

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 5, 2006**

**I. Chair's Announcements**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Vice Chair Schumm reported that both SR 694 and 695 have passed Academic Council and are now out for systemwide review. Chair Schumm said that the 'restrictions on tobacco funding' issue seems to be fading as an important issue this year. He reminded members that earlier this year, The Regents asked Academic Council to re-examine this issue in light of academic freedom. Council subsequently decided that it is ultimately up to The Regents to decide, to which the Regents responded by requesting that the Senate provide a recommendation. Since then, however, the Regent most interested in the issue has left the Board of Regents. He also announced that there will be a meeting between the executive vice chancellors (EVCs) and the Academic Council in April (April 20<sup>th</sup>). Vice Chair Schumm suggested that members submit questions, which the EVCs can answer at this meeting. Other announcements from the Academic Council included no increase in graduate student fees (buy-out) and no change in non-resident tuition (NRT); however the state legislature must still approve this. In the recent November elections, Proposition 1D (the facilities bond initiative) passed with more than 57% of the vote.

Post Doctoral and Professional Education Task Force

Both Vice Chair Schumm and Chair Wu are members of the Post Doctoral and Professional Education Task Force (PDPE). Vice Chair Schumm reported that the PDPE is has recently looked at the projected need for training nurses in California, and it has concluded that the State is 'factors' below in terms of producing enough nurses to meet state need (from both public and private universities). He added that it will be difficult for UC to fulfill its share of this projected need in nursing (there is a dearth in nursing instructors). A related structural issue is that the average income of nursing instructors is lower compared to the average income of nurses working in the field. The Regents have initially approved the establishment of a medical school at UC Riverside. UCR has been given approval to hire a founding Dean, and a final proposal is planned for submission to The Regents by the end of the year. He also provided an update on the allied health fields. In anticipation of the professional certification standard in audiology being raised to an applied doctorate, the five current CSU masters programs in audiology will be decreased to three, and agreements have been reaching with these remaining three programs to partner with UC. He also reminded members that there is already an existing joint professional doctorate in audiology between UCSD and San Diego State University. PDPE will be evaluating options for physical therapy next. CSU currently has 250 students enrolled in eight physical therapy programs; there is one existing joint degree program (UCSF/San Francisco State). PDPE is considering whether to follow the same path as that used in audiology, or to simply cede the physical therapy doctorate to CSU. Regarding the joint Ed.D. programs, all but three CSUs are pulling out of the joint degree programs and are establishing their own independent programs. PDPE is producing a report that stresses this as an opportunity for UC to become a leader in Ed.D. programs with an emphasis on leadership, special education, and early childhood. Other areas of expertise could include English as a second language, executive education, and program assessment (executive education is considered to be at the level of District, rather than single-

school, leadership.). There is also the possibility that the California Institute for Educational Leadership organizational research unit (ORU) might be upgraded to multiple research unit (MRU). A PDPE report on interdisciplinary programs and how to foster these programs is due to come out in January. He also reported that new review criteria are being developed for the National Research Council's (NRC) assessment.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed developing questions for the spring EVC meeting. One path could be through the respective graduate councils with input from the Council of Graduate Deans (COGD). While members agreed that NRT is a significant issue, it might be good to couch it within the larger issue of graduate student support. Members discussed drafting a list of items/questions and developing them over email. Besides NRT, other issues include systemwide financing needs of graduate student education, competitiveness, the role of graduate education in the University's mission. Members remarked that the level of support on the campus is very heterogeneous—many divisions don't agree on the levels of support needed. The Davis member mentioned that his division's 'Academic Planning and Development Committee' has recently produced a report/survey (that he will send out to members), which polled the Davis graduate group chairs (86 graduate groups with over an 80% response rate) on a number of issues, including NRT and graduate student support packages. The general availability of graduate courses is another problem. Students are often encouraged to advance to candidacy early because of the NRT. Another member raised the issue of the increasing choice of post-doctoral fellows over graduate students in research because of their relative lower cost. Graduate student support should also not vary by field. In order to implement such a policy, there would need to be strong campus support; the EVCs would be one such constituency. Members noted that many of these issues fall under the general category of competitiveness. Some members asked if the EVCs have enough control to close the competitiveness gap. While all of these issues are important, Vice Chair Schumm stressed that NRT is looming very large in the competitiveness picture currently. He suggested separating it out as a separate stand-alone item.

Finally, Members briefly discussed the PDPE issues. Members remarked that graduate groups often administer interdisciplinary programs; unfortunately these graduate groups often do not receive adequate resources to run these programs effectively over the long term. Problems can also ensue when graduate groups want to become departments because they need to take faculty out of other departments. Departments may approve the existence of graduate groups as long as additional resources are not directed towards them (and away from the departments). The Berkeley member said that he would circulate a Berkeley report on graduate groups from several years ago.

**ACTION:** Members will consult with their respective Graduate Councils to develop a list of issues to bring to the EVC meeting for the January meeting. At this point, members listed graduate student support, NRT, competitiveness, and cost-effectiveness, reinforcement of the role that graduate students play in the UC research/California economy, and external fund raising for graduate education. The Davis member will send out the results from the survey of graduate groups recently conducted on his division. The Berkeley member will send out a Berkeley report on graduate groups.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

### **A. Draft Minutes from the November 7, 2006 Meeting**

**ACTION:** Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

### **B. CCGA Draft Correspondence Regarding the ‘Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees’**

**ACTION:** Members approved the draft correspondence.

## **III. UC/CSU Joint Graduate Board**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Carol Copperud, Acting Director of Academic Planning and Budget, made a presentation on the reformation of the CSU/UC Joint Graduate Board. She began by noting that this group has been inactive since January 2004; a meeting of the Board will be convened once UC membership is established. The agenda at that meeting will be transactional in nature; the Board needs to approve the joint physical therapy degree between UCSF and CSU Fresno. She remarked that the Joint Ed.D. Board is actually an offshoot of this Board; it has been meeting at least once a year. Traditionally, one of the primary roles of this Board was the approval of joint programs, however discussions will be held on some of its other functions. There are definitely political and academic justifications for the Board. Regarding academics, the allied health field could be discussed by the Board. Promotion of joint programs is another responsibility of the Board. Regarding UC membership, Carol handed out the current UC Board members (see distribution item 1). She remarked that the membership is representative of both expertise (health sciences) and graduate affairs. She asked for nominations for the one remaining UC slot on the Board.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked about the Board’s approval process for joint degree program proposals. Carol responded that CSU does not have a counterpart to CCGA, so the Board gives the CSU a chance for input on the joint degree programs; but more importantly, it can promote joint degrees. While the Board has never rejected a joint degree program altogether, it has sent some program proposals back for further revision from time to time. Members surmised that this Board fills two gaps-- the lack of a CSU ‘CCGA’ and a position/person at CSU that systematically evaluates these programs both politically and academically. Members felt that CCGA should be represented on the Board, but an advisory subcommittee should be established for special programs and issues, which could draw upon CSU faculty. However, other members cautioned that this would delay the approval process. CSU is supposed to provide a lead reviewer for program proposals, but it has not really happened in the past. Vice-Chair Schumm cautioned that although CCGA is the last ‘expert’ word; joint degree program proposals should still go to the Board, as this provides the only formal opportunity for system-wide input from CSU. Finally, members suggested that the Board could call for an assessment of the way in which joint programs are working, and in which areas future joint programs should be developed.

Members nominated Quentin Williams or Paul Heckmann (UCD) for the remaining UC membership slot on the Board. Other possibilities included naming someone from the Joint Ed.D. Board. They stressed that there should be a connection with graduate education at both CSU and UC. Representation from UCSF may also be helpful. CSU membership includes a number of graduate deans and faculty senate representation.

**ACTION: Members nominated Quentin Williams (UCSC) and Paul Heckmann (UCD) for the UC/CSU Joint Graduate Board.**

#### **IV. UC Merced Graduate Group in Biological Engineering and Small-Scale Technologies (BEST) Review**

**ISSUE:** The Merced alternate provided an update to the interim-individual graduate program (IGPP) approval umbrella. CCGA approved the IGPP in 2003, which allows UCM to establish graduate programs prior to the hiring of a critical mass of faculty. The emphasis of the IGPP has been on proto graduate groups. The driving factor for the graduate group in biological engineering and small-scale technologies (BEST) is the hiring of a number of new faculty in this area. Other existing graduate groups are not sufficient to accommodate these new faculty members and/or graduate students in this area. As Merced does not have teaching assistants in engineering, there is no natural home for these students. It is envisioned that this will eventually become a bio-engineering group, but it would also be able to develop programs in materials engineering, etc.

The graduate group would like to admit students by next fall. There is core of five faculty members and two planned hires in the near future, along with affiliated faculty as well. While critical mass for a specific bio-engineering degree has not been reached yet, the basic framework has been to offer a couple of common courses for all graduate students, along with specific courses depending on demand. There is a School of Engineering, which offers undergraduate degrees; however, there is not a graduate department of engineering.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the approval process for the IGPP. Analyst Todd Giedt reminded members that the umbrella authority is in force for at least one more year with the possibility of extension after that. Members wanted to know if the group was well-designed and if there were sufficient resources to support it. Members debated the appropriateness of conducting an external review at this time (as well as instituting CCGA's formal reviewing process on UCM); however, in the end they agreed that an extensive review would not be appropriate. The Merced alternate pointed out that the plans for the bio-engineering thread bring that thread further towards eventual initiation of a department than those of the other graduate threads at Merced. They also wondered about a future threshold to begin conducting full-fledged reviews of UCM program proposals. One member suggested that such a threshold might be the number of FTE faculty. Members also encouraged UCM to start programs in bio-engineering, as this is a growth field.

Members also provided input on the proposal. They identified the critical questions as funding, courses, and the specialization of the program. The UCM representative clarified that the initial focus will be on nano-bioengineering, and the course descriptions are currently being reviewed. Members pointed out that the program needs to be consistent with Type 1 and Type 2 masters programs. Members also pointed out that the part of the proposal that states that students would not receive any more than 12 units in one semester is in error. In masters programs, students often take 16 units per semester or quarter. Another issue is the requirement that students publish at least one article in a peer-reviewed journal; the problem is that the proposal later contradicts this statement. It should be made clear whether this is actually a requirement. They

added that a distinction should be made as to whether the committee can decide if an article is ‘of publication quality’ (rather than simply requiring students to publish in a journal).

**ACTION: The committee continues to support the IGPP; and asked that UCM report back in another year on IGPP.**

## **V. Guidelines for Ed.D. Program Reviews**

**ISSUE:** CCGA has received feedback from UCI, Paul Heckmann, and Harold Lavine. Vice Chair Bruce Schumm said that a two-year grace period will be added back into the proposal. Language will also be added that states that any program that wishes to shut down, it must go through the standard discontinuance procedures.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the possibility of shutting down Ed.D. programs, which would be a discontinuance that would need to be approved by CCGA. Members also thought it prudent to ask for some evidence on how a particular program is meeting its goals. To that end, members remarked that after the two-year grace period, all three-year reviews of these programs should have been completed; sequentially they should be sent to CCGA as part the re-review process. Members also agreed that in class 2 re-reviews, reasons/justifications should be provided as to why the program needs to be changed. However, if a campus only makes a minor change to a program, then it would not need to be forwarded to CCGA. Members also agreed that this proposal should be specific to only joint Ed.D. programs (and not expanded to all joint degree programs). Members will decide if these guidelines will go into the CCGA handbook at the January meeting.

**ACTION: Vice Chair Schumm will incorporate the changes; it will be placed on the January consent calendar.**

## **VI. UC Irvine Italy Agreement (MOU) Update**

**ISSUE/UPDATE:** At the last meeting, members charged the UCI alternate to find out if this MOU could be changed to comply with Senate regulations. However, based on his research on Senate regulations, the UCI alternate claimed that this MOU is actually in compliance with those regulations that govern residency. He stated that Senate regulation (SR) 682 establishes the residency requirement of at least one year in residence for a masters program except for what is provided by SR 694. If the student meets a number of other conditions, SR 694 states that not more than ½ of the residency requirement can be taken off-campus in off-campus programs (in other words, one semester or 1.5 quarters). He remarked that in the UCI MOU, 2/3 of the residency requirement is met.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the interpretation of SR 694, and whether it should be sent to UCR&J. The issue is whether ½ of the residency requirement is the minimum residency time (one semester or 1.5 quarters) for off-campus programs, or if ½ of the total time is the residency requirement (one year). Although members were inclined to approve the MOU, they also decided to ask UCR&J for an interpretation of SR 694; a cover letter will be added to the January consent calendar.

**ACTION:** Members unanimously approved the MOU as being consistent with SR 682 and SR 694. Vice Chair Schumm will draft a cover letter (addressing the interpretation of SR 694), which will be on the January consent calendar.

## **VII. Certificate Programs' Subcommittee Update**

**ISSUE:** The subcommittee chair provided a list of tasks for the subcommittee. These include (1) establish a process of review for new certificate programs; (2) review or not to review existing certificate programs; (3) a review the use of the UC seal for certificate programs; (4) communicating the new guidelines and procedures to the divisions; and (5) select a new subcommittee chair (as the current chair is only serving as a CCGA alternate).

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the use of the UC seal in certificates. One member clarified that SR 732-734 address the use of the UC seal in certificates. According to these regulations, the UC seal is not supposed to be used in conjunction with most certificate programs; the use of the President's signature is allowed however. The only type of certificate that can use both the seal and the President's signature is a special certificate given to undergraduate honors' students. Other certificates include a certificate given to foreign international students who take courses at a UC campus (this one does not even carry the President's signature; only the dean signs it), as well a certificate given to graduate students for the 'completion of a graduate curriculum' (which carries the President's signature, but not the seal). Another substantive issue is the regular review of already-established certificate programs. The subcommittee chair said that he would add this to the list above.

**ACTION:** Analyst Todd Giedt will conduct background research for the subcommittee; the subcommittee chair will send the charge of the subcommittee to the analyst.

## **VIII. System-wide Review of the Recommendations from the Joint Academic Senate and UCOP Workgroup on Recycling Multicampus Research Units (MRS) Funds**

**ISSUE:** Vice Chair Schumm reminded members about its prior comments from 2004 on multiple research unit (MRU) funding contained in its response to the 'UCPB Report "Restructuring the MRU Review Process." He highlighted a couple of issues that the committee highlighted in its earlier comments. These included legislatively mandated funding for MRUs; a multiple categories issue (specifically how funds would be allocated to programs that conduct operations across multiple categories); an automatic termination of full time equivalents (FTE). He invited comments on new issues in light of these recommendations.

**DISCUSSION:** One member raised the issue of the power of the Vice Provost for Research, opining that he does not have much confidence in the present process. He stated that there is not a serious attempt to reach out to all faculty (involved in MRUs) around the UC system. He also felt that the Senate and shared governance was not adequately represented and respected in certain recommendations, noting that UCORP should play a larger role. He cited the following recommendations as objectionable: (1) the Vice Provost for Research convene a group to examine the status of facilities and address such issues as maintenance, expansion, management, business plans, relocation within UC, divestment, and investment in new facilities; (2) the Vice Provost for Research appoint an Advisory Board on Multicampus Research, responsible for examining the MRU portfolio on an annual basis to ensure that UC's research investments are

deployed, via a competitive process, in the most effective manner; (3) the Vice Provost implement a process to introduce greater flexible use of the current MRU funds and work toward augmenting the multicampus budget; and (4) Vice Provost for Research should use the funds made available from the disestablishment of the California Space Institute (CalSpace) MRU and a onetime 2.5% cut to existing MRUs, to seed new multicampus efforts.

Members discussed the plenary authority of the Academic Senate; specifically, whether the Senate has jurisdiction over the issues listed above. They clarified for themselves that the Senate has purview over academic issues along with a consultative role or advisory role in other matters, such as MRUs. Therefore, some members expressed the view that while CCGA can state it has concerns about the Senate's role in the proposed Recommendations, there are limits in what the Senate can ask for in terms of its degree of participation in the process of restructuring MRUs.

The committee also discussed the recommendation that "that systemwide funding for continuing FTEs be decreased by 20% a year for five years, at which time the campuses will have total responsibility for funding the FTEs." Some members noted that at the time many of these FTEs were assigned, some of these MRUs were not MRUs. In fact, some of them were assigned FTEs in order to make them full-fledged MRUs. Therefore, they argued that it is unfair to suddenly take the funding away from these MRUs at this time. It seems to be an effort to balance the MRUs to a level of the organizational research units (ORUs). There is also the issue of legislatively mandated MRUs: if an act of the Legislature establishes ongoing additional funding targeted to the instigation of a new MRU, it may not be appropriate for the University to redirect that funding.. One member believed that the Pacific Rim MRU, for example, was funded by such a legislative act.

Vice Chair Schumm summarized the committee's comments. First, CCGA is concerned that some of the recommendations are not explicit enough in their mention of the role of the Senate. These include the third recommendation on page 2, the recommendation at the bottom of page 3, the first recommendation on page 4, and the first and second recommendations on page 5. The committee is also concerned about the phasing out the support of FTEs with MRU funds (fourth recommendation on page 4). Basically, members felt that such a policy would be unduly abrupt and capricious, and it might cause unanticipated harm to an otherwise healthy and beneficial MRU. Finally, CCGA believes that it may be inappropriate to subject the funding of certain legislatively-mandated MRUs to competitive review.

**ACTION: Vice-Chair Bruce Schumm will draft a letter for the Academic Council to consider.**

#### **IX. Proposed CCGA Proposition 209 Diversity Study Taskforce Charge**

**ISSUE:** Vice-Chair Schumm reminded members of CCGA's charge to produce a report on the effects of Proposition 209 on diversity within UC graduate education. He asked members to discuss how they want to address the questions outlined by the Academic Council, as well as the type(s) of data that CCGA wants to gather.

**DISCUSSION:** Members were interested in the ultimate purpose of this study, as well as its strategic intent. Vice-Chair said that the main purpose is to give The Regents some sense of the

effects of the passing of Proposition 209. Members would like to collect the following data (with a demographic breakdown): applicants, offers, acceptances, graduation rates (professional masters, academic masters, academic doctoral, and applied doctorate), the number of undergraduate eligible students/admitted students, systemwide graduate fellowships, graduating Bachelors with a 3.0 GPA, and the ratio of in-state to out-of-state graduate applications.

Members also discussed how to best evaluate the current diversity climate within UC graduate education. The graduate student representative volunteered to go to the UC Students' Association (UCSA) and further research this question. To that end, members suggested putting this issue as a discussion item on the next UCSA meeting agenda. The San Diego member also said that the UCSD graduate student association had recently conducted a survey on student 'satisfaction', which she will obtain for the committee

**ACTION:** (1) Analyst Todd Giedt will begin gathering the data sets mentioned above; (2) the San Diego member will distribute the results of the survey on student satisfaction; and (3) the student representative will report back to the committee on UCSA's discussion of this issue.

**X. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *In Progress***

**A. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and a Ph.D. in Forensic and Behavioral Sciences with CSU Fresno and UC Davis – *Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (Vice-Chair)***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Vice Chair Schumm reported that Christine Hansen, who is head of the academic affairs within the CSU Chancellor's office, has requested her own review of this proposal. Vice Chair Schumm is now working collaboratively with Hansen, and CCGA may need to reevaluate its own position on this proposal in light of the CSU review. That said however, Professor Schumm is still planning for a site visit in early January.

**B. Proposal for an Interdepartmental Graduate Program Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Bioengineering at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab (UCSF)***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Chehab reported that he has received three internal reviews and one external review. He has sent these reviews to UCR Professor Jerome Schultz, who is the Chair of the Bioengineering department, along with his own comments, which represent CCGA's concerns. One of CCGA's main points is that UCR is late in starting its own bioengineering program, and it currently does not have a bioengineering department. Chair Schultz reported that as of May 2006, UCR does have a bioengineering department with a set of core faculty of six faculty members (with recruitment of one additional professor). Another review comment was the needs for a main 'flagship' or main area of expertise for the program. Chair Schultz responded that they have settled on bio-cellular engineering as their main focus (which is distinctive from other UC campuses). He went on to outline the steps that they will take to capitalize on this area of expertise: (1) establish an advising committee; (2) maintain adjunct faculty positions with neighboring institutions; (3) create a website where this focus is emphasized; (4) list this program focus in the Peterson Guide; and (5) give monthly presentations, etc. Another issue is funding. To that end, the proponents have received a letter of support from the Dean of the College of Engineering, which commits to the funding of the program. Sources of money from grants are also now provided. Another one of CCGA's areas of concern were the courses, which CCGA criticized the proposal for not having specific core



bioengineering courses (they seemed to be modified from other pre-existing courses). In response, the program proponents have designed a better set of courses (11 will be under review shortly; 6 are under current review; and 4 have been approved by the Committee on Courses). Finally, it was not initially clear how they would implement the MS program. They are currently planning an honors program for undergraduates, which will be a BS/MS program. Professor Chehab said that Chair Schultz has adequately addressed CCGA's concerns, and he recommended approval of the program.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the program with one abstention.**

**C. Proposal to Establish a Combined Five-Year Degree Program: B.A. in International Studies and a M.A. of International Affairs at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Stralka reported that he has received one review, which is both substantive and supportive. He said that he will obtain one additional internal review, and he anticipates that the proposal will be ready for a final resolution at the January meeting.

**ACTION: Professor Stralka will send out the reviews to members in time for the January meeting.**

#### **XI. Executive Session**

[Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.]

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Members did not hold an executive session.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m

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