

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MINUTES OF THE MEETING— MAY 3, 2005**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Quentin Williams***SB 724**

Chair Williams noted that SB 724 is being heard in the appropriations committee today (May 3rd). In related news, a study from Columbia showed that there is much more of a market for M.Ed.'s (Masters in Education) than Ed.D.'s. He mentioned that the bill has a good chance of passing in the Legislature. UC is currently concentrating its efforts in lobbying the governor against this bill. Members discussed the significant gap between the CSU-stated California need for new Ed.D's per year (about 1,500), and what the last needs assessment survey (about six years old) showed (about 500).

Senate Regulation (SR) 600(B)

Chair Williams reported that although SR 600(B) passed in the Academic Council (AC), it did elicit some controversy before passing. He reminded the committee that this SR dealt with granting higher/advanced degrees to Senate faculty members at the same division in which they were a member. In particular, some AC members were concerned about inter-divisional and inter-departmental influence in awarding degrees to fellow faculty colleagues. Some AC members also felt that each case should be treated as an exception, rather than changing the regulation to allow the granting of advanced degrees to faculty Senate members. The regulation change did pass in AC however, and it will be considered at the upcoming Assembly meeting.

CalSpace MRU Review

Although the AC voted to abolish CalSpace, the UC Office of Research apparently decided to rebid a space-related MRU among the campuses.

National Labs

- Lawrence Berkeley Lab (LBL): UC successfully rebid its contract for LBL.
- Los Alamos National Lab (LBNL): The final request for proposal (RFP) has been delayed until mid-May. There are two new additional competitors in the bid competition (Northrop Grumman and Lockheed Martin).

Professional School Fees

Professional school fees will increase over the next couple of years at a rate of \$1,050 per year, pending Regents' approval. The increases are to ensure that professional schools will at least break even for the next few years.

II. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Initiatives**UCOP Professional Staff Group**

A professional staff group has been assembled to partially address graduate student support. This group draws upon expertise at both the campuses and within UCOP. Their main foci is on graduate student support--including the determination of the ways in which to fund graduate

education, making that funding more robust, and in general providing a snapshot of the current landscape of UC graduate support.

Graduate Student Proportion Data

At the request of member for data that shows the proportion of graduate students to undergraduate students, Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz told members that they should first consult Provost Greenwood's January presentation to the Regents (http://www.ucop.edu/planning/jan2005gradedpresentation_files/v3_document.htm) and use that as a platform for future discussions, questions, and requests for additional data. He noted that UC's current proportion of graduate students (as a percentage of total enrollment) is only 23% (which includes masters', professional, and doctoral students), while the CSU system boasts a graduate student proportion of 27% (mostly masters' and professional students). Consultant Zelmanowitz remarked that in 1960 (at the onset of the Master Plan), UC was training 53% of doctoral students in California; currently, UC is only training 45% of California doctoral students. The point was also made that it is very difficult to compare UC to its competitors (such as the University of Michigan) in this regard, given the varying mix of professional school configurations between these institutions and UC campuses.

New Models of Graduate Education

Members discussed alternate models of graduate education that might be better suited to high non-resident tuition. One member suggested the possibility of relatively shorter time to degree for a Ph.D., followed by a longer post-doctorate experience (in research groups, etc.). The advantage would be cost savings and efficiency, as post-doctorates are more cost effective than graduate students for departments. The disadvantage would be less well-trained graduate students and newly minted Ph.D.'s. Another issue would be a lack of graduate student instructors (GSI's)—if the number of post-doctorates were to significantly increase. Finally, such a strategy would be limited to certain fields.

SB 724

SB 724 has been moved to the suspense file of the Appropriations Committee in the California Legislature. The bill will be discussed at the May 23rd Appropriations Committee hearing. To that effect, UC filed an argument stating that this is a very costly bill. In response, CSU filed a rebuttal, stating that this bill would not cost the State anything; and they note that these new programs would be financed from their own internal start-up monies, the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI), and professional fees. They anticipate that their fees for these new professional degree programs will be equal to what UC charges. Consultant Zelmanowitz noted that the legislative support for this bill is quite high.

Task Force on Planning for Doctoral & Professional Education

Consultant Merritt updated the committee on the activities of this task force, its charge (see distribution 2), and its current emphasis (currently health sciences given the CSU issues). The charge does include graduate support.

Audiology Report

The Audiology report is completed and will be distributed to the committee (see distribution item 1). President Dynes did send this report to the Chancellor Reed of the CSU system in order to

begin planning for a joint-audiology degree. The Audiology Task Force is the first sub-committee of the above-mentioned Task Force on Planning for Doctoral & Professional Education.

Ed.D. Issues

- CSU/UC Joint Ed.D. Update: Consultants noted that CSU officials are still arguing that the joint UC-CSU Ed.D. programs are not producing enough Ed.D.'s to serve the State. CSU maintains that the State still needs an additional 500 Ed.D.'s per year (in addition to the number of Ed.D.'s planned via the joint Ed.D. programs). It was noted that the State currently produces about 450-500 Ed.D.'s per year (includes all educational doctorates—as well as Ph.D.'s), so this would be a 100% increase. As of 1-2 years ago, K-12 schools were only hiring about 120 doctorates per year.
- UCSB/Cal Poly Joint Ed.D.: Cal Poly recently requested that the joint-Ed.D. dissertation committee structure be changed. They proposed that the new structure be composed of two UCSB professors and one Cal Poly professor (the original structure called for a 2:2 ratio from both universities in the original program proposal). As a reason for the change, Cal Poly's limited capacity in this area was cited. Consultant Zelmanowitz did confirm however that Cal Poly did do the hiring that they committed to in the original proposal (two additional hires), however they are falling short of the five CSU faculty members available for dissertation committees noted in the original proposal. It should be noted that the UCSB Department of Education is favorably disposed to the Cal Poly request.

ACTION: Chair Williams will send a letter of inquiry to the Cal Poly President regarding the current size of the Cal Poly faculty and their ability to staff the dissertation committees.

III. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans

COGD Trip to China

Five graduate deans traveled to China in April to promote UC. Visa regulations/problems were a major emphasis of this trip. The trip was sponsored by the Legends of China. In Beijing, the COGD group met the heads of Tsinghua University, Beijing University, Beijing Normal, as well as meeting with the Mayor of Beijing, the head of the Chinese Ministry of Education, and Thurman Boardman, who directs Visa Control at the US Embassy. They also met with the Director of the company that prepares Chinese students to study for the GRE, TOEFL, and the visa interview (like the Kaplan Corporation in the US). In Shanghai, they also visited Fudan University.

Dean Mason described the visa process as told to her by Director Boardman of the US Embassy in Beijing. The main concern on the part of the State Department is that Chinese students studying at US institutions can show some proof of intent to return to China. The visa interview actually lasts between two and three minutes. Although the numbers of applicants have decreased in the last couple of years, the Beijing Embassy still gets thousands of visa applicants. Approximately 65% of the applicants eventually get visas (not necessarily on the first try). Dean Mason also noted that Professors encounter significant difficulties in obtaining visas. This is problematic for Chinese professors who may have been educated in the US, and their research requires them to travel back and forth between China and the US. Part of this problem is due to

the Technology Alertness system/program, which requires them to be cleared by the State Department (if they are working with/research sensitive technology). In addition, new restrictions require foreigners to be finger-printed.

Dean Mason also reported on the current state of Chinese higher education. Since 1997, China has doubled its higher education system from 400,000 to 800,000 students with plans to double it again. Although Chinese universities are clearly still not at the level of American universities, Chinese higher education officials are very keen to retain the best and brightest scholars at their own universities (as well as encouraging Ph.D.'s from foreign universities to return after graduation). The Mayor of Beijing is also very enthusiastic about encouraging cooperation/exchanges between the Chinese higher education system and UC. Specifically, there was interest in creating a compact that would speed-up the visa process, allow for short-term exchanges, and perhaps provide some relief in non-resident tuition fees. Members discussed possible collaboration between the Education Abroad Program and the COGD, and how such efforts would fit into UC's international strategy, which is currently being developed by Gretchen Kalonji, who is the newly hired Director of International Strategy Development.

NRC Study

Dean Mason reported that it is probable that the NRC study will still happen this year, but with the following changes: (1) There will not be a reputational review/survey; and (2) there will be panels to weigh and provide quantitative measures for faculty productivity, graduate student support, and the total amount of university resources.

Non-Residence Tuition (NRT) Reduction/Elimination Proposals

A discussion/review of the NRT reduction/elimination proposals took place. Dean Mason reviewed her own NRT plan, which proposed to treat all second-year GSI's as California residents. She also introduced another NRT proposal from Charles Li, which argues for eliminating NRT over a period of five years at a rate of 20% per year. Dean Mason noted that very few departments pay first-year NRT out of grants; departments usually pay it out of block grants, which come from internal funds disbursed by the Graduate Division. Still another alternative would be to eliminate all NRT (not in the distributions), however this alternative would mean that significant amounts of external federal funding would be lost. Members mentioned that in addition to showing how much money would be lost (through the elimination of NRT) in each of these models, the sources of such funds should also be noted (block grants, external federal agencies, etc.). The committee was also interested in the effect that such NRT reductions/elimination would have on enrollment rates of prospective students, and suggested that the elasticity of such a response might be calculated. A discussion regarding the fair cost of graduate education ensued. Members made special note that NRT is not justified on a cost basis (as it does not cost more to educate a non-resident student than it does to educate a California resident). However in support of reducing or even eliminating NRT, members made the argument that UC wants to recruit the best and brightest graduate students from around the world, not the best and brightest students from California. The point was also made that graduate students play a key role in educating UC undergraduates, and it is important to ensure that quality graduate students provide such education (see distribution item 4).

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the April 12, 2005 Minutes

ACTION: The April 12, 2005 minutes were approved with minor amendments.

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

ISSUE: Members Albert Stralka and Michael Hanemann reported that they felt that the review was accurate and complete, and agreed with the reviewers that communication between the various campuses remains an outstanding issue. On this last point, the reviewers pointed out that this MRU incorporates three UC campuses—Berkeley, Irvine, and Davis, which function as three separate ORU's with some allocation of funds between them. The reviewers stressed the organic nature and development of ITS in their review (i.e. this MRU started out as an ORU on one campus and spread to two other campuses). The reviewers agreed with the review committee that an advisory council (called the “UC Transportation Research Council”) should be set-up, which would be a committee that included representatives and faculty Directors from the three campuses among others that would meet once a year. A strategic planning exercise was also recommended (to reorganize many of its central services). Another recommendation was an external advisory that would include government and industry clients (currently this is applied at some ITS sites but not systemwide). Other issues include minority and female representation with the MRU. Finally, both reviewers agree that shrinking revenues remain a problem for this MRU, especially in regard to the decreasing Cal Trans funding.

In terms of graduate education, two ITS-affiliated organizations have made significant contributions in this area--the University of California Transportation Center (UCTC), which is partially funded through CALTRANS (\$1 million), and the California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH), which is administered by ITS-Berkeley in collaboration with CALTRANS as well. Reviewers noted that ITS is well-funded by CALTRANS and the potential exists for great collaboration between campuses—perhaps the funding of occasional seminars for graduate students and faculty at non-ITS campuses. Certainly, the graduate components in both these programs could only be helped by additional funding, which remains a CCGA concern.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the broader place of the MRU in the UC system. One member posed the question if these MRU's are simply isolated, but successful academic units, or are they part of a bigger plan? In terms of this MRU, the point was made that its existence provides a locus with which CALTRANS can interact (rather than having to negotiate with three different campuses). Whenever external funding comes from the state or federal level, MRU's make greater sense (as opposed to when funding comes from the local level).

ACTION: Members Albert Stralka and Michael Hanemann will write-up a report on this review.

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

ISSUE: Members Albert Stralka and Michael Hanemann reported that UCLA had the lion's share of graduate students (24) within this MRU, but wondered about the real impact of IGPP on graduate education. The review committee was in favor of completely changing the way this MRU operates, even though they felt that the individual faculty members did world-class research. Their recommendations included (1) open up membership of IGPP (currently UCI,

UCLA, UCSD, UCR, UCSC, and two of the national laboratories—LANL and LLNL); (2) create a “Council of Directors”, which would include all UC campuses and all national laboratories that would vote on a redistribution of resources; (3) establishment of a non-stake holder external advisory board (EAB); and (4) better funding of FTE’s. The MRU Directors rejected these recommendations however. CCGA reviewers suggest that the top priorities should be (1) to stabilize the existing IGPP branches, some of which are currently under-funded; and (2) allow all campuses to have a voice in the governance of IGPP through the advisory board. The concern (from UCLA) of the danger of recycling IGPP’s funding in other directions (such as new organizations) was also mentioned. UC funding goes towards faculty course relief (to attract world-class scientists to the MRU), and any return to funding goes to rebuilding infrastructure.

IGPP’s main direct contributions to graduate education are the afore-mentioned 24 graduate students at UCLA, and a grant process associated with the national laboratories. Given the size of this MRU, members discussed the real effect of this MRU on graduate education. However they do garner a fair amount of grant support in this area (\$16 million at UCLA). In light of this, CCGA reviewers felt that more could be done to support and fund graduate education as well as conferences (shared among the campuses).

ACTION: Albert Stralka and Michael Hanemann will write-up a short report on this review.

VII. Residency Requirements Subcommittee (SR 694) Subcommittee Update

The subcommittee will be meeting after the meeting and will provide an update at the June meeting.

VIII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal to Establish an On-line M.S. in Engineering at UCLA

ACTION: Reen Wu (UCD) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Schumm provided the committee with his initial opinions of the proposal. A key issue is the nature of the program itself, and whether the proposal describes an applied doctorate (D.Crim) or a Ph.D.? For instance, some of the language in the proposal is unclear as to whether the degree program is theoretical or applied (the proposal notes that dissertations will be of varying length depending on if they are applied or theoretical). The proposed time frame for the degree program is four years.

- **Program Costs/Graduate Support:** He also noted that it would be an expensive program—it is hard to tell how much graduate support is built into the program (the proposal language indicates that support would range anywhere from a large fraction to essentially no support of total costs).
- **Program Review:** The procedures for program review are also not clear—especially in regard to the role of national government bodies.

- Admissions: Professor Schumm also had a question on whether the program could require a minimum GPA for admission to the program (according to universitywide regulations, programs cannot deny admission to students based on one single metric).
- Remediation: Remediation may be another issue with this program, as he noted that many students will not have all of the pre-requisite courses (p. 20), and some remediation will be required. The noted pre-requisite courses are very specific (i.e. specific titles), which may be specific to students who graduated from the Masters' in Criminology program at UCD or Fresno State.
- Internships/Research Practica: Although internships/practica are noted in the proposal, there is no real specificity in terms of what types of internships the proposers have in mind, or how they will be funded.
- Dissertation Committees: Professor Schumm felt that language regarding the make-up of dissertation committees should be in both the proposal and the bylaws. The composition of the dissertation and the qualifying exam committees should be seriously considered by CCGA (similar to the dissertation committees of the joint-Ed.D.'s).
- Resources: Although the proposal indicates that the program will need a wide range of resources, letters of commitment are still needed.
- Bylaws: Further specificity is needed in some areas (admissions, etc.).

ACTION: Professor Schumm will follow-up with initial questions to the program proposers as well as obtaining the external reviews.

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 noted that he is currently waiting for the external reviews to come in. He expects these reviews to come in by the end of June.

ACTION: Professor Hanemann is preparing some initial questions for the program proposers. He is planning a site-visit in the fall.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor McDonald was not able to be present at the meeting, but he submitted a written report on his progress. The proposal has been sent out to external reviewers.

ACTION: Professor McDonald will also be sending out a list of initial questions raised by the internal reviewers to the program proposers.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wu reported that the program proposers have adequately responded to his inquiries regarding graduate student support (see distribution item 6). He recommends approval with an initial three-year academic review schedule.

ACTION: Members approved the program with nine votes in favor and one abstention.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Williams reported that the program proposals have sent him the bylaws as well as the academic qualifications for passing the exams (80% for Ph.D. students, 70% for M.S. students). An oral exam will also be required, but that is difficult to truly quantify. Regarding their thesis requirements, they state that student theses should show true scholarship. In terms of resources, the program proposers maintain that students will be fully supported (in the same way that Ph.D. students are supported). However, Chair Williams is still waiting for the discussion of the requirement of a clinical neuroscience course, as was recommended by an external reviewer.

ACTION: Members approved this program pending: (1) the incorporation of a clinical neuroscience course in the curriculum and (2) that the quantitative exam qualifications (see above—70% for M.S. students) are codified, and that the UCD Graduate Council agrees to the exam qualification (to be notified via the UCD CCGA representative). Members voted nine in favor with one in abstention.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wayne noted that he has had trouble obtaining all of the internal reviews for this proposal. He is currently following up on one remaining outstanding internal review. Professor Wayne received the review from the Joint-Ed.D. CSU Review Board as well. He also reported that he has sent the external reviews to the program proposers and is awaiting their comments.

ACTION: Professor Wayne will arrange a site visit. Analyst Todd Giedt will distribute article on the need for an Ed.D. degree (verses a Masters in Education degree) to all members. This issue will also be placed on the June agenda.

IX. **Guest—Provost M.R.C. Greenwood**

At the request of the committee, Provost Greenwood came to the meeting and reported on/discussed a number of issues including the following:

Emphasis on Graduate Education

M.R.C. Greenwood assured the committee that the Provost's Office is especially concerned with the state of graduate education at UC. She said that her office is trying to build a case, which argues that UC has been successful in accommodating the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates in UC undergraduate programs. However, given that the tidal wave II influx of new undergraduates is now abating and the proportions of graduate students to undergraduate students has dropped to low levels, UC is trying address graduate education concerns. Along those lines, UC will continue to resist the pressure to go beyond 12.5% eligibility in terms of new undergraduate students. UC is also lobbying the California Legislature to preserve the intellectual capital of California by growing and enhancing UC graduate education. She noted the complexity of UC lobbying efforts—especially the effect that term limits have had on UC lobbying efforts.

Graduate Support

Provost Greenwood spoke of the some changes need to better support graduate students. Some funding decisions could be internal, however this could mean that the undergraduate faculty:student ratio might go up. She noted the change in the return to aid (enacted earlier this year). She compared the undergraduate Cal Grant program to ideas that could be applied to graduate education, and mentioned that business leaders would probably be attracted to proposals that would support the building of intellectual capital in the California. She stressed that maintaining UC graduate school's competitiveness is very important.

Non-Resident Tuition

Provost Greenwood recognized that this is a problem for many graduate students. She also discussed a number of the proposals that have recently emerged.

X. Executive Session - Members only

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

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