

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – MAY 1, 2013

Present: Ruth Mulnard (Chair), Donald Mastronarde (Vice Chair), Divyakant Agrawal (UCSB), Jutta Heckhausen (UCI), Ari Kelman (UCD), Valerie Leppert (UCM), Joseph Nagy (UCLA), Kwai Ng (UCSD), Martin Olsson (UCB), Youngho Seo (UCSF), Michael Vanderwood (UCR), Matthew Gorlick (Student Representative-UCLA), Charles Saenz (Student Representative-UCSD), Robert Powell (Council Chair), William Jacob (Council Vice Chair), and Fredye Harms (Analyst). Consultants Hilary Baxter, Steven Beckwith, and Pamela Jennings. Guests Todd Giedt and Tyrus Miller.

I. Chair's Report/Announcement/Updates

- April 3 PDST Task Force Meeting

Student Representative Matt Gorlick reported that the PDST Task Force is developing separate guidelines and policy for the PDSTs. At this time, it appears that most of the specific logistics will be housed in the guidelines. One of the primary areas of discussion has been ensuring that total professional degree fee charges do not exceed those in comparable institutions. Peer institutions have to be used for all elements of comparison (academic quality, etc.) not just fee charges; at least a third of those comparators will be public institutions whenever possible. Financial aid and affordability components of the policy still pose many questions, the most pressing of which concerns whether to include a specific percentage of return-to-aid in the policy. The current version states that 33 percent of PDST fees must go to return-to-aid. Some members of the Task Force do not want to be restricted to a specific number.

Progress in diversity of enrollment is a strong focus of the policy, but the Task Force is finding it difficult to specify what qualifies as an effort to increase diversity. The Provost reserves the right to return the PDST proposal if progress has not made in the area of diversity after three years; if no progress is made after six years, then the program could be required to dedicate specific funds toward diversity efforts.

The Task Force is recommending that multiyear plans be shared at the Regents level as well as information related to revenue, affordability, financial aid, and diversity. The Task Force is still finalizing the timeline for the policy and guidelines, but intends to have everything submitted to UCOP by August 15 in order to be on the Regents' November agenda. It is unclear when the policy and guidelines will go to the campuses for review.

Professor Vanderwood raised a question regarding doctoral programs that require accreditation and licensure, and if they have been addressed in any of the Task Force discussions. Mr. Gorlick indicated they had not. The committee discussed the issue.

ACTION: Chair Mulnard encouraged Professor Vanderwood to write a memo to Provost Dorr and to the PDST Task Force in order to bring this issue to their attention.

- April 10 UC Assembly Meeting

The UC Assembly meeting was held via teleconference and included annual reports from all of the Senate committees. An amendment to Senate Bylaw 110 was put forward to allow for the appointment of a parliamentarian *pro tem* in instances when the parliamentarian would not be available.

Chair Mulnard was on the Assembly agenda regarding the new degree title of Masters of Technology Management for UCSB; the item was unanimously approved and has gone forward for presidential approval.

The last item on the Assembly agenda was the nomination from the Academic Council of Mary Gilly for Vice Chair of the Senate for the 2013-2014 term; Professor Gilly won the unanimous vote of the Assembly.

An all day meeting of the Assembly will be held on June 12.

- April 24 Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council meeting was held in Sacramento to give the Council members an opportunity to speak in opposition to SB 520 (Steinberg) at a hearing before the Senate Education Committee. If the bill should pass the Assembly, the University will be taking an even more robust and concerted stand against it. CCGA members discussed many issues raised by SB 520 including the legislative mandate to work with private vendors, intellectual property issues, and maintaining UC quality.

Composite benefits were discussed at the Council meeting and continue to be deadlocked on the issue of summer salaries. The chancellors were given the option of charging either zero percent summer salary or the full benefit rate; neither option appealed to them.

Executive Vice President Brostrom has proposed that UC's contribution to UCRP be increased to 14 percent, simultaneous with the employee contribution raised to eight percent, effective July 1, 2014. The UC Faculty Welfare Committee is opposed to this proposition unless all faculty get a three percent salary increase this year. The Council supported this suggestion and has written a memo to the Provost in this regard.

