compensated, which is the reason for CCGA’s concerns. CCGA considered the topic of differential fees last year, which prompted the concern that these fees were limiting access to professional programs for some students. CCGA subsequently asked UCOP to look into this. The data showed that at present there is not a problem, however at the last meeting members drafted language that would require periodic monitoring every five years of these fees. While differential fees can be justified for such highly-compensated fields as law and business, differential fees are now being considered for public service related fields, which are lightly compensated. The Masters of Public Policy (MPP) is one example. One member noted that if the socio-economic characteristics of the application pool for programs such as the MPP, then one can infer that differential fees are having an impact. Other members noted that some money does come back to the department or school, but the real question is how much of that money is used for student support? To perform that analysis, CCGA needs additional data. The suggestion was made to include applicant pool data in addition to admittance pool data (which was included in the UCOP report). A survey of the programs involved was also recommended.

Another member was interested in the justification of differential fees. Other members responded that such policies are one way to capture additional revenue for a number of so-called ‘good’ causes. Members wondered if these causes were related to the University as a whole, or to specific departmental needs. Members suggested re-examining the UCOP report at the June meeting. They also noted that there is a suspicion that differential fees represent an untapped resource of sorts. In addition to seeking new data (i.e. applicant pool data), they felt that it is important to find more information on the ‘justification’ or reasons behind differential fees. One member suggested that in light of this new information, three-year review of data might be more appropriate.

ACTION: Members will reconsider the UCOP report in June with the intent of developing some language for a letter to Academic Council.

VI. Certificates Update

ISSUE: Vice Chair Bruce Schumm reported that he recently talked with John Richardson, who is the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies at UCLA, regarding how to move forward with CCGA’s review of certificate programs. Professor Schumm suggested that CCGA may wish to only review certificate programs which have a distinct and dedicated admissions process, as opposed to certificate programs that students complete as part of a larger program. Certificate programs offered by UC Extension would also be excluded from CCGA review. He also clarified that certificate programs differ from masters programs in that they do not contain a capstone. A list of certificate programs also needs to be compiled. SR 735 also stipulates residency requirements for certificate programs.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if certificate programs are currently reviewed by the local Graduate Council. At present there is no uniform policy; CCGA is tasked with drafting such a policy. One example of a program that would be reviewed by the local Graduate Council, but not CCGA would be one that is included in a larger program. On the point of specification, one member felt that if a student is registered on the books as someone enrolled in a particular certificate program, that program should be included as one that is reviewed by CCGA. Members also clarified that a Masters of Advanced Study (MAS) is not a certificate program, but an actual degree, which in most cases are reviewed by Graduate Council. Another major question is which certificates carry the official University seal. On that point, there are different types of University seals that are used for different types of programs/certificates. Members took a straw vote on whether CCGA should review terminal certificate programs, as proposed by Professor Schumm. Members favored the proposal with a vote of five in favor, three opposed, and two abstentions.

VII. Expansion of Master of Public Health Program at UC Davis

ISSUE: Professor Upadhyaya explained that this Masters of Public Health (MPH) program was approved by CCGA in 2002. At that time, the proposers had two types of students in mind-- MPH-1 and MPH-2. Students enrolled in the MPH-1, which was designed as one-year program (including the summer quarter), were expected to already have medical degrees. The track for the second group (MPH-2) was not defined at that time, but was expected to be more general. The proposers now want to expand the program from 12 to 30 students. In order to do so, they want to only change the admission requirements (which is usually done at the Graduate Council

level), making it less restrictive and allowing students from other backgrounds to enroll in the program (i.e. students with bachelors degrees). At the time of the original approval in 2002, CCGA made a note that Davis should contact Berkeley and UCLA first to see if these other campuses could accommodate specified increases in their own enrollments before expanding the Davis program. CCGA recommended a formal study to determine personnel needs and job market for the field of public health. Since that time however, UCOP has conducted an in-depth study on health needs in the State of California (see “A Compelling Case for Growth”). This report states that there is a definite and large need for public health professionals and public health programs. To meet that end, UC needs to increase enrollments by 150% by 2010 and 180% by 2020. The report notes that such enrollment increases can not be accomplished through the two existing public health programs at Berkeley and UCLA. Provost Hume is also anticipating proposals for programs in public health from Davis, San Francisco, and perhaps even Irvine. Professor Upadyaya noted that the resources to expand the program are there. Expanding from 12 to 30 students would not be an issue. The Davis Graduate Council has confirmed that the appropriate resources are in place for an expansion of the program.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that California has not followed the national trend in expanding public health programs despite increasing need. The committee received Professor Upadyaya’s report as information and agreed that there is a need to expand the Davis MPH program.

VIII. Senate Regulations 694/695

ISSUE: Professor Schumm proposed delaying this until the fall. However, he does not want to back away from the same standard for on-line as exists for face-to-face courses. He also argued that the issue should also be resolved with dispatch, as on-line and remote programs are already beginning to admit students. However, he justified a slight delay on the grounds that while the modifications of these regulations are important and pressing, bringing them to their successful conclusion requires some serious thought. Bruce Schumm, Farid Chehab, and Cathy Constable volunteered to form a subcommittee to consider this further.

ACTION: Farid Chehab, Bruce Schumm, and Cathy Constable were selected to form the subgroup to review the modifications to SR 694/695.

IX. Capstone Requirement Inquiry

ISSUE: Members considered whether a group project can count as a capstone project in a masters program. Such projects are quite germane to engineering and business programs.

DISCUSSION: It was noted that with group projects, it is often very difficult to figure out who is doing what, or which student(s) have done the bulk of the work. However, some members remarked that collaborative research involves many of these same issues. That said, the committee drew a distinction between research in a Ph.D. program and work completed in a professional degree program. Members felt that in a professional degree, the key concern is if the student has obtained the requisite skills. A group project could and should be accepted, but there also has to be an assessment of each individual student. In other words, there should be an individual contribution, which should be documented. The onus is on the program and secondly on the instructor. The assessment of such projects must include the following components: (1) that each individual show substantial contributions to the project; and (2) that each individual

should be assessed for competence. It is therefore conceivable that in any given project, a student could participate in the group of a passing project, yet fail the course.

ACTION: The San Diego member will take CCGA's opinion on this matter back to her local Graduate Council.

X. University of California Committee on Latino Research (UCCLR)

ISSUE: Chair Wu related the UCCLR issue, which has been reviewed twice by CCGA.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that they should not change their position on this issue, as the committee is not in the position to judge the best uses of the money. In that sense, it is more like a financial management issue rather than the value of a particular program. They added that the Director's response does not detail exactly what they will do with the funding; he only states that it will be used to set-up infrastructure for a multiple research unit (MRU). Even if this were more specific, alternate uses of the funds are not listed.

ACTION: Members reaffirmed their earlier position on UCCLR, that CCGA sees nothing that would recommend strongly for or against this MRU relative to that of other MRUs that CCGA has reviewed in recent years.

XI. UC Merced Senate Regulation 50

ISSUE: Chair Wu introduced SR 50, which would add 'satisfactory' (S) and 'unsatisfactory' (U) grades to graduate course work at UC Merced.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that this regulation change is entirely appropriate.

ACTION: Chair Wu will send a response letter to Senate Chair John Oakley.

XII. Review of the Proposed Open Access Policy

ISSUE: Chair Wu reminded members that they had commented last year on an earlier draft of this proposal, then known as the 'Scholarly Work Copyrights Policy' proposal. At that time, CCGA recommended that department chairs approve opt-out requests, as members were unclear as to under which conditions faculty could or should invoke the opt-out clause. However, CCGA's suggestion was not included in the latest revision of the proposal. Instead there will be a review board established.

DISCUSSION: Overall, members support this proposal. One member opined that this policy is still rather ambiguous. Other members were concerned about the individual faculty member's ability to go up against large journal publishers, who might insist on copyright. However, most commented that open access is becoming more prevalent in academic publishing, especially in the sciences. For example, researchers at the Max Planck Institute/Society and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center publish under open access. A number of publishers are already changing their practices to accommodate open access. Another member mentioned discipline-specific concerns, such as those from faculty in the Arts (especially Art History), who often get a number of 'permissions' or use rights for a single article. Does this mean that every time an Art History professor wants to publish an article, he or she needs to opt-out? Members were also not

clear about the intentions for recording access characteristics of faculty publications. Above all, members did not want faculty members who regularly opt-out to receive an evaluative demerit in terms of promotion. However, other members felt that this was probably only a documentation issue.

ACTION: Chair Wu will send a letter to Senate Chair Oakley, expressing CCGA support for the Open Access policy proposal.

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

A. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Visual Studies for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz

ACTION: Michael Hanemann was selected as the provisional lead reviewer

B. Proposal for the Development of a Graduate Program leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in MEAM at UC Merced

ISSUE: The Merced member explained that this is not a new graduate program proposal in the traditional sense, but it is a program being developed under the individual graduate program (IGP) authority. As such it will be reviewed by the entire membership of the committee at the June meeting, and it will not require a lead reviewer or external reviews.

ACTION: This will be placed on next month's agenda.

C. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Music for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Roger Savage*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Savage has received one external review, but he is expecting two more. He has received three internal reviews. The reviews have elicited a number of concerns. First, two letters are concerned about whether the limited faculty and curricular resources are sufficient to mount a three-track program. There probably should be at least two to three more faculty. In his own mind, Professor Savage is not certain whether this is a three-track program or simply three programs. For example, sometimes the proposers refer to the program as having three tracks and sometimes they simply state it as 'three programs'. The core requirements in each program are also not listed as core courses in each of the tracks either. There is also no pre-19th century music specialist on the faculty, which could be a problem as a musicology program needs to cover pre-19th century music. It is beginning to appear that there simply might not be enough depth in the faculty. While they are focusing on Latin American and Iberian music, the problem is that if you do not have someone with some secondary area of expertise, it is difficult to imagine how the program is going to offer appropriate breadth. Faculty expertise in the Caribbean region also needs to be increased.

The advisory exam is still a question. It should be given it to the ethnomusicology students as well to ensure that they have a sufficient grounding in music theory. Funding is another problem, which a number of reviewers are concerned about, and it could have a negative impact on the program's ability to recruit students. The allocation of funding for the library music resources at UCR is quite low when compared to its peer institutions. He would like to ask the proposers for clarification on the tracks, resources, graduate student funding, and the like.

DISCUSSION: The committee felt that it is entirely appropriate for Professor Savage to send a preliminary list of concerns/questions to the proposers, including a request for a letter from the librarian. Professor Savage said that he would like to ask for clarification on the terms of ‘tracks’ and ‘programs’. He will also list the various concerns of the reviewers. Members also asked about the balance of junior to senior faculty. Professor Savage responded that he thinks it is about half and half; there is not any concern that there will not be sufficient faculty to advise students. Members also remarked that music is a very popular undergraduate major. Professor Savage noted that UCR already has a MA in music, and they are anxious to have a Ph.D. The real question is whether they have the resources to launch a program of this scale.

ACTION: Professor Savage will send a query to the proposers and report back at the June meeting.

D. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Donald Brenneis

ISSUE/REPORT: The committee did not receive an update on this proposal because Professor Brenneis did not attend the meeting.

E. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Film & Digital Media for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Shrinivasa Upadhyaya

ISSUE: Professor Upadhyaya noted that he is having difficulty obtaining an internal review letters from both Riverside and San Diego. However, even without these letters, Professor Upadhyaya feels that he has enough internal reviews to go forward. He has also requested two external reviews; to date he has received one, which is supportive, but expresses some significant reservations. The external reviewer states that faculty size and expertise is appropriate, but faculty experience may not be sufficient. He also feels that oversight of the program could be a problem, but this reviewer may not be familiar with the oversight mechanisms of the UC Senate and Graduate Councils. The reviewer also voiced his concerns that assistant professors may leave the program or not obtain tenure. Currently, there are three assistant professors and one full professor attached to the program. Professor Upadhyaya said that the program is planning on additional hires. While there is a strong applicant pool for this type of program, the job market for graduates is currently in a slight downturn. Another comment concerns the length of the program and its support. The reviewer says that it may realistically take 7-9 years rather than 5-6 years given the required 108 units (90 units of course work—only 18 units can be directed research); support would be an issue if that is indeed the case. This is typical of Santa Cruz; graduate students must take 36 units per year for three years. He noted that this is not the way it is done at Davis; students are allowed to take many more units as research. The second issue is that if a student has some background in film studies, the fact that only ten units are transferable would be an impediment to the program. The reviewer suggests one-third of the total 108 units be transferable. Another issue is that an advisor cannot direct a student in a program that is a higher degree than the one he or she has. For example, a MFA should not direct a graduate student who is enrolled in a Ph.D. degree program. Finally, members were concerned that not having a written dissertation for the Ph.D. could be problematic as it might not conform to international expectations for Ph.D. research/dissertations.

DISCUSSION: One member suggested asking for an update on the program after three years. Members said that rightly or wrongly, a number of UC campuses require discount UC course work units in this way even if the students do not actually need it. Having a previous masters degree is often treated as immaterial. It seems that some of the thinking may be driven by administrative reasoning rather than academic reasons. Basically, this is a very burdensome course requirement. The committee felt that the proposers should be asked to justify this—specifically, whether three years of course credit needs to be course work. There certainly are fields such as Asian foreign languages where it does take a length of time to learn the language. The Santa Cruz member noted that this seems to be the norm at Santa Cruz, but it does vary somewhat by discipline. From the perspective of the Social Sciences and Humanities, this does not seem anomalous. Normative time at UCSC is seven years. Members also remarked that tenure requirements may differ between the UC system and those of the reviewer's home university. Certainly, one of the key issues is whether all of these units need to be coursework. Members also considered whether holders of the DMA and the MFA should be allowed to direct Ph.D. students. Some members said that the central issue is one of familiarity. Does the mentor know what is involved in the dissertation? It would also be useful to know what happens across campuses. In particular, they were interested if a distinction is typically made for the performing arts. Finally, the committee membership made an argument for some sort of written record or work for the dissertation.

ACTION: Professor Upadhyaya will forward either the list and/or letter to the proposers for a response.

F. Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Environmental Systems at UC Merced

ISSUE: Professor Chehab reported that he has received four internal reviews and one external review. This program is conceptualized as a M.S. program with an emphasis on atmospheric studies encompassing the biological, chemical, and physical sciences. It has two options (thesis and non-thesis), in addition to a Ph.D. While there are many other UC programs in the environmental sciences, this one emphasizes a system-based engineering approach. It also capitalizes on field research at the Sierra Nevada Research Institute. Another field station is currently being developed in Sequoia Park. To date, this program has been operating under the IGP and has been admitting students since 2004. The four internal reviews are generally supportive, but they note that the curriculum lacks a social science component, the program suffers from a lack of funds, the faculty are stretched too thin, and library resources are weak. Some reviewers also feel that the proposers should try to create a program that would attract higher-level graduate students than they are currently envisioning. For example, the proposers note that they will recruit students from CSU Stanislaus; reviewers felt that the program should be able to recruit students from a wider and more diverse array of institutions. One problem is that the application deadline is too late (mid-April), so the program would only be able to attract second-rate students. The program also lacks faculty in the area of air pollution, which should be an important area of study for students. Reviewers noted the emphasis on engineering, yet observed that they will not receive a degree in 'engineering' per se. This could be a disadvantage in the job market. Finally, funding is another issue. While the program does plan to provide teaching assistantships, the proposers seem to rely too heavily on faculty to provide grants and stipends. Block grants are not available at Merced at the present time. The proposers

do note however, that the private investigators (PIs) have gathered about \$6 million in funding to date, so there is some money to support students for the time being.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that one element of strategy might be for the program to retain priority for certain hiring slots, along with a commitment to library resources. That said, other members noted that there is a general lack of funds on the Merced campus. Getting the proposers to commit to a time-line might also be important. The Merced member clarified that two searches are ongoing for faculty in air pollution, so the campus is already addressing this weakness.

ACTION: Professor Chehab will collect the external review letters and present them at the June meeting.

XIV. New Business

There was not any new business.

IX. Executive Session

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Members did not hold an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m

Attest: Reen Wu, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst