

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – MAY 9, 2006**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey*

REPORT: Chair Lindsey discussed the Law School Comparative Review and fee levels for self-supporting professional degree programs.

Law School Comparative Review

DISCUSSION: The Irvine and Riverside members presented the following resolution:

“The proposals for law schools at UC Irvine (UCI) and UC Riverside (UCR) have been considered by UC for more than five years now. In 2001, the CCGA reviewed both proposals and found them appropriate and worthwhile for UC to undertake. At the same time, the CCGA rejected the idea that the CCGA should make the decision between the two proposals, and instead stated that the decision was up to the Office of the President.

To have CCGA re-review the two law school proposals now, would create a further and major delay in the already extremely prolonged decision process. Such a delay would have very substantial costs to both UC Riverside and UC Irvine. Planning for either scenario would be delayed yet again. The synergy effects of combining a growth trajectory of either campus with the founding of a law school would be further diminished. The local and regional communities that have become involved in either of the two law school initiatives are likely to become discouraged further. And in addition, the reputation of the UC system and its administrative and Academic Senate leadership will be negatively affected.

The CCGA resolves that the decision to build a Law School at either UCI or UCR, or on both campuses, has to be made by the Office of the President. Any further delay of this decision will be harmful to UCR, UCI, and the University of California system as a whole.”

They added that a full review would probably take about one year, which would have a number of negative implications for both campuses. These are three-fold. First, both campuses have rapid growth trajectories, which will not last forever. It is therefore important to capitalize on the synergies of these trajectories at this current time. Second, another year's delay would hold these campuses in limbo, which would only further waste energy and resources. Third, the local legal communities surrounding both of these campuses have been supporting the development of the respective Law Schools for some time now. Another year's delay would only jeopardize this support.

Members reviewed the CCGA actions from the March 2006 meeting. Analyst Todd Giedt reminded members that they had agreed to complete a both a full CCGA review for each of the Law Schools, but would also resubmit the proposals to divisional Graduate Councils. Members wondered if external reviewers would be required in this sort of review. Consultant Karen Merritt clarified that new Schools are not programs, they are structures. In essence, CCGA is asked to comment on the appropriateness of the structure. Therefore, external reviewers may not

be necessary. Chair Lindsey, who originally served as the lead reviewer for both of these proposals in 2001, provided further context for these Law School Proposals. He said that the main issues at that time were the number of UC Law Schools available to the Southern California student population. For example, Northern California has Hastings, Berkeley, and Davis, while Southern California only has UCLA. Not only was there a latent high demand for law education, but there was also a strong match for a Law School within the cognate mix of Schools and programs on both of these campuses. He also differentiated a UC law education (broad curriculum, legal theory, etc.) from one that students typically receive at a private law school.

Chair Lindsey proposed a compromise in order to expedite a review of these two Law Schools. Both the UCI and UCR Graduate Councils should be given the opportunity to endorse their respective proposals in time for the June meeting; then CCGA could complete its review at that meeting. Another question is whether CCGA would like to comment on the feasibility of creating two new Law Schools, or whether there should only be one? Members felt that this question did not lie within CCGA's purview however. They agreed that both the divisional and CCGA reviews should focus on the following two issues: (1) whether the law school proposals were essentially similar to the proposals approved in 2001; and (2) whether the law school proposals still fit well with the respective campuses and their graduate programs. Finally, members reaffirmed that CCGA should retain the right to re-review programs that are three years old if students have not been admitted into the program or school by that time, with the provision that the life of the review approval could be extended by one year.

ACTION: (1) CCGA will review both Law School proposals at its June meeting; (2) Chair Duncan Lindsey will serve as the lead reviewer for both proposals, as well as serving on the Comparative Review Committee.

Fee Levels for Self-Supporting Professional Degree Programs

ISSUE: Chair Lindsey raised the issue of the high fee levels for self-supporting professional degree programs, arguing that high fees are in effect restricting access to professional schools for California students.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed access to UC professional schools. Most members believed that the bulk of support for students enrolled in these programs comes in the form of financial aid loans. One member remarked that the availability of such loans to some students could also be a problem. Other members pointed out that the market value of the degree and the actual amounts of money that students pay are really tied to one another. Differential fees, which are fees that go directly to the specific school or department at which the student is enrolled, were also discussed. It was noted that differential fees are not utilized for self-supporting programs, but are usually used for full-time academic and professional programs. CCGA members did understand that some professional students (i.e., business students) would be able to recoup the monies that they paid for their program of study however. One member related that the development of these self-supporting programs was a phenomenon that came into being during the 1990's. Before that time, professional schools, such as UCSF's School of Medicine, were relatively cheap. During the 1990's, UC tried to keep undergraduate and academic graduate fees at reasonable levels, but tuition for UC's professional programs gradually

increased, as it was generally thought that students graduating from these programs could afford a higher debt load given their higher salaries. Consultant Karen Merritt reminded members that during the mid-1990's then President Atkinson met with CCGA to create the Master of Advanced Study (MAS), which was designed to be a self-supporting degree for working professionals. She added that in order to get fees for self-supporting programs (which includes the MAS and others) approved, campuses must prove that state funds are not involved in supporting their self-supporting programs.

Members also discussed possible action items. One suggestion included a request to the Office of the Provost to provide data on the student profiles in self-supporting programs and non self-supporting programs. While members agreed that students in business programs generally come from wealthier backgrounds than students in other disciplines, they were interested if there are sufficient opportunities for disadvantaged students to enter UC's professional programs as well. The suggestion was made to pick a couple of external institutions and examine their professional programs with special attention paid to access for minority and disadvantaged students. This could be compared to UC's professional programs. Another member made the distinction between full-time professional programs and those "executive" type programs (such as the executive MBA), which are self-supporting programs designed for working professionals. While these programs may use some state-funded resources (buildings, etc.), they are fundamentally different than the full-time programs. Karen Merritt added that such over-head costs are actually accounted for in the calculation of the fees for these self-supporting programs. Members remarked that since the market for these programs is different than the full-time professional programs, comparing the two types may prove to be problematic. The main issue is whether the University is abrogating its responsibility for fair access in favor of money.

ACTION: CCGA requests a report/analysis of the student profiles of students in the self-supporting graduate professional degree programs with students enrolled in non self-supporting graduate degree programs to be provided no later than January 1, 2007.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Karen Merritt introduced Joyce Justus, who will be replacing Julius Zelmanowitz as CCGA's senior liaison to Academic Affairs. She added that Joyce is working with the Special Study Group on Education, which is chaired by Harold Levine. She remarked that Joyce has extensive experience with the UC-CSU joint doctorate system. Karen said that one of the issues that will be coming before CCGA next year will be the disposition of the Ed.D.'s in Educational Leadership.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the April 4, 2006 Minutes

ACTION: The April 4, 2006 minutes were approved with minor amendments.

B. Proposed Name Change for the UC Berkeley School of Education

ACTION: The name change for the UC Berkeley School of Education was approved.

C. Proposal to Change the Degree Title of the UC Davis International Commercial Law Program from the Master of Arts (M.A.) to Master of Laws (LL.M.)

ACTION: The proposed degree title change was approved.

D. UC Berkeley Request to Add a Notation for Designated Emphases on Diplomas at IC

ACTION: CCGA approved the UC Berkeley request to add a notation for DE's.

E. Draft CCGA Graduate Proposal Comments Cover Letter

ACTION: CCGA approved the template for this cover letter.

IV. GSAC Interim Graduate Student Funding Report

ISSUE: Chair Lindsey referred members to Appendix A, Table 1 in the enclosed GSAC report. He stated that this table definitely shows that the enrollment numbers of international students have dropped over the past several years. He cited the high levels of non-resident tuition (NRT) as one of the main reasons for this. On that issue, he said that the recent elimination of NRT upon advancement to candidacy will improve this situation. He noted that one of the debates within GSAC was whether to eliminate the NRT altogether. There was some concern that since one of the UC's missions is to provide education to California students, members of the Legislature might view the elimination of NRT as lowering the access for in-state students. In the end, GSAC felt that this made sense for undergraduate students, but not for graduate students because UC is really competing on an international level. He asked members to strongly endorse this report and its recommendations.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed with Chair Lindsey that the GSAC report and its recommendations will go a long way towards furthering UC graduate education. Other members inquired about the money that will be lost due to the elimination of the NRT. Chair Lindsey explained that scholarship and fellowship monies will help fill the gap left by NRT fees. He cited \$79 million as the annual cost of eliminating the NRT for the first year. Half of that amount is paid for with fellowship money, so the net cost to the University is only about \$30 million (which is a small percentage of UC's total budget). GSAC also felt that \$70 million should be requested for graduate student support in order to properly compete with high-caliber private institutions. Surveys and reports have shown that UC lags behind these institutions (in terms of graduate student support packages) by about \$2,000. Analyses have also demonstrated that an extra \$1,000 on the margins makes a huge difference in influencing student graduate school acceptance decisions (especially for international students). One member noted that an apparent omission in the report is advancing intramural funding. Chair Lindsey clarified that the report focused almost exclusively on academic doctoral programs, and therefore did not include intramural funding.

ACTION: CCGA strongly endorses the GSAC report and fully endorses its recommendations.

V. PDPE Membership

ACTION: Reen Wu will serve on the PDPE and act as the CCGA liaison; and Bruce Schumm will serve as the alternate.

VI. Institutional Research Boards (IRB's)

ISSUE: Members were asked to provide comments on the draft "UCORP Report on IRB Operations."

DISCUSSION: With regard to establishing a systemwide standard for IRB's, members noted that the main issue is that the standards that have been developed for the biological/clinical sciences are being applied to the behavioral/social sciences as well as the humanities (History), which are generally not appropriate. In general, this has slowed down research in these disciplines. This is particularly the case for graduate students, who often do not have the time to wait for a ruling for from an IRB. Members felt that this report does not place enough emphasis on this critical issue. Another problem with IRB's is the lack of trained staff assigned to them. Finally, each campus employs a different IRB standard. Members acknowledged that there is a danger in systematizing IRB's in that it would add another layer of complexity and impede graduate student research even further. Above all, members felt that those peculiar campus practices that met the needs of the respective campuses should be preserved. They cautioned that any development of systemwide guidelines should be done along disciplinary lines. Members also felt that those best IRB practices on particular campuses should be identified. Finally, members requested an opportunity to review the final report.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter UCORP Chair George Sensabaugh expressing CCGA's comments on the UCORP draft report.

VII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *Final Action*

A. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Statistics at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Stralka reported that he has received three reviews on this proposal. All reviewers expressed their satisfaction on the faculty members who have been hired to administer and teach in the program. He stated that future demand for Ph.D.'s in statistics will remain strong. He noted that the program already exists as an emphasis, so it would be upgraded to an actual department and program. Professor Stralka's only concern is the difficulties that it might encounter surviving purely on undergraduate FTE's. He speculated that graduate student teaching assistants would have a numerous opportunities to teach undergraduates in other majors, such as Engineering. Other concerns include the size of the faculty, especially in regard to thesis advising. At its projected size of 6.5 FTE, reviewers felt that faculty members could easily become overburdened with thesis advising. They noted that only the best graduate students are capable of doing thesis research without considerable guidance. Professor Stralka recommends approval of the M.S. and Ph.D. program in Statistics at UCI pending his final report.

ACTION: Members unanimously voted (with one abstention) to approve the M.S. and Ph.D. program in Statistics at UCI pending Professor Stralka's final report.

B. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Horticulture and Agronomy at UC Davis – *Lead Reviewer Thomas Patterson (UCSD)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Patterson received four reviews (two internal and two external) for this proposal. Most reviews commented that they were surprised that UCD did not already have a Ph.D. in Horticulture and Agronomy, since most of the leaders in this area work at Davis. They suggested that at least one course in soils and/or plant nutrition (soils sciences) should be added to the curriculum.

ACTION: Members approved the proposal unanimously (two abstentions). The curriculum suggestion (soils sciences) will be included in the acceptance letter.

C. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) Degree Program in Health Law at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Shawn Kantor (UCM)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Kantor reported that he has received another external review (Dr. John Jacobi from Seton Hall), which is quite positive. He also received the course syllabi for the core courses from the program proposers. In presenting his final report, he stated that the reviewers have commented that these are all high-level courses (after looking at the course syllabi). Professor Jacobi's analysis raised two important points. First, he (along with Sandra Johnson) questioned if some of these electives are entirely appropriate for the kinds of students coming into the MAS program (lawyers and health professionals). He advocates there should be different standards and expectations for different types of students (different curves on the exams, etc.). He also believes that the program may not get as many high-caliber students as the proposers anticipate. He also raises a budgetary question— basically questioning whether the projected staffing levels were adequate. Professor Kantor said that UCSD has addressed this concern in the response from the Associate Dean of UCSD Extension, which points out that there is 2004 money in the budget for an administrator. Professor Kantor stated that his concerns have been addressed and he recommended approval of the program.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the set-up of the core courses and they speculated if slightly different courses could be established for the different types of students. They wondered if a suffix could be added to the course numbers to differentiate the different types of courses. In the end, however, members reached consensus that it would create an administrative problems if they required different suffixes for the different types of courses. There was also a short discussion on how the units would be assigned since the students would be taking courses at both UCSD and Cal Western.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously with one abstention to approve the program.

D. Proposal for a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Writing at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Sharrer said that he has received a response from the proposers and he feels that they have addressed CCGA's concerns. He summarized their response. First, two new faculty members have been hired, who will be teaching fiction writing (however, Professor Sharrer has not received their CV's). The proposers also hope to hire a fifth member of the writing program within the next two years. They also reiterated that they have commitments from a large number of faculty members in Visual Arts who have expressed an interest to be associated with the program. Regarding the question of the future expansion of the program, the proposers confirmed that they would consult with the San Diego Graduate Council before making any additions to the program. Professor Sharrer reminded members that admission requirements remained another concern of some of the reviewers, particularly the lack of a requirement of a writing sample for admission to the program. The proposers noted that this was an accidental omission; the program will require a writing sample of ten poems, for poets, and three short stories or chapters from a novel for

fiction writers. The program proposers also commented on the degree requirements for the program. UCSD currently requires the completion of 72 units for a MFA degree. Given that 12 of the 72 units can be for supervised teaching, most students would complete 60 units of academic work. The proposers anticipate that students should be able to complete the degree within two to three years, which seems reasonable. One reviewer also pointed out an inconsistency on two different pages in the proposal, which states on one page six that students take 4-12 units of graduate seminar in Literature and on page seven it states that students should take 12 units in Literature. The proposers will be amending the proposal to read that students must take “4-12 units of graduate seminars (or upper division courses or guided independent study) in Literature outside of the Writing Section.”

The addition of some ‘craft’ courses in writing was suggested by one of the reviewers. Proposers said that through teaching undergraduate courses in writing, graduate students in the MFA program will be developing ideas about the formal structure of writing along with developing pedagogical skills. They also note that students will be studying genre and form in the graduate workshops, and that the required theory course will include a consideration of “craft.” Proposers agreed with reviewers that the capstone project should be expanded to 120 pages. In response to a reviewer’s question on the composition of the MFA committees (specifically if they would be composed of tenured faculty members), the proposers cited UCSD policy, which states that “MFA and MA committees must be composed of at least three members, two of which are from the candidate’s home department and one from outside the home department.” While this policy does specify if the committee members are to be tenured, the Literature department will make every effort to make sure that they are.

On the subject of GSI training, proposers said that a pedagogical forum will be held before the start of classes. GSI’s will also be supervised by their respective instructors of record. Finally, students in the program would be supported via a \$50,000 block grant (that would be expanded in future years), in addition to teaching assistantships and a research assistantship. A long-standing writing series will also be continued. They also reiterated that library, administrative, and computer support/resources are adequate. However, the proposers did not answer CCGA’s question regarding space or equipment support for the graduate student journal. Professor Sharrer recommended approval of the program contingent on the resolution of three outstanding issues: a letter of support for the block grants; receipt of CV’s for the recently hired faculty members; and more information on resources/support for the student journal.

DISCUSSION: Members stressed the importance of obtaining a letter of support/commitment for the \$50,000 block grant.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the MFA in writing at UCSD with one abstention pending the outstanding issues noted above.

VIII. Independent Course Responsibility

ISSUE: CCGA invited Denise Segura (UCEP Chair), Ellen Switkes, and Mark Westlye to the meeting to discuss and update the committee on this issue. Professor Schumm, who leads the CCGA Independent Course Responsibility Subcommittee, provided a summary of recent

developments for members. He reminded members that Academic Council instructed both CCGA and UCEP to work on this issue. Both committees have drafted position papers, and they have been working towards the drafting of a common CCGA-UCEP position paper that can be submitted to Council. The core proposals include a review of independent course responsibility for lower- and upper-division courses; requiring a UC faculty member serve as an instructor of record for all courses taught by graduate students; and two classes of graduate student instructors (GSI's). The first is the teaching assistant (TA), which is the traditional teaching role for most graduate students. The second is a teaching fellow, who would have responsibility for a substantial part of the course. Both roles would require the presence of an instructor of record, who would retain more of a mentoring relationship with the teaching fellow.

UCEP Chair Denise Segura reported on the discussion at UCEP's May meeting, which Professor Schumm attended. She said that for the most part UCEP agreed with the CCGA-UCEP memo on this issue. However, she noted that UCEP members felt that there was a need for greater clarity in terms of why we are instituting these changes. In particular, they pointed to the quality of graduate instruction as one concern. In general however, UCEP members concluded that while the quality of graduate instruction is not necessarily poor, they did feel that since the numbers of GSI's are growing, it is important to integrate the professional development of GSI's. Within that framework, they stressed the role of UC faculty members as both the instructors of record, and as mentors to these GSI's. Regarding teaching fellows, Chair Segura reported that UCEP members liked that idea. She said that the major concern was how best to differentiate GSI's from teaching fellows—both in terms of their qualifications and the mentoring relationship between the teaching fellows and the faculty instructor of record. She noted that teaching fellows have historically served as the instructors of record and assumed much of the responsibility for the course, including designing and teaching it. While UCEP members would like to retain much of these responsibilities for teaching fellows, they do insist upon faculty oversight.

DISCUSSION: Professor Schumm reiterated that a central message to fellow faculty should be the reasons why the Senate is proposing changes to the current system. He added that the issue of summer sessions instruction still needs to be addressed.

Special Guest Mark Westlye commented on the dividing line between GSI's and teaching fellows. He raised the issue of GSI's who teach in foreign language classes—noting that some of them do not have a year's teaching experience or a Masters' degree, and they are usually placed in front of a foreign language class in a similar manner as a teaching fellow would be. He did make the distinction, however, that a faculty member is designing the curriculum of these foreign language courses, which is quite different than the case of teaching fellows. He said that he prefers the traditional distinction between teaching fellows and GSI's, which utilized the degree of responsibility (for the course) as the main indicator. UCEP Chair Segura argued that the Senate should stick to the certain principals of graduate instruction (faculty supervision as instructors of record, etc.), noting that graduate instruction is an important component of the professional development of graduate students (thereby leaving details to the campuses). She added that the opportunities for graduate students to teach undergraduate courses, as well as the manner in which they taught those courses, would vary from department to department. Professor Schumm also linked the instructor's experience to his or her classification as a GSI or

teaching fellow, stating that it might be more viable to insist upon one year of teaching experience as the requirement for the teaching fellow. UCEP Chair Segura stated that teaching fellows should really be post-MA, as that is the current practice on most UC campuses. Mark also added that a step scale could be incorporated into the GSI framework.

Mark also addressed summer sessions, noting that the primary use of the contemporary graduate student instructor of record is not during the academic year, but during the summer. He raised a budgetary issue, namely that faculty instructors of record may ask for additional remuneration for their service. This could become especially burdensome during the summer, when UC would need to pay both the high number of graduate students teaching these courses in addition to faculty members serving as the instructors of record. UCEP Chair Segura did not think that this would be a problem if the faculty member remained on campus during the summer, but it could be problematic if that faculty member was not in residence. In that case, another faculty member could be assigned to that course. Professor Schumm felt that it would be dangerous if faculty members were not formally assigned as the instructors of record for all courses offered during the summer. One CCGA member thought that the proposed instructor of record requirement would affect different departments in different ways. Speaking from personal experience, another CCGA member commented that he typically oversees a large number of graduate students teaching courses during the summer (however he does not sign off on the grades). He stated that this only occurs in the summer (when many graduate students are teaching independently), which also serves to financially support the graduate students during the summer. UCEP Chair Segura noted that it is really up to the individual departments on how to implement UC policy on this issue. Members also discussed the recent funding of summer session courses by the Legislature. Mark noted that the Legislature assumes that this money will go to faculty members; therefore Legislators may not view a UC decision to use this money to fund graduate student teaching in the summer favorably. It would be up to the University to justify such spending.

Finally, members discussed the remaining outstanding issues and/or changes that need to be made to the UCEP-CCGA proposal. One such issue is graduate student instruction in courses with large enrollments. UCEP agreed that this should only be done in exceptional cases, but would like to discuss exactly what those circumstances should be. Another addition to the existing UCEP-CCGA document is the restriction that only in rare cases should graduate students provide instruction to their peers and/or supervise other graduate students. Professor Segura provided the example of a GE course in which a graduate student serves as the instructor of record and also supervises other graduate students. Mark Westlye clarified that there is a difference between “teaching” and “supervising” graduate students; Senate Regulation 750 specifically addresses the teaching aspects. He provided the rare example of a Ph.D. in business who might provide instruction for a beginning MBA course. He was satisfied with the provision that in such cases, the divisional Academic Senate would need to approve the course and its particular pedagogical arrangement. UCEP Chair Segura also asked if there should be an ideal or appropriate percentage of upper-division courses that are regularly taught by teaching fellows. She mentioned that there are a number of courses that are always taught by graduate students.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will revise the draft of the UCEP-CCGA independent course responsibility, incorporating the amendments discussed by the members.

IX. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *Initial Discussion*

A. Proposal for an Interdepartmental Graduate Program Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Bioengineering at UC Riverside

ACTION: Members selected Farid Chehab as the lead reviewer for this program proposal.

B. Proposal to Establish a Combined Five-Year Degree Program: B.A. in International Studies and a M.A. of International Affairs at UC San Diego

ACTION: CCGA will consult with UCEP on this proposal.

C. Proposal for a Joint Doctorate in Physical Therapy (DPT) with UC San Francisco and CSU Fresno

ACTION: Members selected Professor Reen Wu as the lead reviewer for this program proposal.

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

A. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Human Development at UC San Diego – *Lead Reviewer Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)*

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Heckhausen has not received anything further on this proposal and therefore she did not have anything to report.

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 reported that he has just received the full revised proposal from Dean Gibling, and he is ready to proceed with the full review.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will begin the full review of the revised proposal.

XI. UC Biotechnology Research and Teaching Program (BREP) MRU Review

ACTION: Members selected Professor Shawn Kantor as the lead reviewer. He will submit his report for the June meeting.

XII. Executive Session

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

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Attest: Duncan Lindsey, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst