

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – JUNE 19, 2007**

Present: Michael Hanemann, Catherine Constable, Omer Egecoglu, Tyrus Miller, Michael Martinez (alternate), David Kelley, Bruce Schumm, Joyce Justus, Roger Savage, Farid Chehab, Albert Stralka, Reen Wu, Michael T. Brown, John Oakley, and Todd Giedt

I. Chair's Announcements

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Wu announced that the UC/CSU Joint Doctorate Board, which approves joint doctorates, met in May and approved the Joint Doctorate in Forensics at UC Davis/CSU Fresno. The CCGA Chair and Vice Chair are permanent members on this Board.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Joyce Justus reported that the search committee for the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies position has not yet met. The Regents have had substantial discussions on the differential fees proposal; Provost Hume is charged with developing a policy on differential fees. She also reported on the search for the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel; it should go The Regents at their next meeting. The proposed position for the Vice President for International Affairs is currently under review by the Senate and it is on the June Academic Council agenda.

DISCUSSION: One member inquired if The Regents discussed differential fees for other programs besides law and medicine, such as public health? She said that The Regents did discuss differential fees for such programs, but they agreed that it is difficult to make an argument for differential fees for programs in education, public health, and nursing. One member thought that there are already some differential fees being applied to some public health programs. Another member remarked that public health graduates are almost forced to take higher-paying jobs rather than go into public service careers because of their high debt loads. She remarked that among The Regents, public health has not really been part of the differential fee discussion; it has been restricted to the medical and law schools. There will be a policy proposed on differential fees, which will include the appropriate review cycles for such fees. One member suggested gathering data on employment patterns on the graduates from these various programs with attention paid to public and private employment.

She mentioned that there have been conversations about not only the projected shortages in nurses, but also the issue of doctorates in some health fields. Provost Hume feels that there are certain health fields that are more research-based; UC should work to protect those research doctorates and keep them within the UC fold. Licensing is another issue. UC can work with CSU to provide professional doctorates that meet licensing requirements. Members remarked that it might be useful to look at post-graduate experiences to help determine which doctorates are indeed research doctorates.

Members also discussed the Joint Doctoral Board and its role in improving UC/CSU relations. One member suggested meetings between the CSU and UC Senates, which could be informal but

center on graduate programmatic issues. Other members mentioned that differential funding for CSU faculty exist for those who teach doctoral students. Joyce Justus noted that in the past CSU campuses received differential funding for graduate programs from the State. However, they gave that up in order to expand their graduate programs. They now fund their graduate programs on a differential basis independently of the State. While the CSU Executive Vice Chancellor is interested in moving CSU graduate students into UC graduate programs, he is also interested in discussions regarding the expansion of the licensing requirements for health professionals. That said, CSU did not have an interest in an independent doctorate in audiology.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the agenda with minor changes.

B. Draft Minutes from the May 1, 2007 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

IV. Simple Name Change for the UC Davis MFA Program in Textile Arts and Costume Design

ISSUE: Chair Wu reminded members of CCGA's earlier discussion on this name change. At that time, CCGA had sent a letter back to the Davis Graduate Council, noting that it represented a substantial change in degree. The proposal expands the program's single track to three tracks—visual communication, interior architecture, and textile and fashion design.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that the name change reflects a much broader change than just a simple name change; he also did not think that this change was well-addressed in the proposal. He is interested if there are elements of the field that are not being covered now; an external review might address that. For instance, he assumed that 'visual communication' is much broader than textile arts. How adequate is the current program in visual communication for example? If the program's current coverage of visual arts is already substantial, then he would not mind treating the change as a simple name change. However, some review (either internal or external) should be required. While faculty may already be in place to teach the new tracks, he would like to insist on an internal UC assessment. Most members agreed with this, noting that there may be a huge difference between costume design and interior architecture for example. However, certain aspects of 'design' may carry-over into related fields. They agreed that an expedited review, which would be aimed at a thorough appraisal of both the new tracks and the existing track, would be appropriate. Such an expedited review could consist of one internal and one external review.

ACTION: Members approved an expedited review (with one internal and one external review) of the program per the compendium.

V. UCEP/CCGA's Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students In University Instruction Update

ISSUE/REPORT: Vice Chair Schumm reported that this document was revised after the last CCGA meeting. Subsequently, the CCGA-UCEP working group met by teleconference and made some small changes to the document; the revised proposal was evaluated by UCEP at their

June meeting. The UCEP Vice Chair also suggested some last-minute changes, which were incorporated. He asked for verbatim approval of the revised proposal.

DISCUSSION: Professor Schumm led the committee through the revisions incorporated since CCGA's last viewing of the proposal. He noted that the last sentence in '*Conditions for Employment*' (on page 5) was eliminated and incorporated more organically into the text. The main issue is whether the performance of the graduate student instructor (GSI) lies with the faculty instructor of record, which this revision clarifies. One member felt that the language, "Responsibility... for the performance of Teaching Assistants... shall lie with the faculty Instructor of Record," is problematic from a grammatical point of view. 'Evaluation' might clarify this clause better, as the faculty instructor of record is not responsible for the actual performance of the GSI. Other members remarked that GSIs are evaluated by a myriad of people; such terminology would not be accurate. With that in mind, Professor Schumm suggested the "overseeing the performance of GSIs" as alternate wording, which members felt was appropriate.

Under '*Courses Enrolling Graduate Students*,' the first sentence has been rewritten as: "Occasionally, a graduate student might assume an instructional role for an undergraduate class in which other graduate students are enrolled. Additionally, there are rare circumstances in which programs propose that a graduate student assume an instructional role for a graduate class." Also added at the end of the paragraph was the phrasing, "...any semblance of conflict of interest." UCEP was also uncomfortable with changing language relating to Senate Regulation (SR) 750; the CCGA-revised language regarding 'appropriate instructional titles' was therefore eliminated.

Independent of CCGA, UCEP also submitted a number of suggested changes. Under '*Teaching Assistants (or Equivalent Titles)*,' UCEP changed the phrasing for '*Conditions for Employment*' to "Graduate Teaching Assistants assist Instructors of Record in the delivery of University instruction." Essentially, this addition will allow graduate student instructors of record to use teaching assistants. Professor Schumm explained that this is at odds with other language that embargoes graduate students from overseeing other graduate students (the second to last paragraph in '*Teaching Positions of Greater Responsibility*' states, "Under no circumstance should a graduate student instructor be supervised by another graduate student."). Members argued that this sentence should be removed as a friendly amendment to the UCEP revisions, as it provides no necessary clarification to the language that precedes it, and contradicts the proposed UCEP change, as just mentioned. Further, they remarked that in this same paragraph, the word 'faculty' should be removed from the last clause in the second to last sentence of the paragraph so that it reads, "...shall lie with the ~~faculty~~ Instructor of Record." In the end, members agreed that this paragraph should be left open-ended, thereby leaving it to the campuses to decide if graduate students can oversee other graduate students. This was acknowledged to be a substantive change, but members felt that, in agreement with UCEP, it is more in keeping with other aspects of the proposal.

UCEP also suggested positive changes to the sentence construction in Section B. in SR 750 that changes the terminology of 'lower-division' to 'undergraduate'; it now reads that "Persons holding other instructional titles may teach only lower division undergraduate courses only unless individually authorized to teach courses of a higher level ~~teach courses of higher grade~~

by the appropriate Committee on Courses or Graduate Council.” Under ‘*Courses Enrolling Graduate Students*,’ UCEP added a section on APM 410-4, which noted that other sections of the APM may need to be changed in accordance with the changes made to SR 750. While members agreed to these changes, they expressed the concern over the use of the term ‘teaching fellows,’ noting that it may be obsolete in some corners, but some campuses still use this term. Professor Schumm recommending inserting a note stating that the term ‘teaching fellow’ was included only to be consistent, but it will most likely be reworked in a later draft. Members agreed to this revision.

Finally, one member objected to the phrasing “consume instruction” on the first page of the proposal; she felt that it should be changed to “receiving instruction” instead. Members also agreed to this rephrasing.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the proposal with the noted changes, with one abstention.

VI. Differential Fees for Professional Programs

ISSUE: Chair Wu briefed members on past discussions, noting that the purpose of this discussion is the drafting of a response/statement of concern for Academic Council.

DISCUSSION: One member said that while the data is good, it is hard to make a general statement. Other members recommended that the data set should be expanded to cover the applicant pool; following up on the career paths of the graduates would also be helpful. This would require a liaison with the individual programs on the different campuses. They also noted that this report only addressed professional programs, not self-supporting programs.

Members also briefly discussed the impact of differential fees as it relates to the ‘power of ten’. One issue is whether differential fees will cause campuses to develop different types of programs with different applicant targets. If the malign effects on applicant pools resulting from differential fees are minimal or nonexistent, then differential fees might be allowed. The relation between professional schools and academic graduate programs is another issue. As differential fees are great revenue generators, departments can leverage these funds to support other programs. That said, not all programs can impose significant differential fees. Assuming that the same standard of excellence exists at all UC campuses, differential fees may disrupt this equilibrium. One alternative might be a differential UCOP funding model for those departments that are able to obtain significant revenue streams. Along similar lines, such fees may also encourage the privatization of campuses. One member felt that the California State Legislature is not currently committed to supporting graduate education, so differential fees may be one way to fill this gap. There is also a significant wealth gap between the private universities and many UC campuses. From a system-wide perspective, differential fees simply generate more revenue. However, on the level of individual departments, these fees allow some them to remain competitive with wealthier peer institutions. In the end, the committee felt that divisions should be able to comment on the justification for differential fees on specific programs.

They also agreed that the letter to Academic Council should first thank UCOP for the data; and second, state CCGA's concern about the potential for differential fees to do damage to select programs. The letter will also make a request for data from programs utilizing differential fees.

ACTION: A letter on differential fees will be sent to the Academic Council for its July meeting.

VII. Five-Year Academic Review of the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Calit2)

ISSUE: Chair Wu presented the five-year review, noting that while a deadline is not specifically stated, the committee expected to respond before the end of the summer.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that while the review does mention that Calit2 funds graduate education generally (fellowships, involvement with graduate degree programs, development of special topic courses, and contests), it does not explicitly state which entities support graduate education. In that way, it seems more like an umbrella organization rather than an organization that runs coherent programs. Instead, Calit2 has funds available for the general support of graduate education. Members were concerned about the lack of specific initiatives in graduate education as it relates to Calit2's mission. One member reported that on the San Diego campus, they try to facilitate research collaborations that would otherwise not occur, especially in the area of engineering with an emphasis on using IT infrastructure to do this.

Members also noted the letters from San Diego and Irvine Academic Senates regarding the review. The Irvine letter remarks that the initial review lacked transparency; it also did not include sufficient Senate involvement. It goes on to say that it is not clear who decided on the specific issues that were to be evaluated. Members agreed with this summary, adding that the review does not give external entities a clear understanding of what is really going on. Instead, it is rather opaque. For example, the review lists a number of grants that have been funded. Although impressive, there is not a clear linkage back to Calit2. One member remarked that these grants simply represent a number of private investigators (PIs) that are doing innovative research on the San Diego. It does not necessarily mean that this money is being ploughed back into the California economy. Members added that clear objectives, targets, and goals are not really isolated in the review.

Specifically regarding graduate education, members felt that a specific mission statement, value added, or impact statement is missing from the review. They also felt that it is important to encourage Calit2 to set some goals/targets overall and generally. While CCGA cannot require Calit2 to set goals and objectives for graduate education, they should be encouraged to do so. Along these lines, members expect that Calit2 should be a nursery for interdisciplinary graduate programs. There is also nothing in the review that states how successful Calit2 was in fostering relationships.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a response to the Calit2 review.

VIII. Certificates Update/Proposal for a Certificate Program in Engineering and Business for Sustainability at UC Berkeley

ISSUE: Chair Wu introduced the proposal, noting that although CCGA has not yet developed an overall policy on certificate program review, it should consider this proposal.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that this certificate only applies to students who have already been admitted to graduate programs at Berkeley (masters' students). Vice Chair Schumm remarked that if UC is offering its imprimatur for some kind of curriculum, which body reviews that? If it is only the local Graduate Council, they are not mandated to obtain expert external reviews. If it is a professional certification however, then expert external reviews should be solicited. Other members stated that this is clearly not the case here. Since this certificate falls along the lines of a parenthetical notation on a degree, it does not need to be reviewed by CCGA. Members agreed that the Berkeley Graduate Council should have final authority over the approval of this proposal.

ACTION: Members acknowledged that the Berkeley Graduate Council should have final authority over the approval of the proposal for a certificate program in Engineering and Business for Sustainability.

IX. Proposal for the Development of a Graduate Program leading to M.S. and PhD Degrees in Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics (MEAM) at UC Merced

ISSUE: The Merced member commented that the program is modeled in the same way as the other emphasis areas under the independent graduate program (IGP) authority.

DISCUSSION: One member asked about the requirements under 2.4.2. One requirement states that graduate students are expected to 'serve as a GSI for one semester.' Does this mean TA or an independent instructor? The Merced member responded that it means that incoming graduate students are expected to serve as TAs once in the first year. Also under 2.4.2 is the requirement for publication in the peer-reviewed literature. The Merced member said that the goal here is for students to have completed publishable work. Members suggested that this requirement should be reworded to: "Prepare at least one publishable work for the peer-reviewed literature..." Members added that some sort of benchmark on the submission of the article should be included in this requirement. They were also concerned about the stipulation that students would not receive credit for more than 12 units of graduate credit for graduate courses in any one semester (2.2.1), noting that 12 units is the minimum to be enrolled, so the minimum is also the maximum. Members also wanted to know if the 'faculty committees' (2.2.3) are the same as qualifying committees, and whether external members could be added to these committees. The Merced member responded that the answer to both of these questions is yes. That language should be modified to state that the qualifying committee must have one external member.

ACTION: Members approved the program per the suggestions above.

X. Senate Regulations 694/695 Update

ISSUE: Vice Chair Bruce Schumm announced that UCEP is interested in joining CCGA in updating these regulations. He suggested moving SR 695 into the SR 700 series to make this SR more generic.

XI. CCGA 2007-08 Agenda Setting

ISSUE: Vice Chair Bruce Schumm asked members for suggestions for CCGA's agenda for the 2007-08 academic year.

DISCUSSION: Members listed non-residence tuition (NRT), UC competitiveness, the internationalization of the University as some prominent themes for next year. Chair Wu clarified that UCOP will be tracking NRT funds next year. One member suggested investigating whether the trend in graduate acceptance rates are being impacted by NRT. If there is an impact, then there are two remedies: (1) eliminate the NRT; or (2) increase fellowship amounts. The NRT issue is also related to diversity and California's place in the global economy.

Members talked about increasing the international effectiveness of UC's graduate programs, noting that there is a push towards a general internationalization of the University. Some members felt that it is wrong to grant UC degrees to students who fully reside in other countries at other universities, such as the University of Singapore. The promotion of graduate student exchange might be one strategy, but members remarked that many faculty are concerned about a lack of control over the development of such initiatives. When considering internationalization initiatives, members cautioned each other to look at the following: (1) the initiative's relationship to residency; (2) the facilitation of international exchange; and (3) a clear understanding of what UCOP is doing in this area.

Overall, members agreed that CCGA should pursue an active agenda. Certainly, SR 694/695 will involve changing Senate regulations, which should be separated from the internationalization in general. Graduate student placement is another area of concern. Members noted that UCOP is really not set up to track placements after graduation. Therefore, data collection in this area on a system-wide basis needs to be improved. Also, some departments really do not provide career mentoring advice. These are often the same departments that do not know what happens to their students after graduation.

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

A. Proposal for a Masters of Science in Environmental Policy and Management at UC Davis

ACTION: Members will select a lead reviewer at their October 2006 meeting.

B. Proposal for M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Feminist Studies at UC Santa Barbara

ACTION: Tyrus Miller was assigned as the lead reviewer for this program.

C. Proposal for a Masters of Public Health at UC Irvine

ACTION: Professor Chehab was assigned as the lead reviewer for this program

D. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Visual Studies for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz -- *Lead Reviewer Shrinivasa Upadhyaya*

ISSUE: Chair Wu directed members' attention to Professor Upadhyaya's letter. He has received two external reviews and one internal review (with another one on its way). His letter

reports that the criticisms are relatively minor. One critique is that the 108 unit requirement is too large.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the best way forward is to send this letter to the program proposals.

ACTION: The committee agreed that Professor Upadhyaya should send the letter to the program proposers.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Savage reported that his initial concerns about the three tracks have been allayed. It is now clear that the proposers will run one program with three tracks. He directed members' attention to the response from the proposers, noting that when the program is finally up and running, it will admit approximately nine students each year. That means that each track will only have only two to three students, which is quite small. Such small numbers may not be the best use of their resources, but if the Dean is willing to support this, he will not object either. He also reported that the department will now administer an advisory exam to the ethnomusicology students; part of his earlier concern was that the ethnomusicology students would be so separate from the other groups that they may not get the appropriate training in Western music theory, which they will need.

He did note that he only has one external review however, but he does have three internal reviews. The external review is positive, but the reviewer feels that the composition faculty do not quite have the national profile as faculty members in the other areas. Another issue is the bifurcation between composition, musicology, and ethnomusicology, which has been partially addressed by the requirement that composition students will have to take ethnomusicology courses. This review concludes that in order to attract quality graduate students, music programs will need to develop Ph.D.s. The internal reviews are also positive. Finally, although one internal reviewer did not think that the program had adequate resources to mount three tracks, the other reviewers thought that resources were adequate.

DISCUSSION: Members wanted to know if there would be any students from other programs in the music courses. Professor Savage thought that this could be a possibility. After hearing his positive report on the reviews received, members agreed that obtaining additional external reviews would not be necessary. One member asked for a clarification on the funding for the ethnomusicology Ph.D. students. Professor Savage responded that there are distinct funding advantages in admitting students directly to the Ph.D., which is one reason to admit students directly to the Ph.D. program. The committee also agreed with Professor Savage's suggestion that the language of the proposal be changed to clarify that these are three tracks in one program; not three separate degree programs.

ACTION: Members voted unanimously (with one abstention) to approve the program pending the suggested changes.

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

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

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

ISSUE: Professor Hanemann reported that he has identified some potential reviewers; he will send letters soon. Although he will not be on the committee next year, he will complete this review.

H. Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Environmental Systems at UC Merced -- Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab

ISSUE: Professor Chehab reported that he has received three external reviews and four internal reviews; all of which are fairly positive. One external reviewer felt that title of the program is too broad; he thinks that the name should be ‘Earth and Environmental Systems’ or simply ‘Earth Systems.’ Another comment concerned the April admissions deadline, which he considers too late. This reviewer also expressed his concern about the authority of the major professor to make decisions on a student’s progress, or even to place a student on probation. He thinks this should be a degree committee decision, which Professor Chehab is also in agreement with. Another reviewer argues that additional courses should be added; for example, bio-remediation, subsurface remediation, surface water hydrology, and hydrogeology. This reviewer thinks that these additions are very important because of the projected demand in hydrogeology.

DISCUSSION: Other members agreed that ‘environmental systems’ is a program title that is commonly used. Members mentioned that Merced has some hydrologists already, but the proposers should see the letter on the suggestion to add additional courses to the program.

ACTION: Professor Chehab will send the letters to the proposers for a response.

XIII. New Business: UCR&J Informal Ruling on Senate Regulations 682 & 694

ISSUE: Chair Wu passed out the UCR&J informal ruling on SR 682/694, which addresses the interpretation of these regulations as they relate to the UCI agreement on a M.S. in Information and Computer Science (concentration in Embedded Systems) with the Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche, Istituto di Cibernetica “Edoardo Caianiello” (distribution item 1). He noted that UCR&J interprets SR 694.B to mean that masters students must take at least ½ of their units in residence at a UC campus. If the program is only one year long, a student must spend at least two quarters or one semester in residence. UCR&J interpreted SR 682 to mean that with the exception of the shorter residence requirements allowed by SR 694.B, all students must spend at least one year in residence. This would be the upper-limit on residence, as neither regulation stipulates that a student spend more than one year in residence if the master’s program is longer than two years.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that this interpretation impacts the UCI Italy agreement on a M.S. in Information and Computer Science. Members agreed, however, that CCGA cannot retroactively withdraw its approval of the program. They also agreed to make a request of

UCR&J to formalize this ruling. They discussed whether years are the appropriate metric by which masters programs should be measures; they argued that masters programs should be measured in fractions of units. One member suggested a regulation change to SR 682 (which states the residence requirement in terms of years, not units). On the other hand, members made the point that you must satisfy both the temporal and unit requirements. In other words, a student must complete half the number of units and half the number of total semesters/quarters to comply with the residency requirement.

ACTION: The committee will request UCR&J to formalize their ruling; a letter of information will also be sent to the UCI Graduate Council.

IX. Executive Session

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

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m

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