

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – JANUARY 9, 2007**

I. Chair's Announcements

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Reen Wu briefed members on the upcoming joint Academic Council/Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) meeting, which is scheduled for February 27, 2007. He said that there a number of important graduate affairs-related issues, such as non-resident tuition, graduate student support, and UC competitiveness among others. He will try to raise some of these concerns at the EVC meeting. Analyst Todd Giedt clarified that the EVC agenda consists of two items—stratification and budget priorities. Analyst Giedt also briefed members on the relevant issues taken up at the last Academic Council (AC) meeting (December 20, 2006). He summarized the AC's [*Recommendations of the UC Academic Senate – Office of Research Multicampus Unit \(MRU\) Joint Workgroup*](#) and the [*Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees*](#).

Chair Wu noted that CCGA's proposal, the *CCGA-UCEP Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction*, will be discussed at an upcoming AC meeting, probably in January or February. He mentioned that the proposal has encountered a fair amount of resistance, and it will be important for CCGA to defend its position in the AC. He also announced that Vice Chair Schumm has agreed to serve as the CCGA representative on the CCGA/UCEP/UCAF Workgroup on UCAF's Proposed Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles. Members will recall that late last year, CCGA recommended that a CCGA/UCAF/UCEP workgroup be formed to better align this document with the CCGA-UCEP Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction.

DISCUSSION: Members asked that the memo tasking them to collect information on NRT be resent. One member suggested that it would be helpful if Chair Wu had some or all of this data in time for the EVC meeting.

Regulations

Members expressed support for better records and documentation of past Senate regulations and bylaws. Analyst Todd Giedt noted that he is working on a long-term project to archive and create a history of Senate regulations. The committee expressed their support for this effort, adding that such a project has the potential to aid CCGA in the fulfillment of its duties. Chair Wu said that the committee would benefit from an inventory/history of the regulations and bylaws specifically related to graduate education. Analyst Todd Giedt noted that there are differences between divisional and systemwide regulations (both of which concern CCGA), and many of the specific requirements required for masters and Ph.D. are contained in these divisional regulations. Members further commented that some of these divisional regulations are contradictory and should be aligned with systemwide regulations.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will resend the NRT memo, which charges members with gathering data on the total amount of NRT generated in the 2005-06 academic year at the

respective campuses, as well as the amounts of NRT that are attributed to undergraduate and graduate students.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Draft Minutes from the December 5, 2006 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

III. Proposal for the Re-Review of UC/CSU Joint Ed.D. Programs

ISSUE: Vice Chair Bruce Schumm requested that this item be moved off the consent calendar for further discussion. In response to a question regarding the determination of a class I and a class II review, Professor Schumm added the following sentence to this document, “The determination of whether a program merits a Class I or Class II re-review shall be made by the local Graduate Council, in consultation with the chair of CCGA as necessary. However, CCGA retains the final authority over the determination.”

DISCUSSION: Members discussed this addition. Members felt that it was important to change the first ‘determination’ to ‘recommendation’; as well as removing ‘as necessary’ (in the first sentence) and ‘however’ (in the second sentence). Members stressed that it is sufficient for a local Graduate Council to simply bring the re-review issue to the attention of the CCGA Chair (rather than informing the entire committee in the early stages). In the end, the committee agreed upon the following formulation: “The ~~determination~~ recommendation of whether a program merits a Class I or Class II re-review shall be made by the local Graduate Council, in consultation with the chair of CCGA ~~as necessary~~ . ~~However~~, CCGA retains the final authority over the determination.”

Members also made the following edits: In the last line of the first paragraph, the committee agreed that ‘UC’ should be inserted. This sentence should read, “This has the potential to seriously impact the nature and quality of the UC program, ...” In the second paragraph, second line, ‘defacto’ should be italicized and separated (as in ‘de facto’). In the last sentence, ‘follows’ should be changed to ‘follow’. The sentence should read, “Any program wishing to cease operation should follow the procedures for Discontinuance of Graduate Degree Programs delineated in ...” Finally, under the ‘Re-Review Processes’ section, the first sentence should read, “For both Class I and Class II reviews, the review process should unfold similarly to that for new proposals.”

ACTION: Members approved the draft policy with the preceding edits.

IV. UCOP Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Wu explained that UCOP-Office of Clinical Services has proposed a set of policy on the relationship between vendors and clinicians. The UCOP reviewers removed two items in the Brennan proposal that are in the purview of the Academic Senate and would therefore require significant Senate review prior to approval. In addition a third item was also excluded from the proposed UC policy at this time. Therefore, Senate Chair Oakley is asking CCGA to look at two separate items. The first is the UCOP proposal ([‘Proposed Guidelines Regarding Vendor Relations’](#)) as presented without the three additional

proposed policies (due March 10, 2007). The second systemwide review concerns the following three proposed policies, and is due by April 10, 2007:

- i) Faculty may not publish articles or editorials that are ghostwritten by vendor employees;
- ii) “No strings attached” grants or gifts directed to individuals from vendors shall be prohibited (this excludes competitive grants);
- iii) All consulting agreement and unconditional grants shall be publicly listed (e.g., on an internet web site).

DISCUSSION: Members were especially concerned about the correct interpretation of ‘no strings attached’ to grants. They noted that the Brennan report remarks that implicit strings can be attached even if overt strings are not. The main point is that the private investigators (PIs) would feel obligated to the grantor even if strings were not attached to the money. Another member mentioned that many bio-ethicists believe that ‘no strings’ is a fiction. Members also discussed the difference between a ‘gift’ and a ‘donation’. For the purposes of these policy proposals, gifts include monies granted to PIs that should go towards research in a specific area. On the other hand, donations are simply monies give to the University, school, or department that can be utilized as the unit sees fit. For example, tobacco funds are given to the State, which are distributed to PIs interested in tobacco research. Another example includes a category of PIs who have ongoing relationships with companies, who might be given money for their research. Such monies would have implicit strings attached. One member suggested that instead of giving the money directly to the PI, it could be given to the Dean with the understanding that it would be distributed to the PI. However, other members objected to this model, noting that the vendor relationship must fit with the real world, which involves instruments and procedures that require academic validation. They remarked that progress would be significantly impeded if firewalls are raised between vendors and PIs. They added that a competitive process may also not work because this would increase costs for vendors, who might object.

Relationships between vendors and PIs in laboratory settings are especially problematic. For example, a vendor may give a piece of equipment to a PI for use and testing in his or her laboratory, specifically asking the PI to test and ‘showcase’ it in their research. Utilizing competitive grants when testing new equipment generally does not work because such equipment is usually unique to that company. When a piece of equipment is donated to a laboratory, the implicit agreement is that the lab will be committed to not only the testing of that equipment, but also its use and development for the long run. Members shifted their discussion to the implications of this policy on graduate students. One member remarked that from time to time, graduate students come directly from industry. There is always the question as to whether such graduate students are pursuing their own research or that of private companies. Another issue is that graduate students are often supported by various vendors; this simply perpetuates the culture of vendor relationships. Of course, medical students are most affected by these relationships. In laboratory settings, the vendors will often talk directly with graduate students, who are often the experts on a particular piece of equipment or process. One member noted that the UCOP policy (under ‘Gifts’) specifically states that “Vendors may donate their product for evaluation or educational purposes to a unit of the University if the University invites the donation.” While this may not solve all ethical issues, it does make an attempt to do so, and it also speaks to the socialization of graduate students mentioned above.

Overall, members agreed that the UCOP policy on vendor relations represents a good step towards regulating vendors. Therefore the committee supports the first step of regulating vendor relations, but members recognize that it does so in an imperfect world.

Moving on to the second part of the review, members essentially agreed with items i. and ii. That said however, there was some concern about the use of the word ‘prohibited’ in item ii. One member felt that by prohibiting the non-competitive grants and gifts, UC would simply lose this money. Instead, he wondered if such monies could be donated to the School or department. However, other members countered that if the grantors instructed the dean of the School to distribute the funds to a certain PI, this would amount to the same thing as given the money directly to the PI. Members briefly discussed modifying this item in some way, but they could not come to consensus. The suggestion was made that a sentence be added that instead of gifts a single individual, gifts could be donated to the University. Another member added that this statement should be considered in context of the broader UCOP vendor relations policy, which these three points are an integral part of. He argued that these statements would seem much less problematic as part of that larger document, which they eventually will be. Above all, members stressed that money from companies that is truly unrestricted is really a good thing. If one took that money, the PI would need to go through the University. The suggestion was subsequently made to remove ‘gift’ under item ii.

Regarding the third issue (item iii.), members did not understand why the University cannot already do this (posting consulting agreements and unconditional grants publicly). They speculated that this may have something to do with the additional compensation of UC medical researchers. They wondered if this is income that researchers can earn on top of their regular compensation, but do not disclose.

Members made a motion to approve the UCOP draft policy on vendor relations, which was seconded and unanimously approved. They added that the letter should note that the “drafters should be mindful of the integral relationship between the three other elements and the UCOP draft policy on vendor relations.” Under the second issue (items i., ii., and iii.), a motion was made to replace ‘individuals’ with ‘graduate students and academic personnel’ in item ii. Members reworded this item to read: “ ‘No strings attached’ grants or gifts (this excludes competitive grants) directed to individuals from vendors shall be prohibited, but may be allocated to academic units in conformity with Vendor Relations 1A, 1B, and 1C.” Members also requested a clarification on the use of the term ‘no strings attached grants’.

ACTION: Members approved the first review item unanimously and expressed support for the second review item with the caveats noted above. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft correspondence for the second review item, which will be distributed by email and voted on in the March meeting.

V. Certificate Programs’ Subcommittee Update

ISSUE: Chair Wu noted that the certificate programs’ subcommittee has not yet met. He said that he will convene a conference call before the March meeting.

ACTION: Chair Wu will set up a conference call. Analyst Todd Giedt will send out prior minutes; an updated charge; and a certificate index/history before the conference call in late February to subcommittee members.

VI. UCR&J Residency Requirement

ISSUE: Chair Wu reminded members that this draft correspondence concerns the interpretation of Senate Regulations regarding residency requirements. He noted that CCGA approved an UCI Italy MOU based on one interpretation of these regulations. He argued that it would be prudent to send this interpretation to UCR&J for clarification.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the implications of sending the correspondence to UCR&J, and realized that this could affect other programs if UCR&J recommends a change in the interpretation of these regulations. They made one editorial change in the text, replacing ‘oversees’ with ‘overseas’. They also recommended that the asterisks be taken out and made into italics.

ACTION: Members approved draft correspondence. Analyst Todd Giedt will forward the correspondence to UCR&J.

VII. Provost Rory Hume

ISSUE:

Planning for Enrollment Growth in the Health Sciences

Provost Hume briefed members on the outcome of the initial report on the health sciences. He noted that the UC has not increased its health science enrollments while California’s population has doubled in size. He reported that there are shortages in nursing (both practitioners and educators), medicine, public health, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine. The only areas that are stable are dentistry and ophthalmology. There are growth plans for nursing (which are being accelerated) and pharmacy; some growth has already taken place in medicine, especially in terms of medical education. There is also a clearly defined need for another School of Public Health and a School of Veterinary Medicine. To that end, UCD has expressed interest in a School of Public Health and UCSF wants to expand its global health programs. This report coincided with expressions of interest from Riverside and Merced for the development of their own medical schools. The Regents recently endorsed Riverside’s proposal, which means that UCR is encouraged to plan for the School and can move forward with the hiring of a founding dean. He said that the committee can expect to see a proposal for a new school/program in about six months. That said, UCR does not foresee graduating any doctors for about eight years. Davis may be interested in public health. He reminded members that UC would still need to go through CPEC for support of expanding its programs in medicine.

UCI Law School Proposal

Provost Hume thanked CCGA for their work in approving the UCI law school proposal. While The Regents approved it, CPEC did have the concern that California has a surplus of lawyers. However, UC is arguing that California needs more lawyers of UC quality. Another issue is that there are simply not enough UC law schools in southern California. At this point, UCI is continuing to plan for the law school. The UC Riverside proposal, which had been submitted concurrently with the UCI proposal, has been set aside for a number of years because of the UCR

medical school proposal. However, UCR is continuing to develop graduate programs in criminology and law and society, which will build an academic infrastructure that can support a law school at a later date.

Planning for Academic Programs

Provost Hume is speaking to the Chancellors and The Regents about academic planning at the system level. He remarked that UC guides faculty into disciplinary groups and encourage/support faculty to work across disciplines. At the campus level UC expects the divisional Senates to approve high quality programs. While the power over resources is vested in the Chancellors and the Deans, the Senate retains the ultimate authority over new academic programs. He remarked that UC works at three levels with regard to systemwide planning. First, UC has focused planning activities/task forces in such areas as planning for doctoral and professional education, planning for enrollment growth in the health sciences, and the information technology guidance committee. UCEP has also asked the Administration to support a detailed examination of undergraduate education. On another level, UCOP is trying to bring individual campus academic plans together in a way that can be discussed as a whole at the systemwide level. Transparency is a key element in this process. The last component is the long-range guidance team, which advises President Dynes on a number of issues of importance to the University. The Regents are also considering forming their own long-range guidance committee. He noted some conclusions of the long-range guidance team: (1) UC will be stronger if the entire system works as one unit; (2) California is rapidly evolving (changing demographics, etc.), and UC must be seen to be responsive to its needs; (3) K-12 education is in real trouble, and UC needs be more active in this area; (4) As the State moves away from public financing of the University, financial challenges will continue to loom large. On that last point, he noted that UC is increasing its funding from industry, federal sources, and other philanthropic organizations.

DISCUSSION: Members asked about support for graduate student enrollment. The Regents are aware of this issue, and they have said that they will allow undergraduate enrollments to level off in the coming years, while increasing UC's graduate enrollments. He clarified that this means ending growth on some campuses; undergraduate enrollments may actually decrease on some campuses. He remarked that some undergraduate enrollments will be shifted to UC Merced. Weaning some campuses away from growth money, which involves changing the financial models for some campuses, is a related issue. Members also inquired about the future of the Master Plan, noting that traditionally CSU has retained authority over professional masters programs while UC has developed academic doctoral programs. Provost Hume responded that UC's focus has indeed been on the academic and professional doctoral education; however UC has underperformed when compared to large public universities. He agreed that obtaining comparative data on this issue would be a good idea. NRT is another crisis, which only ranks second to faculty salaries as a concern among faculty members.

