

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

**Minutes of Meeting****Tuesday, October 5, 2010****10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.****UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320****Telephone: 510-987-9466**<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>**I. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates – *Chair Jim Carmody***

- September 29 Academic Council Meeting

**II. Consent Calendar**

- Approval of the Agenda

**ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed.****III. Overview of Committee Charge, Processes, Member Roles and Responsibilities, and Resources – *Chair Carmody and Members***

Chair Carmody provided an overview of CCGA's charge and program review processes and discussed individual roles, responsibilities, and resources. He described major goals for CCGA this year, including exploring ways to streamline the review process for new graduate degree program proposals as set forth in the Compendium. The review process is also described in the CCGA Handbook. He noted a forthcoming recommendation from the Academic Planning Council that CCGA might solicit more than the needed two external reviews and use the first two to arrive at a recommendation. Vice Chair Rachael Goodhue referred to a sample program review she worked on last year to help illustrate the kinds of issues that members may encounter during the course of a review. She noted one problem with the APC recommendation is that typically the more "positive" reviews are the first to arrive and are followed by more critical reviews later on.

**New Announcements from the Academic Senate Leadership****Item** *Dan Simmons, Academic Council Chair**Robert Anderson, Academic Council Vice Chair*

Chair Dan Simmons thanked members for volunteer service. He presented a broad overview of the major issues facing the Senate this fall, including Post Employment Benefits; Transfer Issues from the CCCs to UC; the Senate's "downsizing" resolution calling for the reduction in the number of faculty by attrition; and a special Senate committee on the future direction of the University in an environment of fiscal retrenchment. The committee is chaired by immediate past Council Chair Harry Powell. He discussed the importance of the faculty to put forth its vision for the University and a plan for the next five to seven years – all of which is critical to protecting the quality of the faculty and the institution. Chair Simmons outlined several

#### **Announcements from the Academic Senate Leadership** (*contin.*)

possible tasks that CCGA might undertake, including: 1) Analyze the impact of downsizing the faculty; 2) Articulate a policy for the Council that states the approval of new program proposals will be contingent on demonstrated funding and sustainable funding streams; 3) Analyze the impact of shrinking graduate program enrollments; and 4) Articulate CCGA's role in the budget and funding of graduate programs. Directly related to this issue, Chair Carmody noted that historically, CCGA has never really considered the impact of recommending a moratorium on new programs or a clear University-wide process for disestablishing existing programs that might be underperforming, antiquated, or inactive. Chair Carmody also described teaching load concerns and "off-loading" of faculty resources directly related to downsizing. Vice Chair Bob Anderson noted that the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students will likely increase in the future which will impact the need for more GSIs. He asked if the number of ladder-rank faculty shrank, what would be the impact on the vigor and viability of graduate programs. Assistant Director Hilary Baxter also mentioned the overlap of some of these issues that came up in the revising the Compendium earlier this year. Chair Carmody suggested that the need for CCGA to quickly consider and craft language in response to the all of the above stated questions and concerns and for CCGA members to engage in these discussions on their respective campus. In other updates, Chair Simmons described recently enacted guidelines for letters from the Senate's standing committees requesting Council action. He also discussed changes to booking travel with Southwest Airlines and submitting travel itineraries with reimbursement requests. In relation to the need for the Academic Senate to put forth a future vision/strategic direction, one member asked if any consideration is being given to a model where the University President and top UC executives are recruited from the campuses and whose salaries are less market-driven, e.g., the notion that high salaries are need to attract the "best" candidates? Chair Simmons shared an observation that the University does not always uniformly apply the same high level of scrutiny that is applied to new program reviews, for example to the ongoing assessment/review of academic programs. Another member suggested a need for a Systemwide review of existing underutilized graduate programs on all the campuses.

#### **IV. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs**

*Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director*

*Todd Greenspan, Academic Planning Director*

*Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

**Director Pamela Jennings** noted that VP Steve Beckwith is out of the country and was not able to be here today. She described VP Beckwith's presentation to the Regents on graduate education and some of the questions that were raised at the meeting. She also described the release of the National Research Council rankings. She suggested that Chair Carmody revisit participation by, and interaction with, the Council of Graduate Council Deans.

**Assistant Director Hilary Baxter** discussed the development of a Share Point website to help track progress of program proposals. She noted that the SSP policy is currently under revision and will be discussed later in the agenda. She also discussed the response the Universitywide call for proposals that had gone out for Professional Degree Fee-charging programs and provided clarifications on several tangential issues, including PDF definitions; setting of fee-levels; factors that might call for CCGA review due to substantive changes in the nature of the

## **Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs** *(contin.)*

program, e.g., delivery, modality, location. She also described CPEC's role in the review process and several issues of particular interest to CCGA members. In other updates, she briefly discussed a requirement for "pre-proposals" for new school proposals contained in the revised Compendium and on follow-up discussions with WASC explications for graduate student learning outcomes from the campuses in accreditation reviews and ways to streamline program reviews.

### **V. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils – Chair Carmody and Members**

CCGA members briefly shared highlights and important issues coming from their divisional Graduate Councils this year in this abbreviated roundtable discussion.

*Berkeley: Two issues that have generated much discussion are proposals for Self Supporting/ Professional Degree Fee Programs, as well as the Academic Council "downsizing resolution" and the accompanying UCLA alternate statement.*

*San Diego: Proposals for Self Supporting/Professional Degree Fee Programs have attracted much attention, as has resolving with the SVC the Graduate Council's delegated authority and purview over graduate education matters.*

*San Francisco: In response to recent academic program reviews pointing to the need for increased funding, better space, more support from central campus administration, the Graduate Council has engaged the EVC&P and the Deans of Medicine and Pharmacy in a broader discussion on the state of graduate education at UCSF during this period of economic cutbacks.*

*UCLA: Forthcoming proposals for variations of the existing Executive M.B.A. Program, e.g., joint programs between UCLA and business schools located abroad are expected to raise many questions this year.*

*Irvine: Forthcoming proposals for joint degree programs, e.g., between the Engineering and Business Schools are expected to stir up discussion. Their Graduate Dean will be asking schools and departments to respond to the outcomes of the National Research Council report. They are also looking closely at the status of programs with extremely low or no enrollment over time.*

*Merced: Growing UCM's graduate enrollment and getting new programs off the ground in the context of the current budget climate is their main challenge. They are focused on how to provide better support for the graduate admission and recruitment processes.*

*Riverside: Developing a new staffing structure to support the Graduate Council is a major focus. Previously, support for the GC was provided by the campus's Graduate Division. Navigating competing interests given the distinct areas of authority and purview of the Senate vs. Administration (the Graduate Division in this case) can be challenging under this staffing model. One option on the table calls for transitioning this staff support role from the Graduate Division to the divisional Senate office. Forthcoming proposals of on-line graduate versions of existing graduate degree programs and how these ought to be reviewed and approved is another issue they expect to discuss this year.*

**V. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils** (*contin.*)

*Santa Barbara:* One topic of discussion is the disjunction between high ratings of UCSB graduate programs in the NRC report and reductions in funding for graduate education. Another topic has to do with changes in how graduate funding flows from UCOP to the campus EVCs and the concern that Graduate Deans will have less control in determining how these funds are used once funding streams are centralized.

**VI. Systemwide Review: Post-Employment Benefits** – *Chair Carmody*

ISSUE: Academic Council Chair Simmons has requested formal comment on two proposed sets of changes in post-employment benefits recommended by the President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits (PEB). President Yudof also has agreed to consider a third option, described in the Dissenting Statement authored by the faculty and staff members of the PEB work groups. Chair Simmons’ letter, with hyperlinks to all of the materials, is pasted below, and a PDF version of the letter also is attached. In addition, this material is posted on the Senate website. While formal, written comment is due by Monday, November 8, Chair Simmons requests preliminary comment, if possible, by October 22 in order to inform the discussion of the issue at the November Regents’ meeting.

DISCUSSION: Chair Carmody suggested that for CCGA’s purposes members may want to confine the PEB discussion to its impact on: the quality of graduate education; UC’s ability to continue be a leader in graduate education; competitive re-numeration for UC faculty; and UC’s ability to retain and attract faculty, staff and graduate students. Academic Council Chair Dan Simmons rejoined the meeting and CCGA briefed members on the issues at hand, the key recommendations (Options A, B and C) of the PEB Task Force, and critical decision points and opportunities for Senate comment between now and November. One member asked why “Option C” had not been more forcefully advocated by the Senate (as in the University Faculty Welfare Committee’s “downsizing” resolution). Another member suggested one measure of the impact would be to poll faculty on the impact of last year’s furlough on their personal savings. Members suggested that the committee could look at comparative data from the PEB report on how retirement packages, Defined-Contribution plans, and faculty salaries at UC stack up to those at comparable Universities as one way of assessing the consequences on graduate education and faculty.

**ACTION:** CCGA members voted unanimously (11-0-0) to endorse the general provisions as outlined in the UCFW resolution from Sept. 22 letter to Academic Council Chair Dan Simmons. Specifically, that CCGA strongly support Option C, the third (7% ceiling) and the fourth bullets (competitive salaries) contained in the UCSF letter.

**VII. Systemwide Review: Renaming Fees as Tuition** – *Chair Carmody*

ISSUE: Provost Pitts has requested that the Academic Senate review a formal proposal to rename the education and professional degree fees (but not the student services fee) as “tuition.” The UC Commission on the Future discussed this idea, and in its response to the Working Group recommendations, the Senate agreed in principle that it is a good idea. Comments on the proposal are requested by Thursday, October 21 so that the item can be placed on the Regents’ November meeting agenda.

**ACTION:** This item was postponed.

### **VIII. Self-Supporting/Professional Degree Fee Programs – Chair Carmody**

**ISSUE:** CCGA members will consider the range of issues associated with the proliferation of self-supporting and professional degree fee programs including criteria, authority, review processes for establishing; more effective coordination between campus/ CCGA/WASC reviews; timeline for reviews; concerns regarding a new category of fees and the definition of professional; distinction of self-supporting from professional fees; and others.

**DISCUSSION:** Academic Planning Director Todd Greenspan briefed CCGA members on how the SSP policy revisions have evolved in recent months along with an accompanying APC recommendation going forth to the TCOF. Chair Carmody raised a number of outstanding issues and questions for CCGA with regard to SSPs that have been addressed in the APMs but not in the SSP policies, e.g., definitional issues; adverse impact on existing programs to the detriment of less well-funded programs; diversion of existing faculty to high fee SSPs; absence of an audit function to mitigate key issues and concerns; a mandate for program reviews after four-year's time. He expressed his opinion that the SSP policy needs to be more explicit about conveying the University's core values and faculty expectations for SSPs, leaving the campuses to adjudicate the policies for their respective campus. He suggested that SSP policy should overall be more "directive" in nature and utilize language that empowers local Graduate Councils to raise questions relevant to the particular need of their campus. He also noted that it would be useful for the campuses to be aware of the reality of the uneven income-generating potential of SSPs. Vice Chair recalled that last year's CCGA felt very strongly about student financial aid and access issues. This led to a broad discussion on the potential of SSPs to create entrepreneurial and market based programs for a specific population with the revenue used to support state-funded programs; the issues associated with creating two universities with very unequal pathways for students, one well-funded and one less so. Chair Carmody put forth the idea of levying a tax on SSPs paid to support the general educational mission of the campus. With regard to the PDFs, Director Greenspan briefly discussed the unique steps in the review of this Regental Action Item to these proposals. One member suggested that CCGA send a letter to Council expressing our concern that purview is being circumvented and that local Graduate Councils need to include in this discussion. Chair Carmody asked that CCGA members to carefully review and comment on the revised SSP policy language (a newer version of which will be forwarded by email). He suggested that CCGA should continue to monitor this issue and continue discussion at a future meeting.

**ACTION:** Members agreed to send a letter to Council expressing CCGA's concern that the Senate's purview is being circumvented and expressed concern that local Graduate Councils need to be included in this discussion.

### **IX. On-line Programs – Chair Carmody**

**ISSUE:** CCGA members will consider the various issues associated with on-line graduate degree programs including teaching load questions; new modalities for existing programs; review of on-line iteration of an existing program; and others.

**ACTION:** This item was postponed.

### **X. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review**

- A. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Public Health at UC Irvine – Chair Carmody**  
**ACTION:** Prof. Alan Buckpitt (UCD) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- B. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Epidemiology at UC Irvine – Chair Carmody**  
**ACTION:** Prof. Karen Gyls (UCLA) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- C. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. Degree in Biomedical Imaging at UC San Francisco – Chair Carmody**  
**ACTION:** Prof. Ruth Mulnard (UCI) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- D. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. in Biological Sciences and Educational Media Design at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Sue Carter (UCSC)**  
**REPORT:** Prof. Carter provided a brief overview and reported that she is going forward with soliciting external reviews.
- E. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Psychological Sciences at UC Merced – Interim Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UCD)**  
**REPORT:** Prof. Goodhue, having just learned of her being assigned this review, reported that she is moving forward with soliciting external reviews as quickly as possible.
- F. Proposal for Graduate Program leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Film and Media at UC Berkeley – Interim Lead Reviewer Jim Carmody**  
**ACTION:** Due to Prof. Carmody transition to CCGA chair this year, Prof. Sharon Farmer (UCSB) was assigned as the new Lead Reviewer.
- G. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. Degree in Quantitative and Systems Biology at UC Merced – Lead Reviewer Morris Maduro (UCR)**  
**REPORT:** Prof. Maduro gave a brief overview of the program and reported that he has solicited four faculty reviews.
- H. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. Degree in Cognitive and Information Sciences at UC Merced – Lead Reviewer Michael Beattie (UCSF)**  
**REPORT:** Prof. Beattie gave a brief overview of the program and reported that he has solicited external reviews and so far has received two reviews.
- I. Proposal for a Graduate Program in the Study of Religion Leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degree at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Christopher Kello (UCM)**  
**REPORT:** Prof. Kello gave a brief overview of the program and reported that he has solicited four faculty reviews and received one. He also discussed some of the issues and concerns that have emerged from the reviews thus far.

**J. Proposal for a Graduate Program in Energy Leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees at UC Davis – *Lead Reviewer John Hildebrand (UCSD)***

**ACTION:** Due to Prof. Hildebrand's rotation off of CCGA in last May, Prof. Dan Arovas (UCSD) was assigned as the new Lead Reviewer. Prof. Arovas will contact John Hildebrand to request any work that he may have completed last year.

**XI New Business**

There was no new business.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Attest: Jim Carmody, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst

**CCGA 2010-11 Remaining Meeting Schedule:**

November 2, 2010 – Room 5320  
December 7, 2010 – Room 12322  
January 11, 2011 – Room 10325  
February 1, 2011 – Room 5320  
March 1, 2011 – Room 12322  
April 5, 2011 – Room 5320  
May 3, 2011 – Room 12322  
June 7, 2011 – Room 5320  
July 5, 2011 – Room 12322