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

I. Chair’s Report/Announcements/Updates – Chair Ruth Mulnard

Chair Mulnard remarked that this was the last official in-person meeting for the academic year. If needed, the committee can meet via email or teleconference over the summer.

The May 7 Academic Planning Council meeting focused on two areas: compendium changes and SSPs. Some governance issues with the MRUs were discussed and addressed for the most part. The Council then discussed the five-year planning prospectus. Academic Planning Interim Director Baxter noted that the Council believes the plan is helpful, but it will be done every other year to lessen OP’s reporting burden. Analysis of trends will still be done regularly and will be circulated more broadly. She explained that the five-year planning process evolved at a time when the University had more predictable state funding. Things are now developed on a much shorter timeline due to the current constrained fiscal circumstances. Ms. Baxter noted that the prospectus process will likely start this coming fall.

The Chair said that the Council then discussed SSPs (now SSGDPs – Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs). The issue of disestablishment and reestablishment of conversion programs was resolved with the determination that immediate disestablishment will not be required for state-funded programs that convert; each situation will be evaluated individually to determine the best course of action. The Council also mentioned that two campuses have communicated with OP to ask if they could impose a differential charge based on student residency. The general sentiment was that the group did not favor differential fees; it was agreed that fees for all students who enroll in SSGDPs should be the same.

A third issue regarding the SSGDP policy concerned the status of CCGA as either a determinative or advisory body in decisions regarding conversions. The question balances on whether a decision by CCGA can be overturned. The issue has partially arisen out of the Anderson School proposal and was not resolved at the meeting because the Council’s conference call time was expiring. It will be discussed again in person later in June. Ms. Baxter speculated that the argument in favor of an overturn would be based on the technicality that all authority is delegated by the Regents, who typically choose not to overrule actions advised by the Senate; nevertheless, they hold the ability to do so. Chair Mulnard agreed that degree approval is delegated by the Regents to the President, but could not think of an instance when CCGA had approved a graduate degree program that had not then been accepted by the President - for it to happen would be precedent-setting.

Chair Mulnard said that the Provost updated the group regarding the Anderson School proposal. Provost Dorr said that the President decided that he will make a decision about the proposal without
waiting for the finalization of the SSGDP policy. Policy development has not gone in favor of the Anderson School to-date, and the School has been pressuring OP for a decision so that it can implement its conversion on July 1. The President said he would not make the decision until he met with the Provost, Academic Council Chair Powell, and Vice Chair Jacob. Chair Mulnard expressed her very grave disappointment at the news and told the Provost to make sure that President Yudof reads the nine-page memo that CCGA wrote last year, and that he is aware of CCGA’s concerns. She said that Provost Dorr had expressed her dismay as well and said she would be immeasurably upset if this action were taken. Ms. Baxter said that the line of reasoning that has been advanced for the Anderson School focuses on a financial change, and not a curricular change; a wide swath of similar program changes would be unlikely. She noted that the Provost has worked very hard to find an agreement that is acceptable to everyone.

Chair Mulnard stated that Provost Dorr did an excellent presentation on Regents’ Item E1. Governor Brown was very pleased with it and requested more information regarding efficiencies. The governor and the Department of Finance had previously wanted some specific academic performance indicators tied to UC’s budget; that demand was dropped in the May revise.

In reference to the Academic Council meeting, Chair Mulnard noted that Senate Chair Powell stated that the presidential search is proceeding on time. Executive Vice President Peter Taylor told the Council that the administration is investigating an effort to create more liquidity in the UC budget by changing the distribution between STIP and TRIP. It is speculated that some funding could go into long-term investments which might help pay down some of the UCRP liability. The issue of the PDST differential is going to go to the Regents in July; if they do not approve it, the President may find another way to fund this need.

CCGA Vice Chair Mastronarde will become chair next year, with Professor Heckhausen serving as vice chair. The leadership of the Regents is also changing, with Regent Varner becoming chair on July 1.

II. Consent Calendar
   • Approval of the Draft Minutes of the January 2, April 3, and May 1, 2013 meetings.
   • Approval of the Agenda

   ACTION: The Minutes were approved with one correction, and the Agenda was approved.

III. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs

A. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in the Interdisciplinary Humanities for the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees at UC Merced – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)
Professor Schumm remarked that the proposal had four diligent and thoughtful reviews. Those reviews confirmed that the program is basically going in the right direction and pointed out some areas of concern. Professor Schumm drafted a letter of response to the proposers, encouraging them in their work and detailing some areas for improvement. Professor Schumm said that he hoped to get a letter to the proposers out as soon as possible and work with them on their response. Once the response is complete, the Committee can either take action in person or via teleconference over the summer.
B. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Master of Information and Data Science (MIDS) at UC Berkeley – Lead Reviewer Divy Agrawal (UCSB)
Professor Agrawal asked for the input of the committee regarding the next steps to be taken with the MIDS proposal. Several components of the project – its online aspect and the private vendor contract, to name two – prompted him to seek direction from the group. While the reviews were largely positive, and the proposers had responded to the concerns expressed, the proposal was in many ways unique. The committee discussed the proposal and response, and agreed that the proposers had adequately and thoughtfully addressed the reviewers’ concerns. That said, it was felt that Berkeley needed to submit a revised proposal that thoroughly incorporated the details and changes included in the response. Professor Agrawal agreed to write the proposers with the stipulation for a new proposal.

ACTION: Members voted to approve the proposal (8-0-3) from Berkeley for a Graduate Program leading to the Master of Information and Data Science (MIDS) pending receipt of a revised proposal incorporating the changes and details from the proposal response.

C. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Informatics Leading to the Ph.D. Degree at UC Irvine
Action requested: Select a lead reviewer. The proposal came with a request that it be expedited; with that in mind, Chair Mulnard advised that two lead reviewers take charge of the proposal.

ACTION: Professors Leppert and Agrawal agreed to serve as lead reviewers on this proposal.

D. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Applied Mathematics at UC Merced
Action requested: Select a lead reviewer.

ACTION: Professor Seo agreed to serve as lead reviewer for this proposal.

IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership
Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair
William Jacob, Academic Council Vice Chair

Academic Senate Chair Powell informed the committee that SB 520 (online education) had passed out of the senate as was currently in the assembly. The bill received significant opposition from UC, CSU, the CCC, and the CTA. If the bill is not defeated in the assembly, it is quite likely to be vetoed by the governor.

Professor Heckhausen asked Chair Powell about the status of Doc2A. He responded that he had been busy with pressing Senate issues, but will follow up on it following the meeting. Speculation was voiced as to whether a decision to change Doc2A lay with the state, the Regents, or the campuses. Chair Powell said he would find out more information about the issue.

Chair Powell stated that President Yudof has announced that he will make a decision regarding the Anderson School proposal before he leaves OP – with or without a SSP policy in place. Committee members expressed profound concern about the implications and ramifications if the President chooses to approve the proposal in the face of Senate opposition. Chair Powell said that
he and Vice Chair Jacob will make every effort to talk to the President before he makes his decision.

The Senate Chair announced that UC will be granting a two percent salary increase for faculty and three percent increase for staff. Much of that increase will be negated by the increased employee contribution to UCRP. Reports from the task force on the negotiated salary plan are not particularly favorable. Chair Powell intends to discuss it at the Academic Council meeting in late June. Senate Vice Chair William Jacob said that a big concern for the Senate in relation to the UC Path plan for consolidated benefits has been the summer salary on grants and the Y component on salary. The Berkeley campus submitted to the DCA its own plan – which incorporated everything sought by the Senate – without consulting anyone at OP. If the Berkeley gets is accepted, OP will allow any other campus to replicate it.

Chair Powell informed the committee of a recent discovery regarding the campus TRIP and STIP accounts. These funds, close to $14B, have not been touched by the campuses despite the desperate financial crisis of the past several years. In fact, five of the ten campuses did not even make use of the proceeds earned on the accounts. The Senate advocates a payment from the accounts into UCRP to help offset needed increases to that fund. The campuses, however, balk at this suggestion. President Yudof has authority from the Regents to make the decision without campus approval; he is talking with the chancellors.

Academic Senate Chair Powell remarked that he would be concluding his term as chair, and thanked everyone on the committee for their service and time.

V. Announcements from the President’s Office—

Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director, Office of Research and Graduate Studies
Hilary Baxter, Interim Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

Graduate Studies Director Pamela Jennings explained that UC representatives were in Sacramento yesterday for graduate advocacy. The day was very useful, and students were able to meet with staff from the governor’s office. UC representatives also visited Washington, D.C. and met with various individuals, including staff from Senators Boxer and Feinstein. The purpose of the visit was advocate for research funding and to oppose the sequester.

Ms. Jennings said she is waiting for the President to sign the budget for HBC funding, and is hopeful to continue the HBCUC grants. Last year was the first time UC hosted HBC students – a total of 36 students on seven campuses. This summer, she is expecting approximately 55 students on nine campuses. Ms. Jennings noted that the Regents and OP continue to hold diversity as a high priority; nevertheless, UC has not yet been successful in attracting and retaining African American PhD students. The University’s outreach through HBCUC is, therefore, making a significant difference, despite the relatively small number of students currently in the program.

Ms. Baxter provided an update on how WASC is moving forward on program outcomes at the graduate level. The campuses have formed groups to address the WASC redesign. Davis is the only research campus in the WASC pilot, said Ms. Baxter, and it has a strong team.
VI. Updates/Inquiries from the Divisional Senates –
Chair Mulnard and Members

- Rationale for Permitting Professional PhD Programs to Apply for PDST Funds – Michael Vanderwood (UCR)
- In Absentia Policy and Practices – Joseph Nagy (UCLA)
- Doc2A Policy – Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)
- Administration of Interdisciplinary Programs that Cross School Lines – Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)
- UCLA Global EMBA Program – Joseph Nagy (UCLA)
- UCSB Master of Fine Arts Program – Divy Agrawal (UCSB)
- Renewal of UC Merced’s Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP) for AY 2013-2014 – Valerie Leppert (UCM)

  o Professor Heckhausen said that if she did not hear back from Chair Powell regarding Doc2A, she would bring the issue back to the committee in the fall.

  o Professor Vanderwood said that he has been trying to determine the answer to limitations in the PDST policy. Chair Mulnard said that the PDST Task Force will conclude its work shortly, and the draft policy will probably be distributed to the campuses in the fall. She suggested that Professor Vanderwood write a letter to Provost Dorr regarding his concerns. The committee discussed the issue, with considerable input from Tyrus Miller, Chair of the Council of Graduate Deans. Professor Vanderwood agreed to contact the Provost regarding his concerns.

  o Professor Heckhausen asked for input from the committee about their campus practices related to interdisciplinary programs. Of particular concern was the governance and funding of those programs when they cross school lines. Committee members shared examples from their campuses, most of which seemed to be beset with problems related to funding, advocacy, review, and staffing. It was generally agreed that IDPs are more vulnerable on many fronts than standard programs.

  o Professor Nagy explained that UCLA has two executive MBA programs which are SSGDPs. These programs are not new; they are seeking a name change to “Global EMBA.” The program in Singapore has requested to change its name to Global Executive MBA for Asia Pacific Program, and the program in Chile has requested to change its name to Global Executive MBA for the Americas.

**ACTION:** The name change was approved.

  o Professor Agrawal stated that UCSB wanted to extend its Master of Fine Arts program to three years. Since the curriculum will change, he was uncertain if the campus should submit a proposal as if it were a new program. Professor Schumm noted that campuses typically justify the motivation for the change; it will be up to the committee to decide how much it needs to be reviewed. However, the campus does not need to provide a new proposal.
Professor Leppert asked the committee to approve the renewal of UC Merced’s IIGP for 2013-14.

**ACTION:** The renewal was approved.

Chair Mulnard said that she would be in touch over the summer if there were any important announcements or if action needed to be taken that could not wait until fall. She thanked the committee members for their dedication over the past year. She noted that proposals are overwhelming at times and require a good deal of attention. She said that the quality of proposals has improved dramatically due to the committee’s careful review and consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

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