

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MINUTES OF MEETING – DECEMBER 7, 2004**

**I. Chair's Announcements – *Quentin Williams***

WASC Accreditation

Chair Williams reviewed the process and the reasons behind WASC accreditation (necessary to receive federal financial aid) for UC campuses. He noted that the process requires a large amount of time and money. As large research institutions, there is little danger that UC campuses would not be accredited. There is currently discussion within the Academic Council (AC) if it would be possible for WASC to accredit all UC campuses on a systemwide basis, thereby saving individual campuses time and money. Discussion centered on exactly how the WASC process has changed in the last few years. Julius Zelmanowitz noted that in the past five years, there have been a couple of changes to the traditional WASC process: (1) UCOP has provided a lot of overlay data that is common to all UC campuses to WASC; and (2) instead of using generic questions, WASC encourages campuses to propose specific issues of concern that the particular campus would be addressing with or without the WASC process. He noted that given the current trend of increased accountability of education (towards more federal control), UC has reason to support the WASC process, which is one of the toughest accreditation processes in the nation.

'Internationalizing' UC

In the question and answer session at the AC meeting, President Dynes said that there would be an enhanced effort at 'internationalism' at the UC campuses.

Academic Planning Council (APC)

- Medical Education in California: It was noted that California under-produces in terms of medical doctors as compared to other states. Discussion within the APC centered on what UC can do to expand medical education in California with a special emphasis on diversity.
- California Arts Council: The Council has produced a study that shows that the economics associated with arts in California is a multi-billion dollar per year industry. Some UCOP administrators are making the argument that the amount of economic input into the California economy from art is not actually reflected in amount of money that UC spends on arts-related MRU funding (currently about 1%).
- Master Plan of Education: Chair Williams commented that the percentage of graduate students within the UC system has dropped from near 40% to about 17% over the past 45 years, while the percentages of graduate students at private institutions has increased. Consultant Zelmanowitz noted that there has been a large growth in Masters and credential programs at both California private institutions and California State Universities (CSU's), as well as an increase in doctoral training at many private universities in California. The share of undergraduate training at private institutions has decreased from 20% to 7%, while their share of graduate training has expanded. Private institutions have also moved towards full-funding of graduate students, which has helped them increase their share of graduate students.

## **II. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Initiatives**

### **Professional Doctorates**

Julius Zelmanowitz provided an update on the collaboration between UC and CSU on professional doctorates. Discussion focused on the future of the Master Plan and CSU's role in providing professional doctorates. Regarding the closure of the Masters in Audiology at CSU Sacramento, it was noted that the requirement of a doctorate for entry into the field by the professional association for audiologists is currently scheduled to become effective in 2011, so this would not seem to be an immediate reason behind the decision to close that program down. The Provost is committed to future studies on California's needs for the education of professionals in the allied health sciences at various levels of credential (similar to the nursing, pharmacy, and medicine studies already conducted).

## **III. Announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans**

Dean Alley could not attend the meeting, and therefore there were no announcements from the Council of Graduate Deans.

## **IV. Consent Calendar**

A. Approval of the November 9, 2004 Minutes

**ACTION: The November 9, 2004 minutes were approved with minor changes.**

B. Simple Name Change for UCD Graduate Group in "Soil Science" to "Soils and Biogeochemistry"

**ACTION: CCGA approved the name change with a vote of all in favor and zero opposed.**

## **V. Comments on the Academic Council Resolution on Restrictions on Research**

### **Funding Sources**

**ISSUE:** The AC is seeking comments on its resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding as it relates to academic freedom and the rights of individual faculty members to accept grants from any funding source. Research funding by tobacco companies has brought this issue to the forefront, and the question is whether university administrative units have the right to prohibit funding based solely on the source of such funding.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Williams summarized the UCORP report and subsequent AC resolution that basically stated that any individual UC investigator could accept or decline any funding source that he or she pleases, but an administrative entity cannot by majority vote of its faculty decide that it will not accept a certain class of funds (such as from tobacco companies). The graduate implication is that eventually research funding does 'trickle down' to the graduate level. Some members were influenced by Professor Stan Glantz's letter to AC Chair George Blumenthal, where he argues that not only are tobacco companies 'bad' sources from which to obtain research funding, but that they are also in violation of certain federal RICO statutes—in particular, the Justice Department is investigating tobacco companies for engaging in and executing "a massive 50-year scheme to defraud the public." The issue of 'strings' on research funding (where granting agencies fund research with certain conditions) was also raised, and it was voiced that the Academic Senate is opposed to research funding with 'strings' attached. In this case, the 'strings' argument can be expanded to say that 'strings' are being attached to

research funding not from an external source, but from an internal source (i.e. colleagues within UC). Concern was expressed regarding the ‘slippery-slope’ that a ban on tobacco funding represents. Some members also compared any potential UC-wide ban on tobacco funding to the Regents’ divestment from companies doing business in South Africa during the 1980’s. In this vein, it was noted that this resolution states that any one entity short of the Regents should not be able to deny faculty the right to accept an entire class of funding sources. While the committee was in general support of the resolution, there was concern that it not prohibit either the Academic Senate or any unit within UC from recommending that funding sources be discontinued.

**ACTION: CCGA will draft a letter to the Chair of the AC in general support of this resolution, however the committee recommends the inclusion of the following statement to the resolution: “This does not impact the Academic Senate’s ability to recommend to the Regents that funding sources be discontinued nor the ability of a unit within UC to recommend an action to its faculty.”**

#### **VI. Review Process for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (CAL ISI’s)**

**ISSUE:** The CAL ISI’s are institutes that were established by gubernatorial fiat. At issue is the fact that there was no Academic Senate review procedure initially established for the CAL ISI’s. Pursuant to a 2003 UCORP report that argued that the CAL ISI’s are very similar to MRU’s and should be reviewed as such, The AC has proposed a review process similar to the MRU review process with a few exceptions. These exceptions include participation from both private industry and chancellors in the review process. As with traditional MRU review procedures, CCGA would play a lead role, along with UCORP and UCPB, in conducting such reviews.

**DISCUSSION:** Members were concerned that the Academic Senate’s role in the review process comes relatively late in the entire process. However, it was noted that the proposed process is not inconsistent with what is typically found in a traditional MRU process. The committee does not have any substantive concerns regarding the review process document in its present form, and is supportive of the fact that the Academic Senate will play an active role in reviewing these institutes.

**ACTION: CCGA will draft a letter to the AC supporting the proposed review processes for the CAL ISI’s, as long as there remains an active role for CCGA to play in the Academic Senate component of this process. CCGA bases its support on the fact that the proposed review process appears to be the MRU process with an enhanced role for industry and chancellors. The committee also expresses its strong support for retaining the Academic Senate’s active participation in such a process.**

#### **VII. Review of a Review: CalSpace**

**ISSUE:** The charge to the committee is to conduct a review of the review. Chair Williams, who was on the review team, provided the committee with a summary of the review team’s findings, and the history of the past reviews of this entity. Specifically, the prior review team was quite critical of the MRU, and the Academic Council had recommended disestablishment and reestablishment as a new entity orientated on space research. The prior team found that it had failed in its original purpose of funding space-related research, promoting interactions with

industry within California, and becoming a central nexus of collaboration between industry, NASA, and UC. There were also significant problems with the budget. After this previous review, a new Director was appointed, Wolfgang Berger, who initiated a move outward towards other UC campuses, establishing “Centers of Excellence” on the San Diego, Santa Barbara (since disestablished), Santa Cruz, Berkeley, and Davis campuses. The current review found that some of the institutional difficulties had been resolved. However, the money that is spent on the CalSpace center at Scripps is relatively large, with its budget remaining rather opaque. The final recommendation of the current review team was to preserve CalSpace, but hold a UC-wide competition for the administration of this entity. Chair Williams did note that CalSpace was not able to provide much data on the number of graduate students that the MRU had supported, and that the tracking of the results of CalSpace expenditures had remained poor.

**ACTION:** Grayson Bill Marshall was selected as the lead reviewer.

**VIII. Review of a Review: Sea Grant College (SGC) – Lead Reviewer William McDonald**

**ISSUE:** The lead reviewer presented his report to the committee. He remarked that SGC’s contributions to graduate education included 700 graduate traineeships and related research activities. He also noted that his report covers the SGC’s budgetary situation as well, with Scripps having truncated funding to SGC. Indirectly related to graduate education, he commented upon the review committee’s suggestion to increase undergraduate opportunities. SGC Director Moll responded that money for such an undergraduate program would have to come out of graduate traineeships. For its part, the Advisory Board did not comment on this particular issue. The CCGA report endorses the position of Vice Provost Coleman, that if adequate funding is not reestablished to SGC at Scripps by January 1, 2005, then a UC-wide competition for SGC should be hosted.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee noted that January 1<sup>st</sup> is only a couple of weeks away. Several members debated at which point (in time) the budgetary stand-off between Scripps Institute of Oceanography (SIO) Director Kennel and UCOP will cause serious damage to Sea Grant.

**ACTION:** CCGA will draft a letter to the AC endorsing the position of Vice Provost Coleman that a UC-wide competition for SGC be hosted, unless adequate funding is not reestablished by January 1, 2005.

**IX. UCAAD Graduate Admission Guiding Principles**

**ISSUE:** The committee is discussing corrections that should be made to the UCAAD Graduate Admissions Guiding Principles document so that it will better represent the graduate admissions process. As background to this issue, Chair Williams had contacted UCAAD Chair Frank and discussed the changes discussed by CCGA at its November meeting. Prior to the meeting, a revised document was distributed to the members.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Williams reported that he had a lengthy conversation with UCAAD Chair Frank regarding the revision of this document. He said that Chair Frank agreed with many of the key revisions that CCGA had made to the document—including the fact that graduate admissions is an international process where the intent is not to mirror the demographic mix of

California. The committee mainly limited itself to editorial remarks. Specifically, CCGA makes the following edits to the document:

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Heading: Change ‘UCSC’ to ‘UC’.
- In the first sentence of #5, change “non-traditional students” to “all students” and move that sentence to the introduction. Move the second sentence in #5 to the ‘Diversity in Graduate Education at UC’ section.
- Change “underrepresented students” in the last sentence under ‘Diversity in Graduate Education at UC’ to “underrepresented and/or disadvantaged students”. In the same sentence, remove “students of color”.
- Add a sentence to the end of introduction indicating the differences between professional and academic graduate programs: “Professional schools may span an intermediate range of philosophies between undergraduate and graduate school with graduates of professional schools primarily serving the community while graduates of academic Ph.D. programs are training the next generation of professors, researchers, and scholars.” At the same time, remove ‘practitioners’ from “scholars/researchers/practitioners” in the third sentence of the introduction.

**ACTION:** Quentin will make the editorial comments outlined above.

**X. Senate Regulation 600(B) Report – Grayson Marshall**

**ISSUE:** As a follow-up from last month, Grayson reported that UCSF’s MAS program is indeed in violation of regulation 600(B) (see distribution item 4). As noted in the minutes from the November meeting, this regulation may impinge on the ability of Masters of Advanced Studies (MAS) programs to allow UC faculty members (specifically Academic Senate members) to enroll in their programs. At issue are not only UCSF’s MAS program (as well as one at UCSD), but also a new program proposal at UCD. Regarding the UCSD MAS program, Chair Williams said that Karen Merritt had looked into this and reported that they have not been in violation of this regulation yet, but that they could be in that position in the future.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the original intent of 600(B). One member interpreted the regulation as preventing campuses from hiring their own Ph.D.’s and then having them languish without completing their degrees. However, Chair Williams said that the wording of 600(B) seems to allow the awarding of a pending degree to someone that a department has recently hired. Members stressed the fact that any changes made to this regulation should emphasize that any further degree obtained should not be granted by the department or program in which a Senate member holds an appointment. The committee agreed that the following change of wording should replace “No voting member of the Senate shall be recommended for a higher degree by his or her Division unless...”:

*No voting member of the Academic Senate should be recommended for a higher degree by the department or program in which he or she has an appointment unless...*

**ACTION:** A vote was taken and CCGA voted all in favor and zero opposed on the motion to the change in the 600(B) wording, as well as applying it retroactively. Quentin will draft the above change in wording to 600(B) along with a cover letter explaining the intent of the change in wording to the Academic Council and to UCRJ.

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

A. Proposal to Establish a Graduate Group and Ph.D. Program in Animal Biology at UC Davis

**ACTION: Grayson Bill Marshall was chosen as the lead reviewer for this program proposal.**

B. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. Program in Religious Studies at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Michael Hanemann*

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Hanemann reported two developments regarding this review proposal: (1) the 2<sup>nd</sup> review arrived; and (2) Riverside responded to his queries. The core issues are the size of the faculty, scale of the program, and the question of whether the program should be ramping up over time. If the program is ramping up over the time, then a plan of such a ramp-up is necessary. Another issue is the library resources, to which Riverside responded with a commitment to provide resources for the library. The first reviewer emphasized that the key was the commitment of the administration to new faculty positions. The second reviewer raises the question of whether the faculty have the breadth of expertise to cover Christianity and other religions. As a possible solution, the reviewer suggests that it may be possible to collaborate with other UC campuses, such as Santa Barbara or Berkeley.

**ACTION: Professor Hanemann will schedule a field visit (sometime in January) and allow Riverside to respond to the reviewers' questions and concerns.**

C. Proposal for a new Interdepartmental Ph.D. Program in Health Economics at UCLA – *Lead Reviewer Reen Wu*

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Three issues of the proposal are the interdepartmental nature of the program, co-courses, and graduate student support (the levels of support are quite different depending on where the funding is coming from—Department of Economics vs. the Department of Health).

**DISCUSSION:** Members expressed concern that graduate students in the co-courses (between the departments of economics and health) may receive different levels of financial support/pay due to the interdepartmental nature of the program. Such a set-up would in essence create two classes of students sitting next to each other in the 'co-courses'. There was also a discussion on the relative merits of this program as opposed to similar programs housed solely in a department of economics or a department of health, and how this program might compare to such programs.

**ACTION: Professor Wu will arrange for the external reviews. He will also query the program proposers on how they are planning to handle issue of differing levels of financial support.**

**D. Proposal for a new Interdepartmental Master of Financial Engineering (MFE) at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Stephen Ritchie**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Ritchie reported that he has sent out invitations to two external reviewers. He handed out a preliminary list of issues and actions (see distribution item 10).

**DISCUSSION:** Some key points of the discussion included:

- **Comparable Programs:** He noted that there are many similar programs out there (about 65), but that they are usually not housed in business departments. Instead they can usually be found in departments of Mathematics or Industrial Engineering and Operations Research.
- **Fee/Financial Assistance:** Professor Ritchie also mentioned that the MFE fees are quite high and that he would inquire with UCLA about financial assistance.
- **Library Assistance:** Although UCLA notes that library resources will be covered via overhead, Professor Ritchie will inquire as to if there are any specific needs that the program may require.
- **FTE's:** There is some confusion regarding FTE's. In the original proposal, UCLA states that they will hire an additional two FTE's. However, more recent documentation indicates that they will simply run the program on an overload basis with the current faculty in the business school.
- **Staff:** There is the question of whether the Executive Director, Assistant to the Executive Director, and a part-time office assistant have been identified. Along those lines, it would be helpful to get an anticipated time-line from UCLA.
- **Student Recruiting:** Given that the program was originally slated to begin in Winter 2005, the committee is interested to know if UCLA has starting any student recruiting efforts at this point.

**ACTION:** Professor Ritchie will query UCLA on the points above, line-up the external reviews, and schedule a site visit for mid- to late-January.

**E. Proposal for a new Ph.D. Program in Culture and Theory at UCI – Lead Reviewer Harvey Sharrer**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** One of the preliminary issues with this proposal is its bylaws. In response to Professor Sharrer's inquiry, the program proposers submitted a new set of bylaws (see distribution item 11). He noted that one aspect that could be improved is the reporting authority. Another issue is a graduate program called "Comparative Culture" that apparently has no students, which seems similar to the one being proposed. The last full description of the Ph.D. program in Comparative Culture can be found in a course catalogue from 1994/95. It should also be noted that none of the faculty involved with that program are involved with this new program proposal. Another point is that this program was never discontinued, although the Comparative Culture program was housed in the School of Social Sciences while the School of Humanities would offer this new program. Professor Sharrer also reported that he is pursuing evaluations from Chairs of other ethnic studies programs within UC. He has also written to the new Chair of Asian-

American Studies at UCI with a response date of December 13<sup>th</sup>. Finally he has received two acceptances for external reviews—both with a December 13<sup>th</sup> deadline.

**DISCUSSION:** Given that the Comparative Culture program is in abeyance with no new students for a number of years, the committee discussed the possibility of requesting a discontinuance of this program. It was recommended that the program proposers be queried as to the relationship between these two programs.

**ACTION:** Professor Sharrer will inquire into the relationship between the suspended Comparative Culture and the proposed Culture and Theory programs. He will also collect both the external and internal reviews by the January meeting.

## **XII. Executive Session - Members only**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Attest: Quentin Williams, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst