

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF MEETING

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2007

I. Chair's General Announcements and Updates – CCGA Chair Bruce Schumm

REPORT: Chair Schumm updated members on the progress of the joint CCGA/UCPB subcommittee on graduate student funding. Although the GSAC report seems to indicate that only \$30 million is necessary to correct UC's chronic underfunding of graduate education, this subcommittee suspects that this is not the case, and that much more will be required. \$10 million was also allocated to graduate education in the 2007-08 budget, but under evolving budgetary constraints, this may have been a one-time allocation. Chair Schumm also briefed members on November Academic Council meeting. The systemwide review of the CCGA/UCEP GSI Memorandum is almost complete; it will be discussed at the December Council meeting. Council members were also concerned over the manner in which the United Auto Workers (UAW) contract with UC's teaching assistants (TA) was negotiated. While no one disputes the value of benefits included in the new contract (e.g., child care for graduate students), members questioned how these benefits would be funded. The lack of appropriate Senate consultation was also raised, but senior management maintained the pace of these negotiations does not always make such consultation possible. Of particular interest to CCGA is the fact that the terms of the contract allow for immediate arbitration of faculty-TA workload disputes by a third party, thereby bypassing the traditional faculty oversight over TA workload issues. While the prospects for the 2008-09 budget are not positive, UCOP is still moving forward with the faculty salaries plan. In light of the prevailing economic conditions, UC is not sure if the Compact with the Governor will be honored by the State; although once described as a floor, the Compact has proved to be a ceiling. UCPB is also drafting an 'Expenditures Report,' which costs-out the Regents' priorities, which The Regents estimate to be \$2 billion in additional funding. UCPB estimates are approximately one billion however. A \$3 million chancellor's compensation plan, which will be reconsidered by The Regents at their January meeting, would bring chancellor's salaries up to market in four years. Steven Beckwith, the new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, has been hired; he will be a CCGA consultant beginning in January. Chair Schumm is expecting the receipt of an external review of the Davis Design proposal, which originally came to CCGA as a 'simple name change.'

II. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic

Initiatives—*Nina Robinson, Director of Policy and External Affairs*

REPORT: Director Robinson briefed members on the campus long-range enrollment planning, which is being driven by the campuses. The State Legislature has asked UC for long range enrollment projections by March 2008. Even though the number of high school graduates is expected to flatten over next couple of years, UC will still ask for funding for reasonable undergraduate growth, as it is expected that the numbers of high school graduates at the upper end of the spectrum will remain constant. UC will also ask for an increase in graduate enrollment funding for both the numbers and proportion of graduate students. The primary argument for graduate funding will be economic in nature, not academic. Indeed, there are studies that show regional economic impacts/benefits from graduate research institutions such as UC. An initial discussion will take place at the January Regents meeting with a follow-up scheduled at the March Regents meeting. The State will provide its feedback to UCOP in budget meetings in April and May.

DISCUSSION: Freshmen applications are peaking this year; they are expected to stabilize over the next couple of years. Merced has witnessed an increase in 15% in freshmen applications and 30% in transfer applications this year. Across the system, California high school student UC participant rates are going up. In the graduate arena, there seems to be a national trend towards ever-increasing levels of professional education. In many professions, the master's degree is being considered as the new bachelor's degree. However, data shows that UC lags behind both the CSU and private universities in terms of the proportion of masters degrees awarded in California. It may be within CCGA's interest to draft a policy brief on this topic, but UCOP is not making any policy recommendation at this time. Members remarked that it would be useful to have some kind of policy direction with regard to the growth in master's programs. CCGA was also interested in 1) whether the allied health fields (including public health) are represented in the enrollment planning; and 2) if there is a sense of where growth in graduate education should take place? Director Robinson responded that the allied health fields are included in a number of campus growth plans; beyond that, there are probably five or six categories or fields where growth will be concentrated. A survey of earned doctorates at research universities across the nation showed that there were significant increases in science and engineering this past year. Although UC is often emulated around the world, it is at risk of losing its investment in higher education, which is another argument that UC is making to the State Legislature.

ACTION: CCGA will continue to monitor this issue.

III. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans—*Gale Morrison*

REPORT: As a group, the Graduate Deans meet three times per year. One of the more important issues being considered this year is a revision of the 'in-absentia' leave policy; a concrete policy will go to the Council of Chancellors soon. At issue is the fact that graduate students cannot afford to remain enrolled when they are abroad doing research, so they usually take research leaves. As a result, they are not being counted in the graduate student head counts. This policy will cost a couple of thousand dollars per student (a certain percentage of the registration and the education fees); individual campuses will decide which portions/amounts of the fees that graduate students will pay. Another issue is the renegotiation of the graduate student health insurance policy (GSHIP); GSHIP costs have been rising. Dean Morrison confirmed that while \$10 million did go towards graduate education, it must be matched on the campuses. A further \$10 million has been allocated for the 2008-09 budget. Finally, she reported that the National Research Council (NRC) Assessment's deadline of February 15th has been pushed back to the spring.

DISCUSSION: Dean Morrison commented that a portion of the \$10 million appropriation towards graduate education was allocated on the basis of how many students paid non-resident tuition (NRT). NRT may return to the campus of origin, but it does not represent new money for graduate support. Chair Schumm said that the CCGA/UCPB subcommittee is looking toward the GSAC report as a starting point for the development of graduate support funding model. Multi-year fellowship packages are not being offered on campuses as a general rule (with a few exceptions). NRT works against increasing the number of multi-year fellowships. Chair Schumm expressed interest in the mechanism behind the allocation of marginal cost of instruction (MCOI) funding; specifically, the mechanism by which MCOI funding is reduced when a domestic student is exchanged for a non-resident student. On a related topic, Dean Morrison reported that the final version of the 2007 Graduate Student Support Survey is out.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will send the 2007 Graduate Student Support Survey to members.

IV. Consent Calendar

- A. Approval of the Agenda
- B. Draft Minutes of the October 2, 2007 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar.

V. NRT/Graduate Funding – *Chair Schumm*

ISSUE: Chair Schumm commented that the executive summary's claim (of the GSAC report) that only \$27 million of new funds is necessary is probably not correct; the actual price tag would be closer to \$122 million. However, much of this would be a redirection of funds. The CCGA/UCPB subcommittee is aiming at updating this report; it will be discussed with the chancellors at the joint Council/Chancellors' meeting in March. Chair Schumm will work directly with a chancellor to develop a consensus, and make a joint presentation at that meeting. Chair Schumm would also like to develop some sort of implementation plan as well.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked the report assumes that UC can grow its way out of the graduate student funding crisis through simple enrollment growth funding. However, the problem is that even if UC grows its graduate student numbers, the actual shortfall only increases. The GSAC report basically asks campuses to reallocate current resources towards graduate education. A funding model should address this. Members asked Dean Morrison how the initial reduction in NRT was handled/processed for doctoral students who reached candidacy; she will look into this. The gap in graduate student support versus competitive growth also needs to be separated out. The funding gap should also be differentiated from enrollment growth. Specific proposals should be developed to address these issues separately. The report's second recommendation (that fees be frozen at current levels) may also pose a conflict with the Master Plan, which states that "when possible, fees should decrease." There is also a bill in the State Legislature that proposes to cap fees (SB 81). Dean Morrison added that one element that needs particular attention is the campus matching issue (for the \$10 million allocation to graduate education). Some campuses have had to rely on private endowments because they are simply unable to redistribute resources to provide the match. Thus, the increased private funding of graduate education has been one unintended consequence of this policy. Chair Schumm is unaware if the subcommittee will be able to identify funding sources; most likely they will provide more of a 'road map' for future funding. Fellowship sources are also decreasing, which needs to be considered. Compared to private institutions, where there is a significant endowment base from which to draw from, UC must make the argument that it must provide an analogue for this stable base in the form of State funding. As a case in point, UCSF's graduate funding is almost entirely based on external NIH funding, which is very unstable in the short-term. Another tenet of the report is the assumption that NRT undermines extramural funding, a portion of which is used to pay the NRT, which is often used to fund other parts and activities of the University. The GSAC report was also criticized for 1) assuming that UC can grow its way out of the graduate funding gap; 2) lacking a proposal that commits a block of funding providing a stable source to make up for the competitive lag in graduate funding; and 3) lacking a proposal to grow graduate programs going forward. The CCGA/UCPB memo should address competitiveness in the short term; a second plan is needed that addresses rational growth for graduate programs, along with a strategy to maintain competitiveness, with regards to stipends in the future. CCGA may also want to articulate where NRT should be directed. Chair Schumm clarified that CCGA cannot dictate to campuses on what they should spend their money on however. Dean Morrison added that separating out the NRT issue from these other issues might be useful. Chair Schumm closed the discussion with the statement that an articulation of principles is important at this stage.

ACTION: CCGA will continue to study this issue.

VI. Remote/Online Instruction Update – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Chair Schumm briefed members on the ‘dialectic’ paper that will go out to divisions; it is designed to stimulate discussions on the campuses.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that under the ‘Interaction with Faculty’ section (p. 3), adding a sentence that addresses the determination and definitions of the equivalencies of direct and indirect contact for on-line instruction, as well as quantifying them, would be a useful. Another comment concerned how residency should be determined for on-line course work. Specifically, the question was asked to what extent should residency be tied to the campus of instruction, and to what extent should it be tied to UC more generally? This is especially relevant for systemwide courses, and even EAP courses.

ACTION: Members approved the ‘dialectic’ paper, but requested a March 15th deadline.

VII. Academic Masters Degrees in a Research Setting – Chair Schumm

DISCUSSION: It was pointed out that having a cadre of students in self-supporting masters’ programs may serve as a stabilizing force for some departments; they could also be complimentary to existing Ph.D. programs. One key question is the number of UC masters programs relative to its competitors. Foreign students are often willing to pay for UC masters programs, as UC has a name abroad that sells itself. While it is not common for first-year graduate students to teach undergraduates, they can do so if needed. Distinguishing UC master’s programs from CSU programs is crucial. Towards that end, UC may want to concentrate on areas that the CSU does not specialize in. UC’s ability to provide an integrated research environment is an important argument for developing its own unique master’s programs. While CCGA could endorse the principle that master’s programs are desirable, it should be argued that these programs must have a clear and coherent relationship to existing programs and UC’s mission more generally. Another question is how the State Legislature will view the perceived competition with the CSU in masters programs. Certificate students could also be encouraged to enroll in related master’s programs; and master’s programs could be used as mechanisms to bring students into doctoral programs. While the points above were cited as benefits to developing new UC masters programs, it was noted that some professors may object to teaching masters students, as opposed to Ph.D. students. One option available to CCGA is a white paper that outlines the relevant principals involved in developing UC master’s programs. It should also address the relevancy of UC masters programs in the current educational environment. The obvious recipient of this memo would be the Academic Council, but it may be useful to request a faculty survey of this issue as well.

ACTION: Chair Schumm will draft a letter for CCGA’s consideration.

VIII. UCLA Proposal to Transfer the Women’s Studies Curriculum to the new Women’s Studies IDP – Chair Schumm

DISCUSSION: Members expressed support. It was moved and seconded to transfer the Women’s Studies curriculum to the new Women’s Studies IDP.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the transfer of the Women’s Studies curriculum to the new Women’s Studies IDP

IX. Discontinuances/Disestablishments—Chair Schumm

- A. UCB Discontinuance of MA in Greek
- B. UCB Discontinuance of MA in Latin
- C. UCLA Disestablishment of the Interdepartmental Health Economics

DISCUSSION: Members clarified that this is really an incorporation of the MAs in Greek and Latin into one MA in Classics. However there is no evidence that the Berkeley Graduate Council reviewed this. Berkeley's Graduate Council's next meeting is February 2008. Professor Tager will report back to CCGA on the Graduate Council's comments in February or March. Members also approved the Interdepartmental Health disestablishment at UCLA, which CCGA approved only a couple of years ago.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will inquire about the status of the UCB Greek and Latin discontinuances (if they have been forwarded and reviewed by the Berkeley Graduate Council). Members also approved the disestablishment of the Interdepartmental Health Economics at UCLA.

X. Systemwide Senate Review of the Report of the University of California Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Chair Schumm noted that CCGA should concentrate on the graduate implications of this review.

DISCUSSION: One member noted that the review report proposes to double the number of graduate students involved in EAP. Although EAP has traditionally been viewed as an undergraduate enterprise, there is a small, but significant, graduate student cadre at EAP sites in Paris and Mexico City, where they not only conduct research but also participate in teaching assistantships, which are supported by Divisional deans. EAP also offers opportunities for graduate research elsewhere and could develop this capacity further. Going forward, especially in the area of global health, EAP could provide a mechanism by which students learn local languages and travel to research sites, given an appropriate funding model. Members agreed that efforts need to be undertaken to bridge the gap to make the EAP graduate enterprise more active. Research opportunities for UC faculty also exist. Eligibility for faculty sabbatical leave should be considered as a model for such opportunities, especially for faculty in the liberal arts and social sciences who typically do not have access to large grants that can support these kinds of activities. Members also acknowledged that the minority report correctly observes that the review does not pay attention to the particular needs of graduate students. The University needs to think carefully about what it takes to adequately support graduate students who are conducting research abroad, which is not limited to only archival research. Indeed, EAP Study Centers could be used as points of access for such research activities. Members also discussed how this review relates to the 'in-absentia' policy. It was noted that EAP would like its graduate students to come under the 'in absentia' policy, but this needs to be further evaluated.

ACTION: Chair Schumm/Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a comment letter for review at the January or February meeting.

XI. Certificate Programs – Farid Chehab

ISSUE: Vice Chair Chehab presented his draft of a CCGA proposal on graduate academic certificates (GAC), which would require a CCGA review and approval if the following are true: 1) GAC is not a UC Extension Program; 2) GAC is a stand-alone program that is not part of a graduate M.S. or Ph.D. program; 3) GAC has been reviewed and approved by the Divisional

Graduate Council; 4) GAC has an independent admissions process; 5) GAC carries a minimum of 3 quarters (or 2 semesters) residency requirement; 6) GAC registers the students with the Graduate Division; 7) GAC awards a diploma that is signed by the President of the University and carries the official seal of the University of California. CCGA would assign a lead reviewer, who would solicit at least one additional review that could be either internal or external depending on the nature of the certificate program. CCGA will not retroactively review existing GACs.

DISCUSSION: It is unclear how many certificates currently exist in the system. Chair Schumm emphasized that an independent admissions process is the most relevant criteria for CCGA review. Defining a stand-alone program by itself can be problematic (without looking at its admissions process), so this is not necessary the only criterion. For example, if a department offers a Ph.D., masters, and a certificate, and the certificate accepts students not only from its own masters/Ph.D. programs, but also external applicants, then this would be considered a ‘stand-alone’ program. The certificate should not require its students to be enrolled in another UC graduate program either. Certificate programs should also require its students meet the requirements of the graduate division, and register with the respective graduate division. Another issue is that of certificate courses that cannot be counted towards a degree. In other words, some certificate programs do not allow courses taken in the program to count towards a higher degree. The final draft may want to consider such scenarios as well. Finally, it was observed that certificates differentiate themselves from masters programs through the absence of a capstone requirement.

Policing the official seal is another issue that CCGA may want to look into. Indeed, some campuses/programs are not aware of the difference between the official and non-official seals.¹ In order to enforce this regulation, one would need to obtain a list of those in violation of using the official seal when the unofficial seal should be used instead. Members were divided on this issue, but the suggestion was made that CCGA could bring this issue to Council’s attention. Generating an accurate list of violators is a necessary first step before any decision can be made on policing the use of the official seal. Chair Schumm proposed that the guidelines should contain two sections—one that provides a definition of GACs, and the other that establishes review criteria and processes for new GACs. Members also suggested that any existing certificate program that would like to use the official seal would need to submit a one-page proposal demonstrating the particular program’s compliance with CCGA’s GAC guidelines and requirements.

ACTION: Dean Morrison will poll the Graduate Deans on the number of certificates in existence in the UC system; Vice-Chair Chehab will present a revised memo at the January meeting.

XII. Setting Conditions for Professional Degree Fee Increases Proposal—Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Chair Schumm asked for feedback on the relevant points that should be discussed in a CCGA memo on this issue. The memo will essentially be a statement of principals

DISCUSSION: If self-supporting programs are treating differently in terms of data collection (as CCGA’s initial inquiries seem to indicate), then CCGA should request that this oversight be addressed.

¹ The official seal contains the words, “Seal of the University of California,” which are located on outside border of the seal. The unofficial seal only uses “The University of California” on the outside border.

ACTION: This issue will be placed on the January agenda.

XII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Film & Digital Media for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Shrinivasa Upadhyaya (UCD)

ISSUE: Professor Upadhyaya remarked that this is a strong program overall and it seems to be well-supported on the campus. The curriculum will be revised as the program goes forward; it seems that the curriculum development will be cognizant of the review comments. He noted that the program still requires 108 units of coursework however; it was his recommendation to change that requirement to approximately 70 units. The proposers' justification for the 108 unit requirement is that it falls in the middle of Santa Cruz's unit requirements for all graduate programs. It was also clarified that the 12-unit requirement can be satisfied by research at Santa Cruz. One external reviewer expressed the point that support should be extended for the entire length of program (six years), however Professor Upadhyaya believes that the support package is fairly reasonable by UC standards (four years support with two quarters of guaranteed teaching assistantships). In its early review, CCGA pointed to the lack of a written dissertation as one weakness of the program; however, the new proposal clearly requires a written dissertation.

DISCUSSION: One member asked how integral the new curriculum is to the program. Professor Upadhyaya responded that some reviewers expressed the concern that some courses were somewhat narrow in scope. That said, should CCGA ask the proposers to submit course descriptions and identify faculty who could teach these before formal approval? If this is only a minor concern, this requirement would be unreasonable. Professor Upadhyaya will stress in his report the importance of developing these new courses, but CCGA cannot enforce it after approval. The program was moved for approval, which was seconded.

ACTION: Member unanimously approved the program. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a final report based on Professor Upadhyaya's last letter from June 10, 2007.

B. Proposal for a Master of Science in Global Health Sciences at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Ira Tager (UCB)

ISSUE: Professor Tager reported that he has sent out inquiries for external and internal reviews.

ACTION: This proposal will be placed on the January agenda.

C. Proposal for a Master of Science in Environmental Policy & Management at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Patricia Springer (UCR)

REPORT: Professor Springer reported that she has received two external reviews but not any internal reviews. Based on these initial reviews, she believes that another external review, as well as a site-visit, is warranted. One major issue concerns the faculty who will actually teach the courses, as the proposal is not clear about which faculty will teach which courses and which faculty will be doing research. The hiring of four new FTEs is noted in some places in the report, but the proposal is not entirely clear about their specific purpose (either teaching or research). Another issue is the one-year intensive nature of the program, which one reviewer observed is not very practical.

ACTION: This proposal will be placed on the January agenda.

D. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Visual Studies for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Michael Hanemann

REPORT: Professor Hanemann has received responses from two external reviewers; the proposers will be responding to CCGA's questions/concerns soon.

ACTION: CCGA will continue to monitor this proposal; it will be placed on the January agenda.

E. Proposal for a Masters of Public Health at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab

REPORT: Professor Chehab reported that he has received three reviews. All three support the program. However, they point out that the one-year program is too condensed. However, the option of completing program in two years is available. One reviewer felt that the practicum is simply too heavy; the practicum would not need to be so heavy if the student already has some experience in public health. Another criticism is that some of the courses are not geared towards public health (e.g., the statistics course), but are designed more for medical students. The depth of the curriculum is still another concern. Finally, it was noted that higher level courses are needed.

DISCUSSION: Members advised that students entering the program directly from a BA/BS degree should not be accepted into the one-year program. These types of students need the depth of a two-year program. If the one-year program does remain, it should be reserved for students who have some experience in public health. The depth of the epidemiology courses is another concern; these courses must be more advanced, especially for students who have already taken the more basic epidemiology courses. Offering only basic courses will not attract the best students either.

ACTION: Professor Chehab will send a letter listing CCGA's questions/concerns to the proposers.

XVI. New Business: DPT/Master's in Physical Therapy Issue

ISSUE: UCSF has both a DPT and a joint master's program in physical therapy. It wishes to disestablish the master's program because the doctorate is the new licensure requirement for this profession of physical therapy. The DPT is a stand-alone program; it is not combined with any master's program.

DISCUSSION: Members opined that the UCSF Senate needs to consider the disestablishment of the master's program; it would need to send a proposal to disestablish the master's program to CCGA. A re-review is not required. CCGA has already approved the stand-alone DPT program.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m

Attest: Bruce Schumm, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Attendance 2007-08

Key: X = In attendance, -- = Absent, Alt = Alternate attended

		10/2/06	11/6/07	12/4/07						
MEMBERS:										
Bruce Schumm, Chair	Santa Cruz (Physics)	X	X	X						
Farid Chehab, Vice Chair	San Francisco (Laboratory Medicine)	X	X	X						
Ira Trager	Berkeley (Public Health)	X	--	X						
Matthew Farrens	Davis (Computer Science)	X	X	X						
Tyrus Miller	Santa Cruz (Literature)	X	X	X						
Mark Machina	San Diego (Economics)			--						
Janice Reiff	Los Angeles (History/Statistics)	X	X	Alt						
Anne Kelley	Merced (Natural Sciences)	/	X	T						
Patricia Springer	Riverside (Botony and Plant Sciences)	X	X	X						
Elizabeth Watkins	San Francisco (Anthropology)	X	X	X						
David van Dyk	Irvine (Statistics)	X	X	X						
Kenneth Rose	Santa Barbara (Engineering)	X	X	X						
Michael Brown (ex-officio)	Chair, Academic Council	X	--	--						
Mary Croughan (ex-officio)	Vice Chair, Academic Council		X	--						
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:										
Patrick Linder	Graduate, UCR	X	X	X						
Katherine Warnke-Carpenter	Graduate, UCI	X	--	X						
GUESTS:										
Donald Brenneis	Santa Cruz (Anthropology)	X								
Nina Robinson	Director of Policy and External Affairs			X						
Robert Dynes	President	X								
Carol Copperud			X							
ALTERNATES:										
Catherine Constable	San Diego (Geophysics)	X								
Lowell Gallagher	Los Angeles			X						
CONSULTANTS:										
Maria Bertero-Barceló	Exe. Dir., Academic Council	X	--	--						
Suzanne Klausner	Prin. Analyst, Acad. Initiatives	X	X	X						
Joyce Justus	Interim Vice Provost, Educational Relations	X	--	--						
Gale Morrison	Council of Graduate Deans (UCSB)			X						
STAFF:										
Todd Giedt	Committee Analyst		X	X						
Michael LaBriola	Committee Analyst	X								