

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 15, 2005**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey*

Chair Lindsey, Council Chair Brunk, and Council Vice Chair Oakley discussed a number of issues facing UC including executive compensation, the UCI liver transplant issue, Provost Greenwood's resignation, and the graduate education task forces. Council Chair Brunk reassured the committee that the graduation education task forces would continue without interruption given MRC Greenwood's recent resignation and appointment of Rory Hume as Acting Vice Provost. Chair Lindsey also proposed canceling the December CCGA meeting, which members agreed to.

DISCUSSION: With regard to faculty compensation, some members argued that the extramural funding or overhead money allocated to research faculty for indirect costs should actually be considered as a contribution to the University (and to graduate education) as these PI's often employ graduate students in their research endeavors. Members also proposed to reformat the meeting agenda to divide the program proposals into proposals that only require updates, and those that will require a final vote/action at the meeting. Analyst Todd Giedt updated committee members on the development of the CCGA website.

ACTION: Members agreed to both proposals: (1) The December meeting is cancelled; and (2) future meeting agendas will subdivide the program proposal into proposals that only require updates and those that require a final vote/action.

II. UC Merced Individual Graduate Program (IGP) Umbrella

ISSUE/REPORT: UC Merced (UCM) Graduate Dean Keith Alley reviewed the IGP authority that CCGA granted to UCM two years ago, and updated the committee on the progress that UCM has made in developing its graduate programs. UCM currently has 37 graduate students and 840 undergraduate students, with a long term goal of reaching a 14 to 17% graduate student enrollment (which is the average percentage across UC campuses). UCM has 56 faculty members, but the campus should have approximately 84 faculty members by the year's end. He mentioned that an ongoing concern is attaining the right mix of senior and junior faculty members. Although the current faculty population is more heavily weighted with senior faculty members, the current recruitment cycle is emphasizing the hiring of junior faculty members to balance out this distribution. UCM currently has 78 active grants and contracts, totaling at about \$15 million, which are even distributed among the three colleges. He noted that IGP was originally conceived as an umbrella authority to initially create new graduate groups and eventually individual graduate programs within those groups. At the current time, UCM does not have any disciplinary-based departments. Instead, it is organized around three schools: the School of Natural Science, the School of Engineering, and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts. A third school, the School of Management, will be established next year, which will remain primarily an undergraduate program for a number of years. The following groups were initially identified under IGP: environmental systems, quantitative and systems biology, world cultures, atomic/molecular sciences engineering, social and cognitive sciences,

and computer and information systems. With the exception of computer and information systems, CCGA has already reviewed the bylaws, policies, and procedures for these groups. For the current academic year, Dean Alley expects that full proposals will be submitted to CCGA for environmental systems and quantitative and systems biology (QSB), and world cultures. He also anticipates submission of the bylaws, procedures, and policies for the computer and information systems group and possibly an “applied math and computational science” group. He specifically requested some flexibility in the termination date of the IGP umbrella authority. While the IGP authority is in place for another two years, he asked for an extension on a year-by-year basis after that point.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the interdisciplinary organization of UCM, and were interested in the reasons why UCM had organized under interdisciplinary groups and schools, rather than along the lines of disciplinary-based departments. Dean Alley responded that the graduate group model was selected on the basis of two elements. First, given the reality of a relatively small number of faculty members, there existed a need to draw from a broader realm of faculty expertise (than would be the case in a single department for example). The second reason was much more philosophical in nature in which UCM founders felt that the development of multidisciplinary approaches was the best way to solving large-scale problems. They thought that the best way to do this would be to organize themselves around these multidisciplinary groups, which they hoped would become one of the hallmarks of UCM. He did add that UCM might eventually (re)organize itself along departmental lines however. Members also asked why UCM decided to develop a School of Management rather than develop other professional programs (in law or other professional areas). Dean Alley explained that this decision was based on a couple of factors. First, the Central Valley is lacking in management skills. Second, UCM received a significant amount of private funding to develop a School of Management. There is also a high demand for business and economic courses across the UC system. He noted, however, that profession programs in engineering will eventually be developed as well. He also mentioned that at this point Education has not been specifically discussed as a field for immediate development.

ACTION: Members agreed that the UCM Graduate Council Chair should update the committee in a year’s time on UCM’s graduate program development in relation to the IGP umbrella authority.

III. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review –Part I

A. Proposal for a Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures at UCSB – *Lead Reviewer Nadine Lambert (UCB)*

Professor Lambert did not have an update for the committee.

IV. Announcements from the President’s Office, Academic Initiatives

ISSUE/REPORT: Consultant Karen Merritt announced that Julius Zelamanowitz will be leaving the position of Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives in March 2006 and he will be returning to UCSB as a faculty member. After Professor Zelmanowitz’s departure, Academic Initiatives staff will be reporting to Acting Provost Rory Hume. She also updated members on the work of current subcommittees. The Allied Health Subcommittee is finishing its work on joint Audiology degrees and proposals for such programs may come to CCGA for review

sometime in the spring. This subcommittee will also be looking at the field of Physical Therapy shortly. A new subcommittee has been formed to address the still outstanding law school proposals from Irvine and Riverside. A membership list will be forwarded to CCGA members.

V. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the October 11, 2005 Minutes

ACTION: The October 11, 2005 minutes were approved with minor edits.

B. CCGA Annual Report

ACTION: The CCGA Annual Report was approved.

C. Discontinuance of the M.S. in Psychology at UCI

ACTION: CCGA approved the discontinuance.

D. Name Change for the Ph.D. in “Library and Information Sciences” to “Information Sciences” at UCLA

ACTION: CCGA approved the name change.

VI. Residency Requirements (SR 694) Subcommittee Update

ISSUE: Bruce Schumm updated the committee on amendments to SR’s 694 and 735, and proposed SR 695.

SR 694

Professor Schumm reported that SR 694 determines residency requirements. SR 694 has been reworded for clarity to reflect that the university extension component is optional. CCGA should be notified if any component of a program is moved from on- to off-campus. On the other hand, legitimate satellite campuses should not be considered “off-site”. Therefore, the wording of the new regulation includes a definition of legitimate satellite campuses.

SR 695

Professor Schumm noted that SR 695 is a completely new regulation, and is designed to outline residency requirements for on-line courses. The wording of the new regulation tries to ensure significant contact time for students. Such time could be in the form of direct face-to-face contact or electronic correspondence.

SR 735

This regulation concerns itself with certificate programs offered through academic departments (not UC extension). Specifically, it is being reworded to accommodate certificate programs that may one or more quarters of study off-site. The current regulation states that certificates offered through academic departments require three quarters in residency. Professor Schumm proposed that the new wording reduce this requirement to only two quarters in residence to accommodate study off-site. However, any certificate program would still require three quarters of total study

DISCUSSION: Members discussed what constitutes on- and off-campus. It was agreed that a site in Singapore would not constitute a satellite campus because there is no “ongoing multi-departmental administrative role” overseeing the site. Members also discussed the concept of contact time within SR 694, and whether it should be required within the context of on-line coursework. It was noted that some competing non-UC on-line programs do not require contact time. Members agreed that this regulation should set a baseline for contact time in on-line

courses, but felt that some material was better suited for on-line coursework than others. Regarding SR 735, members noted that clause E might be problematic in terms of plenary authority in that CCGA “recommends” and does not “approve” graduate programs, according to bylaw 180:

- E. The student has completed a program approved by the Divisional Graduate Council and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs in accordance with their regular reviewing procedures for approval of higher degrees.

ACTION: CCGA unanimously approved SR’s 694, 695, and 735, and voted to send them to the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee.

VII. Independent Course Responsibility

DISCUSSION: Members noted that APM-410-20A deals specifically with this issue, which states that “A Teaching Assistant (TA) is not responsible for the instructional content of a course, for selection of student assignments, for planning of examinations, or for determining the term grade for students. Neither is the Teaching Assistant to be assigned responsibility for instructing the entire enrollment of a course or for providing the entire instruction of a group of students enrolled in a course. The Teaching Assistant is responsible only for the conduct of recitation, laboratory, or quiz sections under the active direction and supervision of a regular member of the faculty to whom responsibility for the course’s entire instruction, including the performance of Teaching Assistants, has been assigned.”

Members noted that “recitation” or “quiz sections” do not exist; instead TA’s are responsible for discussion sections. One interpretation of APM-410-20A is that a TA will not present any new material (or teach a lecture). Therefore, TA’s could be in violation of this when teaching such courses as foreign language or basic writing courses.

ACTION: A sub-committee was formed to address this issue; the committee appointed Al Stralka, Bruce Schumm, and Reen Wu to this subcommittee.

VIII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

B. Proposal for a M.S. in Civil Engineering/M.S. in Urban and Regional Planning at UC Irvine

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Shrinivasa Upadhyaya updated the committee on his review of the proposal. He noted that external reviewers are not necessary as this proposal concerns itself with degrees that already exist. Professor Upadhyaya highlighted a possible overlap between the two individual graduate programs or courses as a potential issue, which he will investigate. He also had questions regarding the length of normative time required to complete the joint degree that the proposal outlines, which he felt might be too short.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed with Professor Upadhyaya that overlap (both content-wise and programmatically) might be a problem.

ACTION: Professor Upadhyaya will contact the program proposers and ask them to address the overlap issue.

C. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Developmental Biology at UC San Francisco for the Ph.D. and M.S. Degree

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Anne Wuerker has sent letters to two external reviewers. She noted that a similar program is well-established and has been active for about 15 years. Under this program, students received a degree in cell biology with a specialization in developmental biology. The proposers would like to keep much of the curriculum the same, however they want to change the degree to a Ph.D. and M.S. in Developmental Biology. They have valid reasons for doing this. There are currently two research programs at UCSF that are in related areas (stem cell research), which would align well with the proposed degree program. She also noted that there are a number of very high-quality faculty members involved with the current program.

ACTION: Professor Wuerker will present the opinions of the external reviewers at the January meeting.

D. Proposal for a Ph.D./M.A. in Education at UC Irvine

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Thomas Patterson noted that UCI is proposing to replace its current joint Ed.D. program (with UCLA) with a Ph.D./M.A. in Education. They also have another existing joint Ed.D. program with the California State University (CSU) system. Professor Patterson highlighted a relative lack of senior faculty members as a possible weakness, which external reviewers may comment on. Letters of review have been requested from external reviewers.

DISCUSSION: Members were concerned with the statement of graduate support. Another issue appears to be an admission requirement of a specific GRE score. On this point, members noted that the California state legislature stated that you cannot reject an applicant on a single criterion. Members also recognized that the department is currently hiring a number of new faculty members, which should alter the current ratio of junior to senior faculty members.

ACTION: Two external reviews are expected by the January meeting and Professor Patterson will report back to the committee at that time.

E. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Music at UC Santa Cruz

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka reported that UCSC already offers a M.A. degree in music as well as a D.M.A. Currently, there are about 20 graduate students enrolled in these programs. The Music department is proposing adding the Ph.D. to the M.A. in music, with a concentration in musicology/ethnomusicology. The current coursework in the M.A. (with the exception of the performance component) would be augmented by additional courses suitable for a doctorate-level program (listed as 250 and 251). The department is also planning on adding one faculty member. Professor Stralka also questioned whether \$7,000 is adequate for library support.

ACTION: Professor Stralka has received one external review and is waiting on a second. He will report back to the committee in January.

F. Proposal for a M.A. in South East Asian Studies at UC Riverside

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab reported that he has already received one external review, and he is expecting three others.

DISCUSSION: Referring to page 23 of the proposal, members noted that it was unclear what the library needed, or what had been promised. In addition, graduate student support is minimal and may need to be strengthened to make this program viable.

ACTION: Professor Chehab will report back to the committee on the external reviews in January.

G. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) Degree Program in Health Law at UC San Diego

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Shawn Kantor reported that this proposal is for a part-time MAS program between UCSD and Cal Western School of Law. Administration for this program will be handled through UC Extension at UCSD. The proposal did not include a set of bylaws; therefore it is unclear at this point how the program will be governed. Professor Kantor has one internal reviewer and he is currently looking for an external reviewer.

DISCUSSION: Members felt that this is more of a regional program and wondered if the local population would be able to support the program. Professor Kantor explained that this is a program principally designed for either lawyers who want to obtain some health care expertise, or for medical doctors who are interested in the legal aspects of health care. Members also discussed the market for this program. One member felt that it was designed for medical students at UCSD and Cal Western law students. However, most members thought that it was primarily designed for working professionals. Members also requested clarification on a certificate (which would seem to be offered through UC Extension), which is mentioned on page 14 of the proposal. Members also had doubts about whether the stated budget would be enough to fund a self-supporting program. Finally, it was unclear whether the faculty listed in the proposal would be teaching the curriculum outlined in the proposal. On that point Professor Kantor noted that the program had recently hired Dr. Leung, who is well qualified to teach courses in the proposed curriculum.

ACTION: Professor Kantor will continue to look for external reviewers; he will report back to the committee on both the external reviews and the issues raised in the discussion above at the January meeting.

H. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Human Development at UC San Diego

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Jutta Heckhausen informed committee members that the proposed Ph.D. in Human Development is an interdisciplinary degree and involves many

different academic disciplines: anthropology, biology, political science, communication, education, human development, linguistics, psychology, and sociology. Although all of these disciplines are listed in the proposal, not all of these disciplines are represented in the list of faculty members provided with the proposal. Another issue is the academic comprehensiveness of the program. Traditionally, human development encompasses conception to death. However, the proposal almost exclusively focuses on child development. She reported that as it stands now, students will complete their main requirements for the Ph.D. within their home departments, except for a set of three core courses in human development and three electives that can be in any of the other disciplines listed above. However, most of the courses listed as possible electives are not actually within the field of human development. Professor Heckhausen has received two internal reviews, of which one is quite supportive of the proposed program while the other criticizes the relatively undefined structure of the program. Letters requesting external reviews have also been sent. Given that the program involves so many different units, a comprehensive set of bylaws will be important.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that comprehensive and clear bylaws need to be established. For example, it is unclear how or where a student would apply if he or she were interested in the program. Members also had the concern that graduates from this program may need a broader background in human development (in order to qualify for teaching positions in academia) than the program in its current form provides.

ACTION: Professor Heckhausen will report back to the committee on the external reviews in January.

I. Proposal for a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Writing at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)

ISSUE: Lead Reviewer Sharrer is still gathering internal reviewers for this proposal. He received another external review, which highlighted program size, fellowship support, and staff support. For example, the reviewer questions whether four faculty FTE can adequately support ten students in the first year of the program. She is also concerned with the areas of study that the program will offer, and whether these areas will align with the interest of the faculty members. Finally, she lists a number of other issues such as the number of required seminars vis-à-vis the number of workshops, outreach, student support, space for graduate students, and the possible inclusion of a teacher training component.

DISCUSSION: Members are still concerned about the future inclusion of new areas of study or concentrations without appropriate CCGA review.

ACTION: Professor Sharrer will submit a final report for the January meeting.

J. Proposal for an on-line Master of Science (MS) in Engineering at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Reen Wu (UCD)

ISSUE: Professor Wu has received two external reviews. One review is generally positive, while the other is critical in the following areas. First, he would like to see more

clarification in terms of the pre-requisites for the program. Second, given that this is an on-line program, he is concerned about the residency requirements. Third, this reviewer is interested in the revenue that will be generated by this program, and how it will be allocated (either towards Ph.D. support and supplemental or overload funding for faculty teaching in the program). Specifically, he raises the question of how contact time will be counted, and whether some of this time would be considered for overload funding (since it may take twice as long to teach these courses on-line, as would be the case in a traditional class room).

DISCUSSION: In regard to contact time and overload funding, members noted that the proposal states that faculty members would be compensated on a 1/9th basis for the first time teaching the course and 1/18th for subsequent times. Members also felt that the design project was not properly explained and wondered if it could be assessed on-line. Other issues of concern included the projected need of the program, the proposed curriculum, and faculty experience in teaching online courses.

ACTION: Professor Wu will send a response to the campus in December and report back to the committee at the January meeting.

K. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and Joint Doctorate in Criminal Justice Sciences (Ph.D.) with CSU Fresno and UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Schumm has sent a review report to the program's proponents immediately following the October CCGA meeting. He noted that the proponents are meeting today (November 15th) to discuss this report. He should have an update at the January meeting.

L. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and the Master of Advanced Study (M.A.S.) Degree Program in Clinical Research at UC Davis

ACTION: CCGA Chair Duncan Lindsey agreed to take this review over. He will try to expedite it for the January meeting.

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