UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE**
COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Tuesday, December 2, 2008
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320
Telephone: 510-987-9466   Fax: 510-763-0309
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/

I.   Chair's Report/Announcements – *Chair Farid Chehab*
   • November 24 Academic Council Update
      – UCRP employee contributions commence in July 2009; a still to be determined issue is the amount of the employer contribution.
      – Issue of enrollment was growth addressed by the Regents; the President is working on an enrollment plan; UC is overenrolled by 10,000 students.
      – New draft 2009-10 UC Budget Request includes $10M allocation for graduate student support; if approved, it would constitute new funds; there is resistance from some the campuses to effectively "tax" themselves; how to incorporate accountability into future reports will be a future subject of discussion.
      – Council approved the UCR Anderson School of Management Reconstitution contingent on: 1) the provision of faculty FTE and 2) its reconstitution as a school, not as a college. Also, UCPB, in its review, had asked CCGA to consider a few issues as well.
      – CCGA comments on President's Accountability Framework were submitted to Council.
      – Council had no major concerns with the QB3 Review.

II.   Consent Calendar
   A. Approval of the Minutes from the November 4, 2008 Meeting
   B. Approval of the Agenda

   ACTION: The agenda and minutes were approved with minor modifications.

III.   Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs
   Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
   Carol Copperud, Strategic Planning, Programs, and Accountability
   Suzanne Klausner, Strategic Planning, Programs, and Accountability

   REPORT: VP Steven Beckwith joined the committee in a discussion on graduate support funds. He commented that putting accountability measures in place are preferable to UCOP attempting to micro-manage the campuses; Carol Copperud noted that the Chancellors are also entering into a new relationship with the President with respect to accountability and that the campus EVCs will be generating new strategic reports on a number of accountability measures and short-term strategic objectives, of which graduate student support is a priority across the board. One member asked if there are plans to measure the delivery of academic support. VP Beckwith also announced that his office is in the process of figuring out the appropriate level of support for graduate studies within the Office of Research and Graduate Studies and that he is working with the President to restore funding for the AGAP program which is in jeopardy due to mismanagement by the NSF.

IV.   Graduate Support Letter to President Yudof via Chair Croughan – *Chair Chehab*
   ISSUE: Council Chair Mary Croughan has asked CCGA to identify targets for the President's initiative to distribute the $10 million dollars to graduate students and to add accountability to the

allocated funds. Members are also asked to 1) review the enclosed list from the Graduate Student Association and to come up with definitions for what ought to be included or excluded from graduate student support; and 2) review the student fee audit report which can be viewed online at [http://ga.berkeley.edu/~tech/gsa/].

DISCUSSION: Chair Chehab suggested that CCGA should stay away from "tags" and asked members for other ideas for how to add accountability and transparency to allocate graduate support funds. He shared some initial thinking on how to spend the $10M, including full or partial off-setting registration fees for graduate students. Some members felt that it would it be more useful to come up with global recommendations in the form of priorities as to what would have the greatest impact for graduate students; others commented that there are going to be different priorities on the campuses. Chair Chehab noted that we need to come up with the list of priorities, e.g., TAs and fellowships, registration fees. Others cautioned against generating recommendations that resemble a "policing" model. Several members suggested that we recommend that the Graduate Deans/Councils issue an annual report to Council on how graduate funds are spent.

ACTION: Before agreeing to continue this discussion at the January 6 meeting, the committee agreed to recommend that the Graduate Deans/Councils issue an annual expenditure report to Council on how graduate funds are spent. Committee members agreed to ask their local Graduate Council for input 1) on prioritizing how to allocate any new funds; and 2) on the reporting back of that money. Members were asked to email their findings to Chair Chehab/Analyst Zárate before the next CCGA meeting.

V.   **Proposed Policy on Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate/ Professional Degree Programs** – *Chair Chehab*

ISSUE: The Provost has requested that the Senate review a proposed policy on Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate/ Professional Degree Programs. It appears that these programs were initially envisioned as part-time programs for working adults but a number of these part-time programs are full-time programs with unclear access for working adults. Members are asked to review the draft background paper prepared by Academic Affairs for CCGA.

DISCUSSION: Chair Chehab thanked Ami Zusman, Carol Copperud and other staff members for their work on the paper. Carol Copperud provided some background on the paper. Chair Chehab asked what is expected from CCGA and if the charge for CCGA is to rewrite/revise the policy. She suggested that CCGA could elect to: 1) advise on the revision and identify academic issues; 2) recommend to the Provost that a joint Senate/Administrative task force be charged with the task of revising the policy; or 3) task a subcommittee of CCGA members to work on the revision with Carol Copperud. The committee discussed issues raised by the paper (p.24) including: disallowing co-mingling of funds for self-supporting and state-supported programs; eliminating "part-time" from the definition of a self-supporting policy; what distinguishes self-supporting from state-supporting programs; ethical considerations for public vs. private/for-profit entities; criteria for name changes; implications for revisions to the Compendium. Chair Chehab suggested the need for written policies/Senate regulations to guide the review of self-supporting programs and feels that these should be reviewed by CCGA. Alternately, Todd Giedt suggested that CCGA could also choose to explicitly state that the current policy/regulation mandating CCGA review applies to self-supporting programs (along with any new programs).

ACTION: Chair Chehab will ask Council for input on how to proceed, e.g., forming a joint task force vs. tasking a CCGA subcommittee.

VI.   **Academic Certificates Memo** – *Chair Chehab*

ISSUE: Before deciding to carry over this discussion from the last CCGA meeting, the committee recommended that non-conforming GACs (to SR735) be remanded to the campuses along the lines of Berkeley's draft guidelines. CCGA will discuss whether to rewrite SR735 to include the types of certificates that CCGA wants to review.

DISCUSSION: Chair Chehab suggested that following the Berkeley model (while sound) would create a double-standard for non-SR735 programs and that the regulations ought to apply to both types of programs. He suggested that requiring certificate programs be reviewed by CCGA. This might possibly require writing a new regulation, e.g., SR736, as well as revising SR735. Members expressed concern with the potential workload for CCGA, given that we have no idea of the potential volume. Chair Chehab noted that unlike our normal program reviews, that this would involve an expedited, abbreviated type of review (for these types of certificate programs, e.g., not stand-alone or parenthetical emphasis-type programs) and that CCGA would review non-free standing, non-compliant programs on an ad-hoc basis. Other questioned CCGA's motivation for taking this on and the value of invoking an additional layer of review (Graduate Council and CCGA). Chair Chehab suggested that some non-SR735 compliant programs could opt for review by their local University Extension in lieu of Graduate Council review.

ACTION: The committee voted (9-0-0) to require that 1) all SR735-certificate programs new and existing (those with independent admissions process, stand-alone graduate programs) be reviewed and approved by CCGA; 2) non-SR735-compliant certificate programs be reviewed and approved by the local Graduate Council and Divisional Senate. CCGA will draft a letter to Council for approval and dissemination to the campuses.

VII.   **Update on Proposal for a New School of Nursing at UC Davis** – *Chair Chehab*

ISSUE: The committee's discussion in November resulted in suggestions to:
–   Appoint a lead-reviewer in advance of receipt of revised proposal in order to meet the January 28 Council meeting deadline
–   Line-up reviewers in advance and be ready to send out letters
–   Send this out for external review (though not customary for the review of School proposals)
–   Consider doing an internal review in lieu of an external review; possibly by the UCSF School of Nursing
–   Bear in mind previous consultation on 1-year M.P.H. degrees obtained by CCGA
–   Members are asked to review the revised proposal which can be viewed online at: [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/ucdavisschoolofnursing.11.19.08.pdf]

DISCUSSION: Chair Chehab briefed the committee on the proposal and some of the factors behind the aggressive review timeline. He suggested that CCGA might want to focus its review on the graduate group and establishment of the school. Chair Chehab noted that he found disconcerting UCD's plans to offer a Ph.D. in four or five years-time and felt that this was not in-line with other Ph.D. programs at UC. CCGA's recommendation is due by the January Council meeting. Chair Chehab noted that he has contacted the Dean for the UCSF School of Nursing about doing an internal review and is awaiting a response.

ACTION: John Sutton (UCSB) was appointed as Lead Reviewer.

VIII.   **Proposed Program Name Change: Bioinformatics M.S. and Ph.D. to Biomolecular Engineering M.S. and Ph.D. at UC Santa Cruz** – *Chair Chehab*

ISSUE: The UCSC Graduate Council has requested that CCGA determine the proposed name change of the Bioinformatics M.S. and Ph.D. to Biomolecular Engineering M.S. and Ph.D. at UC Santa Cruz meets the criteria for a "simple" name change, where the campus decision is final.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed issues associated with the name change including: whether or not this is a "simple" change; significant change in emphasis or addition of emphasis relative to the original proposal. Members commented that it appears that the department was misnamed from the start and that the proposed name accurately reflects the current situation. Members generally supported the name change but acknowledged that due to the convoluted nature of the program's evolution, the proposal suggests that this is not entirely a "simple" name change. Chair Chehab suggested that we ask UCSC for additional information and that the proponents provide a comparison of the old and new programs.

ACTION: Analyst Zárate will draft a letter for Chair Chehab to UCSC that states based on the information provided, CCGA was not able to adequately assess whether or not the merging of the two fields constitutes a "simple" name change; and request that the proponents provide: 1) a side-by-side comparison of the old Bioinformatics and the new Biomolecular Engineering graduate programs with detailed information on present and proposed courses including instructors and supporting courses; 2) a description of proposed curricular changes and field integration; 3) changes in faculty FTE; and 4) confirmation of local academic program review of the Bioinformatics program in its current form.

IX.   **Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review**

A. **Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program in Evolutionary Biology between UC Riverside and San Diego State University** – *Chair Chehab*

    ACTION: Lowell Gallagher (UCLA) was appointed as Lead Reviewer.

B. **Proposal for a Master of Science degree program in Science and Technology Studies in Medicine at UC San Francisco** – *Lead Reviewer David Bates (UCB)*

    REPORT: Prof. Bates shared highlights from the proposal and reported that reviewers are confirmed from Brown and M.I.T., UCI, and UCSD and that these are due later this month.

C. **Proposal for an Interdepartmental Graduate Program leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Materials Science and Engineering at UC Riverside** – *Lead Reviewer Jim Carmody (UCSD)*

    REPORT: Prof. Carmody shared highlights from the proposal and reported that reviewers are confirmed from UCB and UCLA; he is working on finding two external reviewers.

D. **Proposal for a Master of Advance Studies degree program (M.A.S.) in International Relations at UC San Diego** – *Lead Reviewer Liz Watkins (UCSF)*

    REPORT: Prof. Watkins was not in attendance; she reported by email that she has received four of five reviewer letters and will work on her summary report the January CCGA meeting.

E. **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 shared highlights from the proposal and reported that she is working on finding reviewers.

F. **Proposal for a M.S./Ph.D. degree program in Technology and Information Management at UC Santa Cruz** – *Lead Reviewer Jang-Ting Guo (UCR)*

REPORT: Prof. Guo reported that he is waiting for reviews to arrive from Stanford, George Mason, UCSD, and UCSB.

G. **Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Management leading to M.A./Ph.D. degree at UC Riverside** – *Lead Reviewer Sue Carter (UCSC)*

REPORT: Prof. Carter was not in attendance; she reported by email that she is waiting for reviews to arrive in time to discuss at the next meeting.

H. **Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Computational Science, Mathematics, and Engineering leading to M.S. degree (Computational Science) at UC San Diego** – *Lead Reviewer Andre Knoesen (UCD)*

REPORT: Prof. Knoesen shared highlights from the proposal and noted that he now has the correct version of the proposal in hand. He reported that reviewers are confirmed from Princeton and UCD and that he is working on finding two other reviewers.

I. **Proposal for a Ph.D. degree program in Management at UC San Diego** – *Ken Rose (UCSB)*

REPORT: Prof. Rose gave an overview of the review process to date and summarized the key issues that were identified in the reviews: 1) the class size is too small to be fragmented into even smaller specialty areas as proposed, with implications on critical mass of students for advanced courses, for intellectual interaction, etc; 2) the financial support package is not competitive enough to attract top students to the program; 3) the faculty size may not be sufficient to carry the teaching and supervision load beyond the early phase, given the number of courses and steady state enrollment; 4) the interdisciplinary objectives of the program may represent pitfalls in coursework requirements (to match the necessary breadth) and course design (to cover the everyone's interests in an heterogeneous class); and 5) the "Management Science and Strategy" specialty area is too broad to be considered a focus area. After reviewing the response from the proponents to each of these, he felt that the main concerns were satisfactorily addressed and recommended that CCGA approve the proposal at this time.

ACTION: The committee voted (8-0-1) to approve the proposal.

J. **New Proposal for a Master of Professional Accountancy degree program (M.P.Ac.) at UC Berkeley** – *Glen Mimura (UCI)*

REPORT: Prof. Mimura gave an overview of the review process to date and summarized the key issues that were identified in the reviews and the response from the proponents to these. Two of the reviewers were highly supportive of the proposal moving forward – one with comments for improvement – while two were more measured in their responses, one primarily highlighting matters needing clarification and one expressing multiple concerns both minor and major. There were substantial concerns with regard to the curriculum, how specific courses overlap with similar undergraduate offerings, and in particular with the capstone project and internship. A question came up as to whether or not a student can receive academic credit for a position where they receive compensation; Prof. Mimura will find out. He recommended that CCGA ask that the proponents address these concerns before rendering a final decision.

ACTION: The committee concurred with Prof. Mimura's recommendations. He will request additional information from the proponents as outlined above for consideration by CCGA at its next meeting. Prof. Mimura reported that all reviews were now in and that he is preparing his summary report for the January CCGA meeting.

X. New Business

XI. Executive Session (members only)

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

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