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

A. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and a Ph.D. in Forensic and Behavioral Sciences with CSU Fresno and UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (Vice-Chair)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Schumm reported that he recently conducted a site visit. He said that approval of this program is not imminent. He reminded members that there are three tracks

contained in this proposal, which this program is trying to tie together: behavioral science, victimology, and forensics science. He reminded members that there are not any existing forensics Ph.D. programs in the country. Although the reviewers have not been especially keen on the melding of behavioral science to forensics sciences, the proposers have thought this through carefully. Expertise in the behavioral sciences is especially strong among the faculty at CSU Fresno. On the Davis side, there is also solid interest for this program among faculty who are equally solid in the behavioral sciences.

There is more concern with the forensics track of the program, however. He noted that one of the main proponents has recently passed away; the other proponent could not make the meeting due to an emergency. The one UCD ladder-rank faculty that attended the site visit meetings had only received the revised proposal the evening before, and was not familiar with its content. UCD adjunct faculty associated with UCD's self-supporting Master's program in Forensic Science called into question the curriculum of the program. Professor Schumm talked with David Howe yesterday, which went well. However, Professor Schumm is still uncertain how deeply the Davis people are plugged into the forensics community. On the other hand, at CSU Fresno they are consumed with developing a masters program in forensics science.

He said that sending questions to David Howe about the forensics side would be the next step. He mentioned that splitting the behavioral side off from forensics may be one option, thereby allowing the forensics to develop more slowly. He also suggested to David Howe that either UCD or CSU Fresno hire a senior faculty member with expertise in forensics. Professor Howe responded that since a Ph.D. program in forensic science does not exist, faculty members at this level really do not exist in the conventional sense. He added that most of the forensics experts are already at Davis. That said however, he mentioned that Davis would be willing to commit to two additional hires in forensic science (one of which would be senior). However, a structural problem still exists, as ladder-ranked faculty members do not receive any support for teaching in the self-supporting masters program. There are also not any clear mandates for teaching in the Ph.D. program.

Finally, Professor Schumm noted that he did receive a call from the CSU Chancellor's office, which indicated that it is making an inquiry into this program. Towards the successful conclusion of that inquiry, he feels strongly that CCGA should work with the CSU Chancellor's office.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will formulate a number of questions to address the issues outlined above.

B. UCR Music

ACTION: Roger Savage was selected as the lead reviewer.

C. Ethnic Studies UC Riverside

ACTION: Donald Brenneis was selected as the lead reviewer.

D. 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 – Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Stralka reported that he did receive one review and he proposed that the committee has enough information to vote on the proposal, which members accepted. Reflecting on the external review, he said that there is not much concern about the graduate curriculum. There is some concern, however, regarding the undergraduate sequence. The program allows students to absorb the first year of their masters' program (the core courses) into the fourth year of their study. He remarked that the program effectively screens students twice—once in the third year and then again in the fourth year. Those that successfully pass the core courses in the fourth year move onto the fifth year (at which time they will be awarded a BA in International Studies and a MIA degree upon the completion of their fifth year). Another major concern expressed was the fact that these students would not have had much experience (however, this is built into the program via an internship).

DISCUSSION: While some members expressed concern about the undergraduate program, they were confident that the graduate program is of high quality.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the program with one abstention.

IX. Proposed CCGA Proposition 209 Diversity Study Taskforce

ISSUE: The student representative briefed members on her efforts to investigate the 'culture' of inclusiveness/diversity within graduate education at UC. She has sent an inquiry to the UC Student's Association, and she should have a response by the March meeting.

X. New Business

A. Academic Council's Resolution on 'Safeguarding the University's Future: A Resolution of the Academic Council on Returning UC to a Sound Fiscal Base'

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Wu briefed members on AC's resolution, which asks the President to do the following: (1) Provide to The Regents detailed projections of the full costs involved in achieving each of The Regents' budget priorities; (2) Present to The Regents the budget-trends analysis adopted by the Academic Council ("Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California"); and (3) Communicate to The Regents the Academic Council's strongly held views that: every year's delay in increasing the University's revenues by approximately \$1.1 billion in General Fund monies (or their equivalent) will make achieving The Regents' priorities ever more costly and difficult; and the urgency of the current situation requires that a multi-year plan of General Fund augmentation be established.

DISCUSSION: Members did not have any comments on the resolution.

XI. 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

Distributions:

1. Academic Council's Resolution on 'Safeguarding the University's Future: A Resolution of the Academic Council on Returning UC to a Sound Fiscal Base'