The campus salary equity plans were reviewed by three Council committees and were determined to be of little generalizable value. Most of the plans were surprisingly brief and not sufficiently detailed. There will be further work on these plans.

An all-day meeting was held on April 13 to discuss the UC online education initiative. Northern participants met at OP, and southern participants met at UC Irvine. The meetings were productive and resulted in a webinar that the entire University community can view. This weekend, a small group of division chairs, EVCs, and selected key personnel will develop the RFP for the online initiative.

ACTION: *Chair Mulnard will send committee members a link to the webinar.*

- April 26 UCOP Budget Call Meeting

Vice Chair Mastronarde stated that the budget call primarily concerned the Assembly Education Committee budget hearing which had just taken place. The multi-year plan for UC's budget was discussed as well as performance outcome measures. The governor had said there would be outcome measures attached to the increased funding for UC, CSU, and the community colleges. The University pressed for appropriate evaluative measures, however the Department of Finance did not respond. Ultimately, the Department of Finance came out with a broad approach requiring that each segment increase its graduation rate by 10 percent. Professor Mastronarde illustrated the extreme disparity in this seemingly uniform approach: UC currently has a graduation rate of 60 percent, compared to CSU's 15 percent. The Education Committee chair did seem to recognize the problematic nature of this generalized expectation and said that the legislature would work to create an alternative measure.

The Assembly does not want to allow the University to restructure the financing of its debt, which poses a significant obstacle to the University's current fiscal plan. UC hopes to reinstate the debt restructuring in its negotiations with the governor. If it remains off the table, the University will propose revenue bond approval from the legislature. The Assembly did approve \$4.2M in furniture and equipment for a building at UC Merced which was finished but empty. The legislature is considering the insertion of language regarding enrollment targets into the UC budget; the governor vetoed that effort last year.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Draft Minutes from the March 6, 2013 Meeting and the April 3, 2013 Meeting.

ACTION: *Members had corrections to the March 6 minutes; the April 3 minutes were not available.*

B. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: *Members approved the agenda.*

III. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Political Science at UC Merced

ACTION: *Members approved the proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Political Science at UC Merced. (9-1-0)*

B. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in the Interdisciplinary Humanities for the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees at UC Merced

Chair Mulnard remarked that Professor Schumm has commitments from four reviewers, but reviews have not yet arrived. He hopes to take action on this proposal at the June meeting; the committee could also consider action beyond that date via email.

C. Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to the Master of Information and Data Science (MIDS) at UC Berkeley

Professor Agrawal stated that he has three reviews – two external and one from UC – and is awaiting two more reviews, one of which will be from a UC campus. All three current reviewers agree that Berkeley has submitted a very innovative proposal, but have expressed concern that it may involve interaction with other departments, namely Engineering/Computer Science (ECS). The committee agreed it would be advisable for the proposers to secure a letter of support from the ECS chair. Professor Agrawal stated that he would prefer to postpone the full discussion of the proposal until he had the two outstanding reviews, particularly the review from UC. However, he was feeling pressured by the proposers, who were hoping to start the program by fall 2013. Chair Mulnard advised that Professor Agrawal not feel compelled to complete the review process to accommodate the proposers' aspirations.

Committee members were shocked and dismayed at the proposal's supposition that the private partner in the program be given 70 percent of the self-supporting program fees. Many observed that similar concerns had been raised with previous proposals and that SSP budgets have not been adequately reviewed. Chair Mulnard expressed frustration; the original CCGA guideline - which required that every SSP be reviewed by UCPB – has been completely and repeatedly disregarded. The committee discussed the ramifications of such information about excessive charges from private vendors being made public. Assistant Director Hilary Baxter observed that the issue should be brought to the attention of the Provost and others; she said she would "red flag" the topic.

D. Proposal to establish a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Public Health at UC Irvine

ACTION: *Members approved the proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Public Health at UC Irvine. (8-2-0)*

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Senate Chair Robert Powell thanked everyone on the Academic Council who was able to come and speak in opposition to SB 520 (Steinberg). He stated that the Assembly has said it will not support the measure and that the governor has said he won't sign it; however, positions often change during the budget finalization process.

Senate Vice Chair William Jacob said that he had spoken with Senator Block regarding SB 547 and indicated that the University would support the measure if it were amended to state that each segment of higher education would create its own courses. Senator Block seemed amenable to the suggestion.

Chair Powell provided an update on the online education initiative and the webinar that grew out of the April 13 meeting. The group hopes to have the RFP out by June 1. The University is feeling pressure to show movement on the proposal, and would like pilot courses over the summer and in September. The legislature is particularly focused on "lower division bottleneck" courses, and the University is investigating ways to offer classes across the system (from more than one campus) via an online delivery system. Cross-campus collaboration has already begun in some areas.

The search for a new UC President is moving apace, as is the search for a new Riverside Chancellor.

Vice Chair Jacob discussed the governor's seven proposed accountability measures, which focus almost exclusively on undergraduate education. The first and most problematic is the insistence that the University increase its graduation rate (currently at 61 percent) by ten percent over the next four years. Susan Bonilla, chair of the Budget Subcommittee on Education and Finance agrees with the University that the requirement is ridiculous. The final outcome is yet to be determined.

The composite benefit issue has not yet been resolved, and it is unclear where it rests at this time, much to the frustration of the Council. Chair Powell stated that the Provost is very open to the idea of adding a fourth year to non-resident tuition (NRT) relief. He encouraged the committee members to urge their graduate councils to push on this issue. At this point, the state does not care about time-to-degree for graduate students; it is not considered in the accountability model. The rebenching document does not speak to it, and rebenching is the foundation for the budget.

Chair Mulnard raised the issue of SSP proposals that involve outside vendors with contracts for excessive fees. CCGA does not have the expertise to evaluate the financial ramifications of these contracts; UCPB should be reviewing the proposals. Senate Chair Powell voiced concern about SSPs, outside providers, and intellectual property rights. The committee discussed the many complications and difficulties with SSPs at length. It was agreed that both issues (vendor fees and intellectual property rights) need to be brought to the attention of the administration and the Senate.

ACTION: *Senate Chair Powell, Committee Chair Mulnard, Assistant Director Baxter, and Associate Director Todd Giedt will write a letter to the Provost outlining their concerns.*

V. Announcements from the President's Office

Vice President Steven Beckwith stated that his office has been tracking the effects of the federal sequester on graduate students. Many federal agencies seem to be preserving existing grants but are not giving new grants. Some campuses have heard that their grants will not be renewed. Overall, the

University is anticipating a seven to ten percent drop in federal funding for graduate students. Mr. Beckwith's office has a report detailing the cuts to various federal grant programs and will forward that to the committee.

Graduate Director Pamela Jennings shared the results of the first systemwide placement survey, which was emailed to the committee during the meeting. The University does not have much systemwide data on graduate education and is pleased to now have this survey as a foundation for future work and evaluation. Berkeley and UCLA have done placement surveys for years, so the amount of data for those campuses is quite dense. The other campuses assembled their data in a somewhat ad hoc fashion; it is not uniform across the system. The ability to do a more systematized and in-depth study is currently hampered by a lack of funds.

Assistant Director Baxter referred to the materials that had been sent to the committee regarding trends in the planning pipeline. This information was previously collected annually and has recently moved to biannual collection. She asked if the information was helpful to CCGA and the campus committees or if it was superfluous. Ms. Baxter stressed that she would like to provide any information that might be helpful to the campuses, but was not sure if this particular report was of significant value. Committee members voiced various perspectives on the application of the report at the campus level. The final consensus was that the report is helpful in forcing campuses to articulate their upcoming plans and demonstrate forethought in developing a particular degree program. However, it was noted that not everyone was familiar with the presumed function of the report and that some guidelines and direction would be helpful.

Ms. Baxter addressed the topic of academic performance indicators (formerly academic efficiencies) at UC. Item E1 "Academic Performance Indicators at the University of California" will be heard at the May Regents' meeting. Ms. Baxter suggested that the committee members read the item and listen to (or view) the upcoming meeting. The issue of adding additional classes to the faculty workload and the governor's performance indicators will be discussed. She said that she would send a link for the Regents' audio/video to the committee.

A committee member had asked about WASC policy regarding degree level approval. Ms. Baxter explained that when institutions are accredited, they need to have programs at each degree level at which they want to offer degrees for a certain number of years before they can have general approval. UC Merced does not have that standing, and must undergo WASC's substantive change process any time it wants to add anything other than a bachelor's degree program. Questions were raised about SSPs in relation to WASC. Ms. Baxter explained that a program's funding mechanism is not a "trip wire" for WASC. If 50 percent of the coursework is online, then it must be reviewed by WASC.

VI. Updates/Inquiries from the Divisional Senates

Professor Nagy reported that UCLA has dispelled with graduate student leave of absence for academic reasons. The graduate dean is working with some of the programs to develop ways to adapt to the new methods and determine how students can take time off. Changes to the in-state/out-of-state requirements for the *in absentia* policy have been suggested. UCSC Vice Provost Tyrus Miller stated that the University deans are largely in favor of such a change. The development of substantive criteria for granting *in absentia* – instead of geographical location – is a possible option.

Professor Heckhausen said that UC Irvine has discovered an increase in its Doc2A student numbers across a variety of programs. Irvine's graduate advisers explained that the change has risen from two different sources. International students are trying to advance as quickly as possible to avoid paying nonresident tuition rates. This accelerated progress puts considerable stress on students and they do not always finish in the three years allowed after candidacy, thus becoming Doc2A students. Separately, dissertation completion rates vary among disciplines; some can be done in two years and others can

easily run longer due to hurdles or additional tasks the student undertakes. Professor Heckhausen said that there is also perception that students will have a difficult time in the market, so they don't submit their dissertations even though they are finished. The campus has been discussing the possibility of having qualifying exams to catch students who are having problems and who perhaps should go only for a master's degree.

Professor Heckhausen then asked why there is a "once size fits all" three-year rule after candidacy for all graduate students; normative time to degree is variable, and perhaps this should be as well. She suggested that CCGA discuss the matter and forward it to the Senate leadership. UCSC Vice Provost Miller stated that he did not have a problem using the normative time to degree but would not want to reward campuses for "carrying" students. The two discussed the issue with some input from other committee members.

ACTION: *Chair Mulnard said that the committee would look at the issue of Doc2A students in terms of rebenchmarking.*

VII. New Business

Professor Heckhausen stated that UC Irvine has interdisciplinary programs that cross school lines, and a question has been raised as to how to house them administratively. She asked if other campuses shared this issue and how they handled it. Committee members discussed the approaches taken by their campuses and their level of success. Chair Mulnard said that it would be helpful to have the input of Professor Kelman on this topic – Professor Heckhausen will contact him to understand his experience at UC Davis with graduate groups.

ACTION: *Professor Heckhausen will discuss the issue with Professor Kelman, who will report back to the committee at the next meeting.*

Professor Vanderwood explained that UC Riverside is in the midst of starting a medical school. He asked if other campuses had their medical schools take their courses through the normal graduate council approval process and program review. Chair Mulnard said that course approvals, if they are for anything other than the medical school (i.e., graduate programs that live in the medical school that are not about the medical students) go through the regular channels for course and program approval. She remembered that Professor Shumm (who was not present) had commented that when he was chair of CCGA he got the policy changed because it had the Senate outside of the oversight of law schools, medical schools, etc. He said he had it changed so that CCGA was reinserted into that process. Todd offered to share that policy (105.2) with the committee.

ACTION: *Mr. Giedt will forward policy 105.2b to the committee.*

Chair Mulnard reminded the committee that the next meeting (June 5) is the last in-person meeting. However, the committee remains on duty until the end of August. She remarked that President Yudof may take some action before he leaves that might cause CCGA to meet via iLinc.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Attest: Ruth Mulnard, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst