

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

## MINUTES OF MEETING

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2008

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

**REPORT:** Chair Schumm announced that this is the last meeting for Professor Tyrus Miller, who is the Santa Cruz member, as he has accepted a new post as the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies at UCSC. Chair Schumm also attended the COR meeting. At the last Academic Council meeting, the joint CCGA/UCPB GSAC request to create a follow-on joint Administration-Senate committee was approved and will be forwarded to Provost Hume. This request originally emerged from a joint UCPB-CCGA subcommittee on graduate support/funding; it may be appropriate to retire this subcommittee pending the establishment of the larger GSAC follow-on committee. Chair Schumm will make a presentation on graduate student funding at the joint Council/Chancellor's meeting tomorrow (March 5th). Council will also consider the revised UCEP-CCGA GSI memo. Council is suggesting that Senate oversight over upper-division courses be retained; Chair Schumm would view this as a friendly amendment. The UC Davis School of Public Health is also on the Council agenda with the most likely result being a re-review of a revised proposal. There was also a presentation on long-range enrollment planning out to 2020 at the February 27th Council meeting; it will be presented to The Regents on March 18th. It is important to note that enrollment planning has been campus-driven. There is a projected 50% growth in graduate student enrollment; in 2020-21 graduate students would comprise 20% of total student enrollment. The percentage growth is the largest in the professional schools; the largest numerical growth is in the STEM fields. Chair Schumm also reminded members that CCGA had solicited expert opinions on the possibility of one-year M.P.H. Programs. The letters from experts were consistent in concluding that while a one-year program might be suitable for seasoned practitioners or those with doctoral degrees in related fields such as medicine or law, it would not be sufficient for recent graduates in meeting goals of the program. CCGA should consider writing white paper or cover letter on how overall conclusions from experts re: one-year M.P.H. programs could be helpful for current and future review of proposed/revised M.P.H. and other public health related Masters programs. Self-supporting degrees: we are waiting for UCOP's Report to The Regents that is due in March.

**ACTION: Patrick Linder will draft a cover letter for these reviews that the committee will consider at its April meeting.**

**II. Announcements from the President's Office – Joyce Justus, Vice Provost–Academic Affairs; Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies**

**REPORT:** UC's budget is facing a proposed 10% cut, which is based on a \$14 billion deficit. However, the real deficit may stand as high as \$16 billion. In VP Beckwith's office; there are a number of people who carry out 'transactional' duties due to legislative mandates, many of these are involved in the disbursements of grants, etc. He has been visiting the campuses and is getting a sense of the campus cultures. These visits will inform the future configuration of the Division of Graduate Studies. One of his concerns is the lack of solid research behind the policy options. This is true of all of these issues that emerge. While he is not risk-averse, he is cognizant of the impact of small changes. In Research, he does not have anyone tasked with long-term strategic policy. He needs to set-up a good way of communicating with the campuses. He also gave the committee his sense of general reorganization/ goals for graduate studies: 1) increasing the

percentage of graduate student enrollment at most campuses; 2) improving and maintaining the quality of graduate students; and 3) the challenges of a lean budget period. All projections indicate a down turn over the next couple of years. UCOP is cutting down on the total number of things that it does; for the most part, these ‘things’ are not essential. There are also efficiencies to be had. Eventually, we will have to have a conversation on priorities.

