

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting**Tuesday, November 2, 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**

- October 27 Academic Council Meeting
- Chair Carmody asked CCGA for their concurrence to send a letter to Council concerning the need for the Senate and local Graduate Councils to be involved in a substantive way in the deliberative process of reviewing and approving campus proposals to establish and charge new Professional Degree Fees.

II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the Agenda
- Approval of the October 5, 2010 Meeting Minutes

ACTION: The reordered agenda was approved and the minutes approved as noticed. It was agreed to move the Program Review discussion to the morning portion of future meeting agendas.

III. Announcements from the Academic Senate Leadership

Dan Simmons, Academic Council Chair

Robert Anderson, Academic Council Vice Chair

DISCUSSION: Chair Dan Simmons shared his thoughts with CCGA on SSPs and PDFs. He discussed the timeframe for reviewing the policy revisions and floated the idea of CCGA crafting a new Senate Regulation that prescribes an appropriate level of Senate review and stipulates that it will not consider proposals for new PDFs until there is clear policy on how PDFs are reviewed.

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

Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director

Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

Hilary Baxter updated CCGA on a recent meeting with CPEC in which they proposed several changes to program review guidelines, including subsuming the “societal need” under the “advancing knowledge” criterion, which UC vehemently opposed.

V. Systemwide Review: Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University – Chair Carmody

ISSUE: Academic Council Chair Simmons has requested formal comment on two documents regarding the future of the University of California. The first was a recommendation from the Academic Council to the UC Commission on the Future, which was narrowly approved by Council. The second is a Statement of Academic Senate Values and Recommendations, which was developed by the UCLA division.

V. Systemwide Review: Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University *(continued)*

DISCUSSION: CCGA discussed how to analyze 1) the impact of downsizing the downsizing the faculty (including teaching load concerns and “off-loading” of faculty resources directly related to downsizing; vigor and viability of graduate programs affected by decrease in ladder-rank faculty vs. increase in “teaching” faculty; increase in the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students leading to a demand for more GSIs); and 2) the impact of shrinking graduate program enrollments faculty. CCGA discussed how to analyze the impacts of downsizing the faculty; decreasing ladder-rank faculty vs. increase in “teaching” faculty and the effect on the vigor and viability of graduate programs; and increasing the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students and resultant demand for more GSIs. At Chair Carmody’s request, it was agreed that CCGA members would attempt to identify departments most at risk or vulnerable with the goal of assessing the landscape Systemwide due to: 1) faculty downsizing on their campus; or 2) recent historic low or under enrollment. In the end, CCGA agreed to transmit the following comments to Council regarding the Council recommendation and UCLA statement:

- Graduate students and graduate programs, an indispensable component of a research university such as the University of California, are almost completely ignored;
- The need to recruit and attract top-quality graduate students and the impact of increased fees on access and diversity could be more strongly emphasized;
- The degree to which access to top-quality graduate students assists in recruiting and retaining world class faculty and the centrality of graduate education to faculty should be explicitly addressed;
- The notion of leveraging the need to shrink faculty as a way to generate graduate student support, e.g., by creating job opportunities for graduate students, could be useful in charting future recommendations;
- Relying on “unplanned attrition” as a chief strategy for downsizing the faculty is a bad idea and a more deliberative plan is needed by the University;
- The Senate needs a voice in the discussion over what happens when resources shrink and how resources are allocated or reallocated, especially with regard to program closures, consolidations, and faculty FTEs; and
- The Senate needs to be involved in developing strategies for how best to allocate faculty talent and finite resources in order to develop and sustain top notch programs, even if fewer in number, across the UC system.

ACTION: CCGA agreed to transmit the above comments to Council regarding the Council recommendation and UCLA statement.

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. Specifically, CCGA will clarify its position with respect to what needs to be in the new SSP policy; any adjustments CCGA needs to make in evaluating self-supporting programs; how CCGA should define “professional” for the purposes of approving the imposition of professional fees; and what actions CCGA can take to assert its proper influence in the approval of professional status.

VIII. Self-Supporting Programs/Professional Degree Fee Programs (*continued*)

DISCUSSION: Director Todd Greenspan summarized key revisions since CCGA last discussed the proposed changes and clarified that whereas approval of self-supporting programs (SSPs) is a Presidential process (except those charged by programs administered through Extension), the approval of professional degree fee programs (PDFs) is a Regental process. Members discussed concerns about the way in which new PDFs are approved and the way in which these fees are set have eluded local Graduate Council/divisional Senate/CCGA review. Chair Carmody made the point that it is not entirely accurate to say that the setting of fees for a program approved by the faculty is a matter solely for the campus to decide. He noted that a program's financial support and fee structure is a part of the initial program review process and that when a program decides to call itself a professional program and impose a new PDF, it can materially change the nature of the program and thereby trigger formal Senate review. Members expressed concerns about the absence of language that keeps the proliferation of PDFs in check; the criterion and boundaries that define an SSP; the extent to which SSPs are designed to be profit centers and draw faculty energies away from state-supported academic programs; the implications for access and how profits could be used to offer more competitive support packages; the notion of charging fees according to what the market will bear; preserving the "UC" brand name; the need for ongoing monitoring of programs once they are approved and for faculty consultation on any subsequent transformative changes that are made to the program.

ACTION: Chair Carmody asked members to annotate their copies of the revised policy document on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs with their comments for continued discussion at the next meeting.

IX. On-line Programs – Chair Carmody and Executive Director Martha Winnacker

ISSUE: CCGA members considered 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. CCGA was asked for guidance on how extensive a review CCGA would likely need to conduct for a newly proposed online extension of an existing approved graduate degree program under a given set of conditions that were presented by Martha Winnacker's memorandum to CCGA.

DISCUSSION: CCGA discussed several questions/factors that it would likely consider in determining how extensive a review would be needed based on what known at this point.

- How to ensure that the e-M.P.H. won't compete, draw faculty and financial resources away from the existing in-resident M.P.H. program?
- How much student to faculty and student to student interaction will there be?
- The experience or quality of these interactions can be hard to replicate online.
- How will the in-residency requirement be met?
- The extent to which the existing program's core intellectual quality will be reflected/retained by the online version.
- The CCGA and WASC reviews would benefit from shared access to the same set of program review documents.
- Overall, the CCGA review would benefit from seeking external reviews from people with expertise in electronic or online instruction.
- Information on comparable online M.P.H. graduate programs would be helpful to CCGA.

ACTION: Martha will pass along comments to the proposers for their consideration.

XI. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

- New Item** **A. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Biomedical and Translational Science at UC Irvine – *Chair Carmody***
ACTION: Prof. Morris Maduro (UCR) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- New Item** **B. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the J.D. and Ph.D. degrees in Law and Graduate Studies at UC Irvine – *Chair Carmody***
ACTION: Dorothy Hale (UCB) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- C. Proposal for the UCLA Anderson School of Management to establish a new Executive M.B.A. Program in cooperation with the Universidad Adolfo Ibañez in Santiago, Chile – *Chair Carmody***
ACTION: Rachael Goodhue (UCD) was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- D. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Public Health at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Alan Buckpitt (UCD)***
REPORT: Prof. Buckpitt reported that he has one internal and one external reviewer confirmed.
- E. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. degree in Epidemiology at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Karen Gyls (UCLA)***
REPORT: Prof. Gyls reported that she has one reviewer confirmed and is working on identifying additional reviewers. She discussed several preliminary concerns including that the proposal may need updating since it was first conceived; and that it may potentially overlap and compete with the UCI Public Health Ph.D. program proposal.
- F. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. Degree in Biomedical Imaging at UC San Francisco – *Lead Reviewer Ruth Mulnard (UCI)***
REPORT: Prof. Mulnard reported that she has two UC reviewers and one external reviewer and is working on finding one more external reviewer. Chair Carmody noted that CCGA will need to watch for issues raised by the hybrid model, e.g., an existing program thinly masked or presented as a self-supporting program, i.e., an Extension program.
- G. 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 reported that she two internal reviewers confirmed and is working on finding external reviewers.

H. 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 reported that she has one internal reviewer and one external reviewer confirmed and is working on finding additional reviewers. She noted initial concerns regarding possible overlap with the CIS program at UC Merced.

I. Proposal for Graduate Program leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Film and Media at UC Berkeley – Lead Reviewer Sharon Farmer (UCSB)

REPORT: Prof. Farmer provided a brief overview of the proposal and reported that she is working on finding reviewers. A question was raised about what actually was or was not previously approved by CCGA, i.e., an existing graduate program with the same curriculum formerly under another department with a different program name. Chair Carmody asked CCGA to review the proposal and letters and decide whether or not this is a review that CCGA can do internally without external reviews.

J. 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 reported that he has received two reviews and that two other reviews are forthcoming.

K. 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 reported by e-mail that he has received 2 external reviews and one internal review and is waiting for a second UC review to arrive. The reviews were generally very supportive of the proposed CIS program. Positives cited were the high quality faculty, which received abundant praise, and the interdisciplinary nature of the proposal, blending computational and cognitive sciences. Based on his read of the proposal there may be issues about the budget and future faculty commitments by the campus administration that he may need to follow-up with the proposers.

L. 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 reported by e-mail that he has three reviews in hand and early feedback from a fourth reviewer. The reviews are very positive about the quality of the faculty and the structure of the program in terms of emphasis areas and course selections. Reviewers appreciated the niche that the proposed program would fill, particularly with respect to religious studies in the UC system. He summarized the main issues raised at this point, the most significant of which concern faculty resources and career opportunities for graduates.

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

REPORT: Prof. Arovas reported that he has conferred with John Hildebrand on John's prior work on this proposal last year and that he has one review on hand and two others reviews forthcoming. He noted an apparent lack of student support as one area of concern.

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

CCGA members will be asked to highlight and discuss important issues coming from their divisional Graduate Councils this year.

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed.

XIII. New Business

There were no new business items.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

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

CCGA 2010-11 Remaining Meeting Schedule:

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