

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting**Tuesday, December 1, 2009****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 Farid Chehab**

- Nov. 23 Academic Council Meeting: Chair Chehab noted an upcoming Council meeting with the three newest Chancellors and Council plans to meet with Regent Gould. The Regents' meeting and student protests were discussed; Council issued a letter in response to the protests. Other regents' actions: approval to resurrect MLK Jr. L.A. County Hospital; advocacy efforts to identify faculty for outreach to the state legislature; the Blue and Gold financial aid program was approved; UC requested \$900M from state; Council issued a letter in response to the protests. Chair Chehab reminded the Provost about CCGA's recent letter regarding new ideas to support graduate education: Interim Executive Vice President for Business Operations confirmed that indirect costs could be used to fund graduate students as proposed by CCGA. It was suggested that CCGA/Council request that UCOP issue a formal statement to the campuses about the use of indirect costs. Chair Chehab will explore this suggestion with Council. Council has asked the President to intervene over a dispute with Chancellor Birgeneau over printing of honorary degrees for WWII internees. It was announced that faculty members at some point will be asked to sign a revised patent assignment agreement with the University. Council supported an exception to the furlough policy for sabbatical faculty. It was determined that CCGA purview of business overlaps with the following Gould Commission Working Groups: Research Strategies; Access and Affordability; and Education and Curriculum. Council also heard an update on UC/UAW Post Doc negotiations. Analyst Eric Zárate will invite Mary Croughan to next CCGA meeting. The President has granted permission for UCSD-SDSU to enter into negotiations on a proposed JDP; a formal proposal is forthcoming.
- Chair Chehab asked members about their interest in having President Yudof attend future CCGA meeting, possibly in the spring to which members responded positively.
- Chair Chehab polled members about meeting in July instead of January; he will assess the amount of business for the January agenda and decide whether or not to modify and/or hold January meeting, e.g., abbreviated meeting by teleconference.
- Nov. 6 PDPE Teleconference: VP Steve Beckwith noted \$150M shortfall needed for graduate student support. He presented a scenario for reducing the gap to \$2M: decrease graduate student enrollment plans by half and increase faculty and research grants. Chair Chehab raised the issue of the cost of hiring Post Docs v. graduate students; VP Beckwith noted that money comes back to system when hiring graduate students, e.g., return-to-aid as an important consideration. Also discussed was whether or not to raise graduate students diversity fellowships to NSF levels; it was decided to leave levels where they are now. Options for simplified graduate University Student Aid Program (USAP) allocations were also considered. Chair Chehab noted that CCGA had previously raised this issue with Kate Jeffery and David Alcocer.

II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the November 3, 2009 Meeting Minutes
- Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed and the minutes were approved with minor modifications.

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

Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Todd Greenspan, Director Academic Planning, APPC

Hilary Baxter, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

Hilary Baxter reported that the Executive Director of WASC has expressed interest in meeting with Academic Council possibly in January or February; WASC is accepting nominations for WASC commission for the two UC representatives. Members contemplated possible motivators for WASC's interest in graduate student learning outcomes. It was suggested that the dialogue would benefit from a better understanding of where WASC is coming from. Another suggestion was for Farid or some sub-group of CCGA to do some fact-finding with WASC in advance of their meeting with Council. Hilary Baxter also volunteered to meet in advance with WASC.

IV. Continued Roundtable on the Value of UC as Research Institution, Graduate Education and Why Graduate Students are Critical to UC – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: CCGA is preparing a document on the value of UC as a graduate research institution. Members put forth a number of supporting statements, namely that University research:

- fosters international cultural exchange and builds cultural capital locally
- drives and conditions undergraduate education and creative endeavors
- [and] creative innovation drives the UC educational mission and fuel California's economy
- defines new knowledge, brings innovation to the market and enriches the quality of life
- is threatened by the shortfall in producing research and professional graduate students
- fosters intellectual creativity and flexibility and critical thinking skills of undergraduates vis-à-vis their hands-on involvement in University research and work alongside graduate student and faculty researchers

DISCUSSION: Members continued their discussion of the larger issues associated with the value UC as graduate research institution. Chair Chehab asked members for feedback on the draft white paper (see handout/Addendum). Members discussed possible solutions and important points to put forward in the letter or accompanying documents. Another suggestion was to invite someone from Communications to consult with CCGA on messaging. Hilary volunteered to look into this.

ACTION: Chair Chehab asked all members to provide examples from their local campus of academic achievements that have contributed to the environment, economy, arts, sciences, humanities, and quality of life in California and beyond.