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked if there are substantial state mandates that UC does not wish to do. VP Beckwith is trying to eliminate some of these mandates; however, some may be more difficult to remove due to politics. But UCOP is working hard in making its priorities known. Chair Schumm asked for perspectives on the budget stabilization act; UCPB has reacted very negatively. Others were somewhat positive. VP Beckwith remarked that it needs more study. They are under tremendous pressure from The Regents that to show UCOP can respond with changes to its organization. Chair Schumm noted that the cuts that VP Beckwith identified are on the research side, not the graduate studies side. Another issue is the evaluation of new schools. Chair Schumm noted that there seems to be about five new schools that will be coming forward. What role will UCOP play in this area? Who will figure out if a Merced School of Medicine is the right way to go? How will the Senate and UCOP partner on this? VP Beckwith remarked that he will raise this issue when he speaks with Provost Hume. One member mentioned that when one looks at graduate programs, there are unquantifiable durational and human capital elements. This also figures into campus differential characteristics; some graduate programs are well-established on some campuses; others are not. VP Beckwith commented that when looking at cuts, these things should be considered. However, the cuts will be made under a tight time pressure. Another member praised VP Beckwith’s comments on improving the current stock of graduate students. VP Beckwith said that UC’s ability to improve is also dependent on its ability to recruit the best and brightest graduate students from around the world. In fields that attract substantial amounts of money, UC is drawing from the best and brightest; in those fields that do not draw large amounts of money, UC may not be attracting the best and brightest. The issue of NRT was briefly raised in relation to attracting higher numbers of international students and while it is just one of many issues to consider, NRT as a source of revenue should not be overlooked. The external view is that people who deal with Sacramento have said that this is not going away because the Legislature will insist on some form of NRT. UC may not be able to eliminate it, but the University may be able to mitigate it in some fashion (e.g., eliminate it after the second year, etc.). Some campuses have said that NRT really does not impact their graduate studies goals. VP Beckwith commented that there are a number of environmental issues that impact UC’s ability to attract the best and brightest students and that there seems to be little attention paid to these intangibles. These intangibles have more to do with the philosophy of the leadership. UC will need to be competitive, but these are not the absolute discriminating factors. These factors are the quality of the institution. If you want to recruit the best, you need the best professors and researchers.

### **III. Announcements from the Graduate Deans – Gale Morrison/Sam Traina**

**REPORT:** Dean Morrison reported that among the top issues for the graduate deans are: graduate student funding; mandates from negotiations (child care and parental leave); health and student mental health (gSHIP programs and more info on student mental health concerns, and the unionization of Post-Docs (how best to approach talks).

**DISCUSSION:** Members briefly discussed the NRT issue. Chair Schumm stated that UCPB and CCGA appreciate that NRT is not the sole issue. It often seems that the Administration often thinks that NRT is the only issue; CCGA takes a more nuanced view, e.g., weighing optimization

rather than elimination of NRT per se and keeping this issue on the radar screen. Dean Morrison does not think that it is accurate to say that NRT is not a ‘problem’; it is part of a more complex conversation. NRT is also tough to go after legislatively. Chair Schumm clarified that the GSAC letter states that legislative action is not being considered by the Senate at this time. Graduate student mental health care was briefly discussed. In the report that Provost Hume commissioned in 2007, one of the important documents was the Berkeley mental health study that identified graduate students as an important group in this area. One member asked if there were any recommendations from the Graduate Deans re: the Unionization of the Post-Docs and faculty communications with the UAW. Dean Morrison noted that the Graduate Deans take their instructions from Labor Relations, and would not be taking a position.

#### **IV. Consent Calendar**

A. Approval of the Agenda

B. Draft Minutes of the February 5, 2008 Meeting with minor edits.

**ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar.**

#### **V. Systemwide Senate Review of the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) report, “Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure” – Chair Schumm**

**ISSUE:** Members asked to review the report and its recommendations, which aim to: 1) identify strategic directions for IT investments; 2) Promote the deployment of information technology services to support innovation and the enhancement of academic quality and institutional competitiveness; and 3) Leverage IT investment and expertise to fully exploit collective and campus-specific IT capabilities. This report is due May 5, 2008.

**DISCUSSION:** Several members questioned whether the following issues were issues raised prominently enough: 1) “human” support needed to support faculty and students with educational technology; 2) institutional commitment to campus library services and adequacy of interlibrary services; 3) ways that infrastructure can facilitate articulation across disciplines, keeping both the sciences and humanities in mind; 4) ways to make it easier for faculty to get involved while preserving their time for core duties; and 5) issues associated with establishing a UC-wide grid. Assuming a UC-wide grid is a good idea, this report would constitute a body to implement such things. Chair Schumm noted that while they have identified a number of good ideas, they never talk about how the committee will be constituted, nor do they suggest a charge for that committee. The structure of the committee will be especially important, and it should be representative of the broad spectrum of faculty.

**ACTION: Chair Schumm will summarize review comments and circulate for review.**

#### **VI. Comments on the Diversity Report – Chair Schumm**

**ISSUE:** At its February meeting, CCGA considered the Report of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity. Members asked to finalize their comments on this report.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed several issues associated with the report including: inclusion as a 4th Criterion for career review of faculty, in addition the existing teaching, research and public service criteria; a support structure with money and teeth that would enable faculty to participate; the pipe line issue; and what deficiencies in the cultivation of diversity would look like for faculty. CCGA agreed: 1) that the “4th Criterion” is not held as a minority opinion; and

2) to endorse a majority opinion that a structure is needed to enable faculty participation in outreach.

**ACTION: Chair Schumm will revise draft comments and circulate for review; comments are due by March 13th.**

**VII. Preliminary Proposals for a School of Nursing Science at UC Irvine, a School of Medicine at UC Merced, and a School of Global Health at UC San Francisco – Chair Schumm**

**ISSUE:** These proposals have been submitted to Senate Chair Brown as a courtesy from Provost Hume. CCGA is invited to make informal comments on them.

**DISCUSSION:**

- UCI School of Nursing Science: Members recommended that the proposal will need to address: 1) why the full structure of a school, including the administration burden of a Dean and an associated office, is needed; 2) how the program's nurse output relates to the types of nurses that are needed statewide; and 3) how it feeds into other Irvine programs.
- UCM School of Medicine: Members recommended that the proposal will need to: 1) speak to how this "fragmented" approach is consistent with best practices of top medical schools; 2) address firmness of obligations from partners; 3) specify performance criteria for teachers; 3) indicate how quality of clerkships/education will be measured across campuses; 4) address impact of pending Executive Order re: Medicare; and 5) provide information on how schools of this type are evaluated/reviewed/ accredited. Members noted that that the UCM concept differs from the conventional medical school. However, of the last 20 or so medical schools established, most of them have been put together in this distributed way. The security and legal obligations of the arrangements also need to be considered (e.g., Sutter hospital with UCSF).
- UCSF School of Global Health: Members recommended that the proposal will need to address: 1) why a School, and its associated administrative burden, is warranted; 2) how it relates to and grows out of UCSF's Institute for Global Health; and 3) how it would relate to the concept for a UC-wide School of Global Health.

**ACTION: Chair Schumm to summarize the preliminary comments specific to each and circulate for review; CCGA agreed that for the committee's purposes, these "preliminary" proposals would be more aptly named letters of intent.**

**VIII. Certificate Programs – Vice-Chair Chehab**

**ISSUE:** Professor Chehab presented an updated draft of the CCGA memo on certificate program.

**DISCUSSION:** Whether a student could be simultaneously enrolled in a GAC and a graduate program varies by campus. Members discussed what to do about existing programs and decided not to require retroactive review of GAC programs. It was suggested that one way to continue to address GACs that have not been approved by the Senate would be to request that these programs submit a brief description to their respective Graduate Council.

**ACTION: Vice Chair Chehab will draft an e-mail to the Graduate Deans and circulate for review. He will also work with Consultant Gail Morrison on sending a request to the Chairs of Grad Councils re: cataloguing SR735-GACs on their respective campus. Context: "...existences of SR735-certificate programs on multiple campuses without prior CCGA**

review have come to our attention...” (with no mention of other issues raised in the draft memo and discussed today).

**IX. Systemwide Senate review of the proposed revisions to the Code of Conduct for Health Sciences – Chair Schumm**

**ISSUE:** As background information, this Code of Conduct has been in effect since 2000. On September 21, 2007, Chair Brown requested member of the Academic Council to submit nominations of Senate faculty from which Chair Brown could select one member to work with Rory Jaffe, Executive Director, Medical Services (UCOP/Academic Affairs), on the proposed revisions so that this code is consistent with the faculty code of conduct and the statement of ethical values. Chair Brown appointed Dr. Henry Powell, Professor of Pathology (Neuropathology), and Head, Division of Neuropathology and Electron Microscopy, UC, San Diego and former UCSD Divisional Chair. This collaboration is now completed and the proposed revisions are out for review.

**ACTION:** CCGA has no substantive comments; Analyst Eric Zárate will draft response letter.

**X. Reconsideration of CCGA’s Purview over the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and (in at least one case) the J.D. – Chair Schumm**

**ISSUE:** Some time ago, CCGA elected not to review M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and (in at least one case) J.D. program proposals. The proliferation of professional doctorates has cast a new light on the role of Senate review on professional degrees however. The committee will discuss whether CCGA should reconsider this, and what the parameters of that reconsideration would be. Chair Schumm discussed the PDPE (Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education committee), from which a subcommittee was convened on professional doctoral degrees (e.g., Ed.D.). In his work on this subcommittee, Chair Schumm saw that in general, it is probably beneficial to the University for CCGA to review professional doctoral degrees, and that the “first professional” degrees (M.D., etc.) are probably no exception. It is thought that the role of accrediting institutions was one reason why CCGA felt it unnecessary to have the Senate do its own review. However, several sources used by the Professional Doctorates subcommittee pointed out that the review criteria and motivations of accrediting agencies are generally different, and sometimes at odds, with those of Senates, who have the best interests of the University, and not the particular profession, at heart. The question was raised whether or not it was indeed appropriate to cede CCGA’s authority in this area?

