

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

## Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, November 7, 2012

10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

UCOP Kaiser Center, 300 Lakeside Drive, Oakland – Room 1217

Primary Dial-In: 1-866-740-1260 | Passcode: 9879466

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>I. Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates – *Chair Ruth Mulnard*

- **October 24 Academic Council Meeting:** Items of particular interest to CCGA that were discussed include: the BOARS' Report on Comprehensive Review; the UCFW briefing on total remuneration for faculty; the Negotiated Salary Trial Program; the Systemwide initiative to establish a composite fringe benefit rate for each campus; the Proposed 2013-14 University Budget; the affect of Proposition 30 on funding streams and how cuts would be proportionally distributed should it fail.
- **Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Task Force:** Provost Dorr has convened a work group to revise the PDST policy and develop implementation guidelines. The group has significant student representation. One issue to be deliberated and which fall within Senate's purview, is *how to define a professional degree*. Others include *what are appropriate comparators* and *what constitutes adequate consultation*. We hope to make the document a policy document and develop separate implementation guidelines.
- **Academic Planning Council:** The APC will be convened in November and will discuss updating the President's Policy on Self-supporting Graduate Degree Programs to better reflect the types of proposals that are being received and possibly revising the *Compendium* to resolve discrepancies between it and the APM regarding the appointment of directors of MRUs, among others.
- The CCGA Handbook has been revised for 2012-13 to reflect changes approved last year by CCGA. The new version has been uploaded as a PDF file on the CCGA SharePoint site.
- Council of Graduate Deans: Ari Kelman (UCD) has volunteered to represent CCGA at COGD this year.

## II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the Agenda
- Approval of the Meeting Minutes of October 10, 2012

**ACTION:** The agenda and minutes were approved with minor corrections.

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

*Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director*

*Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

**Pamela Jennings** provided updates on the UC-HBCU and ongoing work on establishing pathways to careers outside academia for UC graduate students.

**Hilary Baxter** reported on UC Davis's concerns with the data review process and the content of the WASC initial panel report. This draft report highlights details of the narrative but provides no substantive comment about the considerable strength of the rates presented. In a couple of cases, the panel notes are simply incorrect. She shared highlights from a recent letter sent from Provost Dorr to the WASC President with regard to concerns over communication and the Commission's organizational capacity given the scope of its current agenda, magnitude of work demands and internal restructuring. The letter very clearly states our support for certain elements of the new accreditation model as well as the gravity of problems we see at this point. The University believes WASC should retain flexibility for institutions to determine how best to demonstrate student achievement – whether that achievement relates to the competencies or to the meaning of degrees. The Commission should frame the questions that institutions must address but should not circumscribe the answers. It is the prerogative of faculty to determine both the form and substance of these answers. UC agrees with calibrating to some degree the depth of reviews based on the relative strengths or challenges evidenced by financial and retention/graduation data submitted and distinguish among institutions through reviews of varying levels and duration, addressing greater effort to those that present greater cause for concern. The University also agrees that institutions, rather than WASC, should be responsible for articulating the meaning of degrees, setting rigorous standards, choosing assessment methods and defining success.

### **IV. Review of the UCOP SSP Policy Guidelines and the CCGA SSP Review Guidelines and processes – Chair Mulnard and Members**

DISCUSSION: Chair Mulnard provided a brief historical overview of the issues considered by CCGA in crafting the *Guidelines for Senate Review of New Self-supporting Graduate Degree Programs* in the context of the administration's revision of the *Policy on Self-supporting Graduate Degree Programs and Implementation Guidelines*.

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

*All program proposals are posted on the CCGA SharePoint [site](#); contact the [committee analyst](#) if you would like the proposal(s) e-mailed to you.*

#### **A. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. degree in Games and Playable Media at UC Santa Cruz – Chair Mulnard**

**ACTION**: *Martin Olsson (UCB) was assign as Lead Reviewer.*

**B. Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Art History at UC Riverside**  
– *Lead Reviewer Joseph Nagy (UCLA)*

REPORT: Prof. Nagy provided an overview of the proposal and shared some preliminary concerns having to do with the void left by the recent departure of the lone faculty member that specialized in a key area of the proposed program; unclear nature of dedicated faculty, i.e., those not-holding joint appointments with other departments; curatorial prospects outweigh rather than academic ones in current job market and more data is needed; and the questionable need for a third Ph.D. in Art History program in the UC system.

**C. Program for an M.S. in Healthcare Administration and Interprofessional Leadership at UC San Francisco** – *Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)*

REPORT: Prof. Schumm provided an overview of the proposal and discussed the Plan II aspect of the program, i.e., the comprehensive exam option and how it dovetails with the blended-nature of the curriculum and the needs of the non-traditional target audience. He has two Nursing School Deans from UC lined up as reviewers and faculty from the University of Michigan and the University of Washington. He notes some concerns with some requisite missing budget/financial information from the SSP proposal and with the unresolved discontinuance /conversion of the older existing program by the same name.

**D. Proposal for an Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Dynamical Neuroscience at UC Santa Barbara** – *Lead Reviewer Andrew Chisholm (UCSD)*

REPORT: Prof. Chisholm reported that he has received two reviews from Stanford and UCSD which are both are positive. He is awaiting a third (and last) review from MIT before he can complete his review and make a recommendation to CCGA.

**E. Proposal for a Master in Bioengineering (M.Eng.) Program at UC Berkeley** – *Lead Reviewer Mike Vanderwood (UCR)*

REPORT: Prof. Vanderwood reported that he is confident that we can finish this up by the December meeting. He noted that it took almost three months before he received a list of possible reviewers from the proposers after a month trying to find them on my own; he also sent at least three e-mails before receiving any response from the proposers. He also had two reviewers back out after they had committed, and one that keeps pushing his date back. He will be contacting the proposers with some follow-up questions next week and hopes that the final review does not add a substantial amount of additional issues.

**F. Proposal for a Self-supporting Master of Finance Program at UC Riverside** – *Lead Reviewer Donald Mastronarde (UCB)*

REPORT: Prof. Mastronarde reported that the revision had just been received before the last meeting and that he is working with the proposers to provide guidance on what elements of the proposal need to be revised prior to submission. He is also working on soliciting two additional external reviews.

**VI. Updates/Inquiries from the Divisional Senates – Chair Mulnard and Members**

- A. Los Angeles: Proposal from the Department of Community Health Sciences to departmentalize/transfer the M.S. and Ph.D. school-wide degree programs to the department – Joseph Nagy (UCLA)**

**ACTION:** *CCGA voted unanimously to accept the proposal from the Department of Community Health Sciences to departmentalize/transfer the M.S. and Ph.D. school-wide degree programs to the department. Committee members found that the campus review meets all of the conditions that would normally trigger a Systemwide review and does not feel the need to review the proposal any further.*

- B. Berkeley: Proposed Discontinuance of the Berkeley-Columbia Executive M.B.A. Program – Martin Olsson (UCB)**

**ACTION:** *CCGA voted unanimously to accept the proposal from the Haas School of Business to discontinue the Berkeley-Columbia Executive M.B.A. program. Committee members found that the campus review meets all of the conditions that would normally trigger a Systemwide review and does not feel the need to review the proposal any further.*

**VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership –**

*Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair*

*William Jacob, Academic Council Vice Chair*

*Todd Giedt, Associate Director (SharePoint demonstration)*

**Chair Bob Powell** discussed the upshot of the passage of Proposition 30 on UC's budget and institutional well-being. He also discussed the system of "composite" benefit rates in place on some campuses that will eventually spread Systemwide. There has been considerable push-back from both the administration and the faculty to this system.

**Todd Giedt** provided a brief demonstration of and orientation to the CCGA SharePoint [site](#).

**VIII. Systemwide Senate Review Items – Chair Mulnard and Members**

- A. UCOE Copyright and Licensing Agreements Presented to Faculty Developing Courses for UC's Online Education Program – Bruce Schumm (UCSC)**

**DISCUSSION:** considered the Online Instruction Pilot Project Agreement developed to codify the contractual agreement between the Regents and faculty developing online curriculum under the UCOE pilot program. The committee found the proposed agreement which, like the program itself, oriented towards the development of online undergraduate curriculum, and as such, has little bearing on graduate education. However, if at such time, similar developments should materialize in the graduate arena, CCGA respectfully requests that it be afforded the opportunity to opine about prospective revisions to the agreement and its attendant policy particularly with regard to the distinct aspects of the relationship between faculty members, graduate students and the University that could be affected by these policies.

**ACTION:** *CCGA agreed to incorporate the above comments in its response.*

**Systemwide Senate Review Items (continued):**

**B. Proposed Pilot for a Negotiated Salary Plan – Joseph Nagy (UCLA) and Divy Agrawal (UCSB)**

**DISCUSSION:** CCGA discussed the Proposed Trial Program for the Negotiated Salary Plan to be implemented at UCLA, UCI and UCSD, pending approval and agreement between the Divisional Senate and administration on those campuses. CCGA generally concurs with some (though not all) of the concerns that were raised by the various reviewing agencies during the Systemwide review of the previously proposed APM-668. The committee is particularly disappointed however with the task force report's lack of any requisite measures to mitigate and monitor the many concerns that were raised. In view of those omissions, CCGA members strongly recommended that extensive data and metrics be tabulated progressively during the four-year trial period. At such time the data becomes available, CCGA respectfully requests that it be afforded the opportunity to independently review and access this information particularly with regard to the impact of the general campus negotiated salary trial program on graduate student research funding support and faculty retention.

**ACTION:** *CCGA agreed to incorporate the above comments in its response.*

**C. Report of the Rebenching Budget Committee – Kwai Ng (UCSD) and Donald Mastronarde (UCB)**

**DISCUSSION:** CCGA considered the Report of the Rebenching Budget Committee. The committee supports the idea of developing a more transparent and equitable process for allocating funds received from the state of California to the campuses and believes that the policy of rebenching is an important step towards achieving that goal. CCGA agrees that the adoption of rebenching will set a clear benchmark for the equal distribution of state funding across different UC campuses and a transparent mechanism for resolving many of the historic concerns associated with this issue. However, committee members expressed concerns on several issues, some of which were only briefly touched upon in the report. A list of these concerns follows:

- **Feasibility of the rebenching proposal.** The central recommendation is that every campus should receive \$15M of state funds, plus extra on a per student basis at the level now received by the campus with the highest level of funding among the eight campuses included in the mechanism, i.e., \$6,413 per weighted student (UCLA). The report recommends a “waterfall” method for the distribution of new state funds in which campuses currently receiving an amount higher than the Systemwide average level of per-student funding would receive less new state funding. CCGA believes an upsurge in new state monies is critical to carrying out rebenching and for achieving a clear benchmark for the equal distribution of state funding across different UC campuses. However, the latest reduction of state funding as a result of the 2008 financial crisis and the ensuing economic downturn is just the latest episode of a long and gradual retreat of the state's financial support of public education. It is common knowledge that state-supported per-student-allocation within the UC system has dropped 60 percent since 1990. Given the well-documented trend, it is overly optimistic to presume that substantial ongoing new funding from the state will be made available for the purpose of rebenching. It is more realistic to assume that state funding will continue to decline in the foreseeable future.

**Systemwide Senate Review Items (continued):**

- **Possibility of downward rebenching.** If the existing level of state funding continues to decline, the report recommends that cuts should be distributed “in alignment with the goals of rebenching.” What does “distributing cuts in alignment with the goal of rebenching” mean? If it means that the University would be forced to adopt a lower benchmark for all ten campuses, then campuses that currently receive higher per-student funding are likely to face deeper cuts than campuses currently with lower per-student funding. Implementing deeper cuts on the budgets of selected individual campuses is likely to disrupt the operations and planning already under way on these campuses. It will also be demoralizing to the individual campuses concerned. CCGA believes that further studies of the ramifications of downward rebenching should be conducted.
- **Imposing drastic budgetary cuts imposed on particular campuses within any short timeframe.** CCGA urges the President to exercise his discretion to avoid such measures.
- **Outstanding issues that significantly affect the outlook of the rebenching policy.** Special arrangements for the Merced and San Francisco campuses and the distribution of state funding for student financial aid will need to be separately negotiated. Enrollment policy (percentage of graduate students on a campus, percentage of non-resident undergraduates) will have a significant role to play in the way rebenching actually affects the campuses and UC as a whole; these issues remain to be addressed.
- **Other queries about the rebenching proposal.** First, the determination of the multipliers of one [1] for undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, graduate professional, and graduate academic master’s students, two-point-five[2.5] for doctoral students, and five [5] for health sciences students lacks justification. For example, why not award a higher weight to master’s degree students or upper division (junior and senior) transfer students from community colleges? The allocation of weight should reflect the admission goals of the UC system. Second, the rebenching target value of \$6,413 per weighted student is simply expressed in current market value terms. The model developed (Appendix A) does not adequately take into account the effect of inflation during the proposed six-year period. The amount of new state funds actually required to achieve the stated target of \$6,413 reflected in 2012 dollars is likely to be higher once projected inflation is factored in.

**ACTION:** *CCGA agreed to incorporate the above comments in its response.*

## **IX. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils – Chair Mulnard and Members**

*CCGA members were asked to highlight and discuss important issues coming from their respective Graduate Councils this year.*

Merced: *Prof. Leppert discussed how the practice of soliciting internal reviews and including these with the submission of a program proposal would be particularly advantageous to Merced. This segued into a discussion of various ways in which CCGA can help the campuses in preparing stronger proposals and resulted in the suggestion to for CCGA to send a letter to the divisional Graduate Councils calling their attention to the newly revised 2012-13 CCGA Handbook and to request their assistance in advising departments to use this latest version as well as to point out there is a great deal of built-in flexibility and latitude inherent to the review of new programs and multiple opportunities to interject themselves – at any point – in the local portion of the review process.*

Riverside: *Prof. Vanderwood raised a question about the lack of uniformity in the list of people who CCGA communicates with on the campuses with regard to the transmittal or communications on proposals.*

Santa Barbara: *The review of APM-430 and the open publication policy are focal issues.*

Santa Cruz: *Discussions are ongoing about how to increase the increasing the proportion of graduate students overall from the current 6% to 12% at UCSC, online education and on the rights and responsibilities of graduate students.*

San Francisco: *One issue of concern is the misperception of the Graduate Council's pro-forma role with regard to approving program proposals.*

Berkeley: *The final version of Graduate Council Statement on the Review of Online Degrees will be issued very shortly.*

San Diego: *The question posed last month is one that is likely to resurface with some regularity, (i.e., Whether or not a proposal from an approved MAS degree program that is requesting subsequent approval for allowing degree requirements to be satisfied in full by off-campus graduate study require CCGA review in addition to divisional Graduate Council approval?). Chair Mulnard advised that if the case in question doesn't rise to the level of CCGA review, then decision campus should make exercise its purgative to make those decisions within its purview. Note: UCR&J is still working on revision of SR-694 and Eric will check with Martha on the status of the review.*

Irvine: *The campus is discussing program learning outcomes from WASC review; how to assess graduate learning outcomes; how to optimize performance of by identifying early-on students likely to fail; pathways to careers outside academia.*

Los Angeles: *The Graduate Council is considering revising the UC regulation on the upper limit on combined GSR and TA units (currently 18 units at UCLA) and possibly fine-tuning policies regarding in-absentia leave policies for visiting scholar graduate students (VGRs).*

Davis: *The Graduate Council is focused on program reviews, SSPs, and WASC; formalizing of the parental leave policy for graduate students; and the adoption of a new campus budget model (legacy to incentive-based budgeting) and metrics for the allocation of block grant funding.*

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Attest to: Ruth Mulnard, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Eric Zárate, Principal Committee Analyst

**CCGA 2012-13 Remaining Meeting Schedule:**

December 5, 2012 – 5320 Franklin  
January 2, 2013 – 11326 Franklin  
February 6, 2013 – 12322 Franklin  
March 6, 2013 – 5320 Franklin  
April 3, 2013 – 5320 Franklin  
May 1, 2013 – 5320 Franklin  
June 5, 2013 – 5320 Franklin