V. Gould Commission Education and Curriculum Working Group Update – Chair Chehab and UCEP Chair Keith Williams (UCD)

ISSUE: The Commission and its five working groups – on the size and shape of UC, its education and curriculum, access and affordability, and funding and research strategies – will meet through March to consider, among other issues:

- What is the right size and shape of the University going forward? Where should it grow, or should it?
- What educational delivery models will both maintain quality and improve efficiency for UC's future?
- How can UC maximize traditional and alternative revenue streams in support of its mission?

DISCUSSION: Keith Williams, who co-chairs the Education and Curriculum Working Group with Dean Chris Edley, reported that the Working group has met twice and is in the process of narrowing the list of issues to consider. He fielded questions from members on the draft document and noted areas of focus of the Working Group. These include on-line education; methods of delivering curriculum; viability and completeness of curricular offerings on the campuses; what level of quality is UC committed to, what factors are important to quality; and areas for compromise particularly with regard to undergraduate education. Chair Chehab asked if increasing opportunities for graduate students to teach undergraduates was among the issues being considered and what input would be helpful for the Working Group to have from CCGA. It was suggested that the Working Group ought to include a graduate student and a CSU representative. Chair Chehab suggested increasing research training for upper division undergraduates as one way to get more students on a research track. Prof. Williams mentioned that there has been some preliminary thinking about the infrastructure and funding requirements associated with delivering online courses and noted various aspects of pilot studies or projects most attractive to funders. Given that the issues relevant to CCGA are spread across three Working Groups, Chair Chehab asked how they will communicate and collaborate on recommendations. Chair Chehab indicated that it would be helpful to have Prof. Williams to phone-in to the February CCGA meeting. There was a brief discussion on the issue of how fees circulate and cycle within the UC system, e.g., flow of fees when a graduate student is the instructor-of-record. It was suggested that CCGA recommend that the Education and Curriculum Working Group take into account the pedagogy of UC graduate education in their deliberations.

ACTION: No action was taken at this time. Prof. Williams invited CCGA members to send him input directly between now and February.

VI. Systemwide Review: Report of Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency – Chair Chehab and Members

ISSUE: Senate committees have been invited to opine on the final report of the Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency. The Special Committee was convened at the joint request of CCGA, UCEP and UCCC. It examined the use of remote and online instruction both within the University of California, and at other institutions, and developed a set of recommendations to guide UC in the expansion of remote and online instruction, where appropriate. Comments are due to Council by January 15, 2010.

DISCUSSION: Chair Chehab asked members for comments on the report. Members put forth the following: it seems inconceivable that online instruction would not compromise quality of education; the report is only relevant to graduate education insofar as that it might enrich content of undergraduate curriculum; UC should thoroughly vet existing models for on-line instruction in the system; due consideration be given to the niche of students (such as in Executive MBAs) most likely to benefit from online instruction; a distinction be made as to what constitutes UC-quality, i.e., what is the qualitative element? Others cautioned that preserving quality in the delivery of instruction ought not to impede access to or inhibit the future development of online degrees. It was suggested that UC exercise caution about the kinds of degrees that are granted online and CCGA members were generally supportive of “blended” programs rather than entirely online degrees; that no online doctoral program should be offered; that multi-campus seminar courses are most likely to benefit from on line technology; that technology should be user-friendly and ease course development and innovation. With regard to the implementation of a pilot program for online instruction, CCGA members recognized that although the program is primarily aimed towards undergraduate instruction, it should also have some graduate component to it. CCGA recommends that online campus courses be approved by the divisional committee on courses of instruction (COCI) and that systemwide courses be subject to CCGA’s and/or UCEP’s usual review processes.

ACTION: Members agreed to forward the above comments to Council.

VII. Update on Post Doc Negotiations – Chair Chehab and Prof. Jerry Hedrick (UC Davis)

ISSUE: The collective bargaining process formally began in January 2009 when the UAW and UC exchanged preliminary bargaining proposals that in due course will yield a labor agreement covering postdoctoral scholar terms and conditions of employment. Contract negotiations have progressed over the last several months with the last meeting held in October. At this meeting, the University and the UAW “TA’d” (reached tentative agreement) on Union Security, Union Access and Rights, Leaves of Absence, Personal Time Off, and Work Incurred Injury and Illness. The outstanding articles are significant economic issues – Wages and Benefits, and Appointments, Layoff, No Strikes and Duration. The parties last met on October 9 without settlement or impasse. Additional negotiations to be determined.

DISCUSSION: Prof. Jerry Hedrick, who is a member of the UC negotiation team, reported on the on-going UC/UAW Post Doc contract negotiations and described that the current negotiations were at a stalemate, but that communications remain open between the two sides. Some of the outstanding sticking points are on six Articles: Appointment; Benefits; Wages, Duration of Contract; Layoffs; Strike Provisions. He also noted ways in which the contract may potentially change the nature of faculty and Post Doc relations. He noted that UC has not been very successful in conveying its point of view regarding to how specific Articles might discourage faculty from hiring of Post Docs in favor of less costly alternatives. He referred to the Ruth L. Kirschstein NRSA Salary Scale, which applies to the three UC Postdoctoral Scholar Title Codes and lists \$37,368 for a Postdoc with no experience. Prof. Hedrick noted that a small group of postdoctoral fellows at the UCSD campus have initiated a decertification process, as means to end their support of UAW.

ACTION: No action was taken at this time.

VIII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

- A. Proposal for a graduate degree program in Architecture-Based Enterprise Systems Engineering leading to the Master of Advance Studies (M.A.S.) at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Morris Maduro (UCM)**

REPORT: Prof. Maduro was not in attendance.

- B. Proposal for a Ph.D. degree program in Epidemiology and Translational Science at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UC Davis)**

REPORT: Prof. Goodhue reported that she has one reviewer confirmed and requests for several others reviewers in progress.

- C. Proposal for an M.S. degree program in Dental Hygiene at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Steven Nelson (UCLA)**

REPORT: Prof. Nelson reported that he has four reviewers confirmed and a request for one other reviewer in progress.

D. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Nursing Science and Health-Care Leadership at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Ira Tager (UCB)

REPORT: Prof. Tager reported that he obtained five non-UC and two-UC reviews. Five of the reviewers agreed on the need for such a program. He cited the long-term funding restrictions relevant to the program. He noted unique attributes of the program and discussed aspects of the proposal that he found troubling, such as: concerns with the program's academic rigor; commitment of faculty; lack of specificity in core curriculum; mechanisms for evaluation; non-uniqueness of curriculum to nursing science; mentoring and workload implications for junior faculty; stipends for Master's-level students. He shared highlights and overarching concerns from the reviews.

ACTION: Prof. Tager does not believe the program as proposed is ready to be implemented and identified key areas of the proposal in need of response by the proponents. As a next step, Chair Chehab will send a letter to the UCD School of Nursing Dean enumerating the major concerns in the review and will request for a site visit led by Prof. Tager in January. The site visit is aimed at providing guidance and counseling to the proponents in order to improve the quality of the proposed program.

E. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. degree program in Chicana and Chicano Studies at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Jim Carmody (UCSD)

REPORT: Prof. Carmody reported that he has received two reviews and is waiting on two others to complete their program reviews.

F. Proposal for a joint UC San Diego/SDSU Ph.D. degree program in Engineering Sciences (Bioengineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Structural Engineering) – Lead Reviewer Valerie Leppert (UCM)

REPORT: Prof. Leppert reported on progress made in soliciting the requisite number of external reviews and new information gleaned from these. Prof. Leppert commented on the appropriateness and necessity of requesting additional clarifications. Prof. Leppert thinks that there are a few outstanding questions that are worth requesting a response from the proponents (e.g., one letter addressed to the Chairs of each of the three programs).

IX. New Business

• **WASC and Student Learning Outcomes for Graduate Courses – Chair Chehab**

DISCUSSION: Prof. Leppert described her experience on the Merced campus in working with WASC. Other members shared experiences from their campuses and concurred with earlier comments about the intense staff workload associated with providing the data and documentation required by WASC. The main concern expressed was that the WASC process should not drive or impinge on internal data, documentation, and record-keeping requirements. Hilary Baxter suggested that it would be helpful for a subgroup of campus Graduate Council representatives and UCOP Administration to conduct additional fact-finding and to possibly meet with WASC. She will follow-up on this suggestion with Prof. Leppert, et al.

ACTION: No action was taken at this time.

X. Executive Session (members only)

Adjournment:

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

Attest: Farid Chehab, CCGA Chair
Prepared by Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst

CCGA 2009-10 Remaining Meeting Schedule:

January 5, 2010 – Room 5320
February 2, 2010 – Room 12322
March 2, 2010 – Room 12322
April 6, 2010 – Room 12322
May 4, 2010 – Room 12322
June 1, 2010 – Room 12322