**DISCUSSION:** Members thought it was worthwhile to consider, but that reviewing MDs would be a daunting task. It was explained that we would only be reviewing new programs, not old ones. One member did not wish to add this authority.

**ACTION:** Analyst Eric Zárate will research history and background to date on the purview issue.

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

**A. Proposal for a Master of Science in Science and Technology in Medicine at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Matt Farrens (UCD)**

**REPORT:** Nothing to report.

**ACTION: No action items.**

**B. Proposal for a M.S. and Ph.D. in Bioinformatics at UC Los Angeles – Lead Reviewer Anne Myers Kelley (UCM)**

**REPORT:** Nothing to report. Professor Kelley remarked this would be a very small program; it is not entirely clear whether this should be that small.

**ACTION: No action items.**

**C. Proposal for a Master of Public Policy at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Gary Jacobson (UCSD)**

**REPORT:** Professor Jacobson has solicited two reviewers; he should have two internal and two external review letters on hand shortly.

**ACTION: No action items.**

**D. Proposal for a Master of Science in Nursing Science at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Janice Reiff (UCLA)**

**REPORT:** Professor Reiff reported that she has had a difficult time finding reviewers; she has secured one external reviewer though. She questioned references to a Ph.D. program, which did not seem to exist.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Schumm said that the School is far from guaranteed. The proponents should be reminded of this fact, and potential reviewers informed.

**ACTION: No action items.**

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

**REPORT:** Professor Tager has received external reviewer comments from three of the leading programs; he has also written an internal review. Of the external reviews, there was a consensus that: 1) it is tenuous that a one-year program can accomplish the goals of the program; and 2) faculty support for course development is vague (no mention made of how much time mentors will have to put in at the local sites, or how will they select the mentors). The proposal falsely assumes that the program will provide adequate preparation for work in epidemiology, yet there are no further courses required in epidemiology and biostatistics. Reviewers had concerns that there is insufficient depth to the courses, particularly the quantitative elements. Additionally, there was concern about the structure of the program, e.g., the “measurement of global health” course comes after the field work, when it seems that such skills should precede field work. The timing of the oral examination is also problematic – it will be hard to have a meaningful oral exam (it is before mid-way through the curriculum). It will be hard for these students to meet the expectations of the oral exam. One reviewer pointed out that this program is heavily dependent on Berkeley. The proposal is lacking in other areas as well: 1) guidelines as to what ‘mentoring’ actually means; 2) small and self-sustaining nature of the budget; and 3) plans to ensure equitable access.

**ACTION:** Professor Tager will summarize the concerns, as well as the comments from the reviewers and forward a copy to Chair Schumm to go out with a cover letter under Bruce’s signature; Professor Tager will also plan for a site visit.

**F. Proposal for a Master of Science in Environmental Policy & Management at UC Davis**

– *Lead Reviewer Patricia Springer (UCR)*

**REPORT:** Professor Spring noted that the two major issues are the one-year length of the program, which is not realistic. The second issue is the investment of the prestigious faculty listed in the proposal. Who would be doing the teaching? A memo was sent to the lead proposer. He has responded verbally that they recognize that not all students can complete the program in one year, but they want to give students the option to do so. They also expect that the four new FTE will be teaching, but some of the other ‘prestigious’ faculty would also be teaching. He also said that in the current budgetary climate, it is unsure if they will get the FTEs. He requested a conditional approval from CCGA based on obtaining these FTEs. CCGA cannot do this.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Schumm insisted on a written response that confirms the commitment of four faculty FTEs.

**ACTION:** Professor Springer will follow-up with the lead proposer re: evidence of faculty FTE and also request a written response to Chair Schumm’s prior letter re: concerns over the 1-year duration of, and faculty investment to teaching in the program.

**G. Proposal for a Masters of Public Health at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab (UCSF)***

**REPORT:** Professor Chehab has nothing to report.

**ACTION:** No action items.

**XII. New Business**

No new business.

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

Attest: Bruce Schumm, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst