COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday, December 6, 2011
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 12322
Telephone: 510-987-9466
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/

I.   **Chair's Report/Announcements/Updates** – *Chair Rachael Goodhue*
- November 30 Academic Council Meeting
- Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS)
- November 30 Council of Graduate Deans Meeting: Ruth Mulnard (UCI) reported that among the main items discussed were: AB-131 implementation and impact on graduate students; template for voluntary campus disclosure of data for; and the UC Leads program.

II.   **Consent Calendar**
- Approval of the Agenda
- Approval of the November 1, 2011 Meeting Minutes

ACTION: The agenda was approved as modified; approval of the minutes was postponed.

III.   **Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs –**
Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination

VP Steven Beckwith announced that the Provost will convene a joint administrative and Senate work group to examine graduate student funding. He discussed the work group's draft charge which is to look at the adequacy and competitiveness of graduate student support. The group will begin meeting in January and is expected to report its findings by summer 2012. Chair Goodhue suggested first circulating list of questions before staff work starts. He also reported that an RFP has gone out for the second year of UC's HBCU initiative.

Assistant Director Hilary Baxter updated the Committee on the continued collection of CPEC questionnaire and polled members on their thoughts. She will send out an announcement. She also announced that Todd Greenspan has will be temporarily filling in as the Chief of Staff to the Provost. She discussed the last CPEC report which criticized UC's program review process, characterizing it as not responsive to state labor needs.

IV.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership –**
Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair

Chair Anderson discussed the recent student protests, police response and developments to date. He reported on a special teleconference of the Academic Council held on Nov. 20 to discuss student protests and violent response by the police at both UC Berkeley and UC Davis. Council members agreed that a statement should be issued expressing outrage at the display of force by the police, supporting freedom of speech and peaceful protest, and making it clear that the responsibility for providing an environment that allows peaceful protest ultimately rests with the Chancellors.

V. Planning for Discussion with WASC President Ralph Wolff on Proposed Changes to WASC Guidelines – *Chair Goodhue and Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination*

Chair Goodhue and Assistant Director Baxter briefed members and provided an update on proposed changes to WASC guidelines. The committee generated the following list of key questions for President Wolff:

1) *We agree completely with the broader goals of the DQP, that students should receive a broad education covering the 5 areas defined in the DQP. We are wondering, however, if the DQP goes too far in extending? General education? Beyond the freshman and sophomore years, and if in so doing it: would slow down time to degree and dilute the quality of advanced study at the Upper Division and Masters levels?*

2) *WASC question on review of PhD: The PhD is a unique degree title. Its focus is explicitly to create new knowledge, creative avenues, and modes of application of knowledge, and explicitly not to acquire a set of skills spelled out by a pre-determined rubric. Does WASC share this perspective? If not, why not? It seems that there is no intent of having the learning-outcome-oriented rubrics apply to PhD programs. Can you verify that? Also, CCGA is wondering about the evolution of WASC's views on review professional program activity on campuses. Does WASC have an official definition of what constitutes a professional program?*

3) *What is (are) the problem(s) the new guidelines are designed to address? Is there knowledge these problems exist within graduate level training at research focused universities? Should a separate accreditation track be considered for research universities?*

4) *What specific requirements are being considered for Master's degrees?*

5) *We understand that there was at least some discussion of a minimum number of units (30) without allowing for fewer units combined with a thesis or comprehensive examination. Is this discussion headed anywhere?*

6) *Given that the problems WASC seems to be most interested in addressing are primarily with the for-profit segment of higher education, might it make sense to consider a two-pronged approach to accreditation, one for non-profit and one for for-profit institutions?*

7) *CCGA would particularly like to emphasize the unique nature of the Ph.D. degree. Rather than acquiring pre-determined skill sets, the focus of such a degree program is explicitly to create new knowledge, creative avenues, and modes of application of knowledge. Departments and programs oriented toward the production of specialized knowledge thus continuously and rigorously assess students in relation to the concrete goals of each respective degree (in the form of annual reviews, required research presentations, preliminary exams, oral qualifying exams, dissertations and theses and capstone projects, job placement). Does WASC shares this perspective? If not, how does it understand the difference between a Master's degree and a doctorate? Or an undergraduate degree and a doctorate? From our discussion, it seems that there is no intent to apply learning-outcomes-oriented rubrics to Ph.D. programs. Can you verify and assure us that this is the case?*

VI.   Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review
All program proposals are now posted on the CCGA SharePoint site; contact the [committee analyst](#) if you would like a proposal(s) sent to you.

A.   Proposal for a Graduate Program in Computational Biology leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees at UC Berkeley – *Chair Goodhue*

ACTION: Andrew Chisholm was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

B.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. Degree in Computer Engineering at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)*

REPORT: Prof. Schumm reported that he has received one review with two others in process. He plans to follow-up with the proposers on issues raised in the reviews.

C.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Online M.S. Degree in Engineering at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Robert Raffai (UCSF)*

REPORT: Prof. Raffai reported that he has received two external reviews and discussed some of the concerns raised. It was suggested that it would be helpful for CCGA to develop review guidelines for on-line program proposals.

D.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.A. Degree in Accounting, Auditing and Assurance at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Will Shadish (UCM)*

REPORT: Prof. Shadish reported that he has four reviews on hand and passed along his concerns along with those raised in the reviews to the proposers and is awaiting a response.

E.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.A. Degree in Theater Arts at UC Santa Cruz – *Lead Reviewer Rita Raley (UCSB)*

REPORT: Prof. Raley reported that she has four reviews confirmed and is waiting for these to come in. She will draft a summary for the next meeting.

F.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. Degree in Latin American and Latino Studies at UC Santa Cruz – *Lead Reviewer Sharon Farmer (UCSB)*

REPORT: Prof. Farmer reported that she expects reviews to arrive in January.

G.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. Degree in Biotechnology Management at UC Irvine – *Interim Lead Reviewer Rachael Goodhue (UCD)*

REPORT: Chair Goodhue reported on responses since last meeting. She recommended conditional CCGA approval at time.

ACTION: Prof. Goodhue will request that the proposers satisfactorily responding to reviewer's concerns for curriculum revisions (for better coherence and integration); and ask UCPB to comment on the outstanding SSP question.

H.   Proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Energy at UC Davis – *Lead Reviewer Dan Arovas (UCSD)*

REPORT: Chair Goodhue reported that Prof. Arovas has not received anything from the proposers to CCGA's request for information from July 2011.

I.   Proposal for a Graduate Program in Nursing Science leading to the Ph.D. Degree at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Donald Mastronarde (UCB)*

REPORT: Prof. Mastronarde reported that he has received response from proposers to concerns previously raised by CCGA. He has three reviewers confirmed and expects replies in early January. He noted the fairly negative tone of the one review received earlier.

VII.   Systemwide Senate Review Items
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/welcome.html

Systemwide Review of University of California Observatories (UCO/Lick Report) – *Chair Goodhue*

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed the UCO/Lick Report and its possible impact on UC graduate education. The Committee recognized that many graduate students participate in research involving UCO/Lick, including students' dissertation research. Consequently, CCGA members were surprised that graduate education was not even mentioned in the report. CCGA considers the importance of UCO/Lick in maintaining excellence in graduate education in specific fields at the University of California an additional reason for UC to continue to fund it.

ACTION: Chair Goodhue will draft brief letter and circulate to the Committee for comments.

VIII.   UCSF Inquiry: Conversion of D.N.Sc. to Ph.D. – *Chair Goodhue*

DISCUSSION: CCGA discussed the requirements for pursuing conversion. The Committee Analyst will forward to Chair Goodhue and Prof. Ruth Mulnard (UCI) relevant information from the Senate archives, including Senate protocol, if any, for ex post facto degree conversions. Members discussed key questions in need of answers including: a clear comparison of the two degrees (equivalency of requirements at the time approved); the projected number of people possibly affected; rationale; and why now/timing for pursuing the conversion; and whether or not CCGA can sign off on the proposed conversion ahead of/absent a clear policy.

ACTION: Chair Goodhue will draft email outlining CCGA's planned course of action to the Dean of the School of Nursing.

IX.   WASC Guidelines – *Chair Goodhue and Members, Ralph Wolff, President of the Senior College Commission of WASC*

DISCUSSION: CCGA discussed concerns regarding the new WASC guidelines with Ralph Wolff, President of the Senior College Commission of WASC and his colleague Teri Cannon. The main topics of discussion included:

- DQP: Graduate education expansion deleterious to undergraduate and master's study.
  - *Have not adopted DQP; separate from 5 proficiencies (not need to be done as part of graduate education; could be incorporated into program review process).*
  - *Institution to define proficiencies and WASC believes much is already being done.*
  - *Will it slow TTD? No, always been part of requirements; just shifting to UD assessment of proficiency.*
  - *Graduate level? WASC provisions on graduate education need updating and improvement (40 institutions are grad only). Want to look at graduate as well as undergraduate but haven't "filled that in."*

WASC Guidelines *(continued)*

- *Focus on retention/graduation is undergraduate level but also looking at graduate figures – looking for external benchmarking but not filled in at graduate level.*
- *Gathering input about whether master's framework from DQP is appropriate?*
- *Welcome UC input on requisite processes at graduate level.*
- *June goal for having something in place; Commission action in February.*

- What problems Redesign meant to fix?
  - *Higher education pilloried; accreditors part of problem as well as solution.*
  - *Main issues: Don't want feds to set grad rate standard; academic rigor – learning outcomes, meaning of degrees; changing landscape (22 institutions in eligibility and 15 are for profit; IRP process.*

- Multiple tracks – has WASC considered?
  - *Attempting to do that with finances and graduation rates*
  - *Elements of redesign will be expectations for all institutions*
  - *Question on full-time faculty: Vanderhoef anecdote about don't believe you can have quality w/o full-time faculty but willing to let institutions make case.*
  - *WASC held accountable for all institutions so need some commonality of approach as well as some differentiation.*
  - *Comprehensive self study and site visit and apply all standards.*
  - *Open to UC ideas about what would be helpful (2001 revision grew out of UC consultation).*

- Ph.D. learning outcomes oriented rubrics/other directed assessments; professional degree program.
  - *Standards on SLOs apply to all programs (only 2.2a is baccalaureate only)*
  - *Many institutions have rubric for assessing dissertation or culminating experience*
  - *Rubric examples – defined for individual degree programs.*
  - *Trying to move to conversation about what is good learning.*
  - *Never disaccredited nor put institutions on probation for not using rubrics.*
  - *Professionally oriented programs – considering passing tests and employment*
  - *What is the culture that produces Ph.D.? Need UC's help to define – concern about quality of what we're accrediting.*
  - *Professional degree distinction (from research degrees) – some areas are hybrid; professional accreditation often applies.*

- Metrics/systems of accreditation to legitimize disciplinary study.
  - *Not really looked at since WASC doesn't do disciplinary accreditation; rely on institution to hire appropriate faculty; varies a lot with level and program type; WASC doesn't drill down into disciplinary content.*
  - *If institution moves to new degree level, then do ask for syllabi and research agenda (if relevant) and judge whether appropriate capacity.*
  - *How to keep quality current (program review for graduate level programs)? DQP attempting to insert subjective judgments about program quality. Note importance of distinguishing between research Ph.D. vs. professional programs.*

- Timeline: Comments by January 15 on external validation of baccalaureate proficiencies.
  - *Commission did not want to make external validation optional; DQP pilot has different deadline. Even if DQP were adopted, unclear what WASC would do with all text beneath the 5 learning area headings (AAC & UC LEAP outcomes very similar).*
  - *How do we evaluate what degree means? Maintain as pilot? Cannot predict. If don't like DQP, why not like and what would we do as an alternative? Working well for pilot doesn't mean that work well for all (self-selection).*

X. **WASC Guidelines Discussion Debrief** – *Chair Goodhue and Members*

ACTION: Following a short debriefing on the discussion with Ralph Wolff, CCGA decided to send a follow-up thank you letter to President Wolff requesting any further thoughts he might have on the questions raised by CCGA at the meeting as well as his response to remaining questions from the above list.

XI. **Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils and Inquiries from the Divisional Senates** – *Chair Goodhue and Members*

A. UCLA Anderson School Proposal – *Chair Goodhue and Karen Gylys (UCLA)*

DISCUSSION: Chair Goodhue briefed the Committee on the proposal and the issues at hand. Karen provided additional background information. The general sense of the Committee was that it should not be approved because it does not meet UCOP SSP guidelines and Senate conversion standards. Chair Goodhue will to draft broad statement to this effect and circulate it to CCGA for comments; she will also confer with the UCPB Chair to request UCPB comments if ok to do so.

ACTION: Ruth Mulnard (UCI), Donald Mastronarde (UCB) and Chair Goodhue volunteered as CCGA Lead Reviewers.

B. UCSF Inquiry: Local authority to expand an approved graduate *inter-professional* post-bac program and to include graduate *academic* post-bac students (Can this be done administratively or would it require going back and obtaining Graduate Council/ CCGA approval?) – *Chair Goodhue*

DISCUSSION: After rereading the proposal for the original inter-professional post-baccalaureate program, CCGA determined that administrative approval alone is not sufficient to expand it to a program for academic graduate students. The students are in different classes of degree programs with different degree objectives. On the other hand, members were not sure a full review is necessary. If the program proposers are inclined to move forward, CCGA can entertain the possibility of doing an expedited review at the systemwide level. An expedited review would presumably entail resubmitting the professional post-bac application and all associated paperwork along with a justification for why it should be expanded to include academic graduate students. In addition, the timing of the request should be addressed, e.g., why should the program be expanded to academic graduate students now, when it presumably has either not started or has barely started for professional students; and if the program would benefit academic graduate students, why weren't the proposals submitted concurrently?

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA agreed to forward the above comments to the campus.

C. UC Davis Response to CCGA Memo: Status of the Applied Science Engineering Graduate Program – *Chair Goodhue*

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA determined that it had no additional questions or concerns and to inform the campus accordingly.

XII. Student Protests and Police Response – *Donald Mastronarde (UCB), Alan Buckpitt (UCD), André Knoesen (UCD)*

DISCUSSION: UCD Graduate Council Chair André Knoesen, who has been very involved in follow-up discussions at the Davis campus in response to these incidents, provided an update.

XIII. Self-Supporting Program (SSP) Updates

A. UCSF Inquiry: Joint class attendance of students enrolled in a self-supporting program in non-SSP courses offered on the same campus (Is it appropriate for student on campus to sit in the same classroom but pay different fees?) – *Chair Goodhue*

DISCUSSION: At this point in time, CCGA has not developed any policies or guidelines regarding the enrollment of students in SSPs and state-supported programs in the same course. It is quite possible that CCGA will issue guidelines prior to the end of the academic year. The committee is engaged in an ongoing discussion regarding SSPs and their implications for graduate education at UC. At present, UCOP's SSP policy states (in VI.H.) that students may enroll in the same courses "so long as there is separate accounting for the self-supporting and state-supplied costs."

ACTION: After a brief discussion, CCGA agreed to forward the above response to the campus.

B. Subcommittee Report – *Bruce Schumm (UCSC)*

XIV. CCGA Handbook Revision – *Vice Chair Sharon Farmer*

CCGA will discuss revisions to specific sections of the Handbook and what information regarding faculty involved should be included in the proposal.

This item was postponed due to time constraints.

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

Attest: Rachael Goodhue, CCGA Chair
Prepared by Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst

CCGA 2011-12 Remaining Meeting Schedule:

January 3, 2012 – iLinc
February 7, 2012 – 5320
March 6, 2012 – 11326
April 3, 2012 – iLinc
May 1, 2012 – 11326
June 5, 2012 – 11326
July 3, 2012 – 11326