

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MEETING MINUTES – MARCH 7, 2006**

**I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey***

**REPORT:** Chair Lindsey went into executive session.

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

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Consultant Karen Merritt updated the committee on the activities of the Task Force for the Planning of Doctorate and Professional Education (PDPE). This task force has decided to be the umbrella committee conducting the ad-hoc comparative law school review, thereby disbanding the Legal Education Advisory Subcommittee (LEAS). However, a PDPE subcommittee will be convened, which will include the two co-chairs of LEAS, to carry out the comparative review after the criteria have been agreed to. The results of the ad-hoc review will then go to the Senate for further review. The PDPE has also convened a Health Sciences Subcommittee, which has issued a RFP for a joint doctorate in audiology. To date, UCD, UCSF, and UCLA have responded to the RFP. This subcommittee will also be looking at physical therapy. In response to Provost Hume's visits to the campuses, a Subcommittee on Interdisciplinary Programs has also been assembled. Karen reported that the CSU has announced that it will launch new Educational Leadership doctorates by 2007. She noted that UC has assembled a Subcommittee on Education Doctorates, which will look at the appropriate role for UC in this area. This subcommittee is also looking into the contributions that UC can make to the field of special education.

She also said that UCI has requested to add a masters' program to an existing Ph.D. program. She clarified that a long-standing, but yet unwritten, policy states that if the Ph.D. is already approved, then adding a Masters to the Ph.D. program does not require additional CCGA review. Since this policy does not actually exist on paper, she suggested that it be included in the next revision of the CCGA hand book.

**DISCUSSION:** The UCI member asked if CCGA needs to approve program name changes if the name change does not imply a significant change in the resources dedicated to the program. Analyst Todd Giedt and Consultant Karen Merritt responded that the Chair of CCGA should be notified of impending name changes, who can then decide if it should be discussed at a CCGA meeting.

**ACTION:** (1) Chair Lindsey requested that a cabinet-level consultant be appointed to replace Julius Zelmanowitz. (2) Berkeley member Nadine Lambert will request that Graduate Dean Mary Ann Mason appoint a regular Graduate Dean representative, who will attend CCGA meetings. (3) Analyst Todd Giedt will work with Karen Merritt to codify the policy of adding a masters' program to an already-existing Ph.D. program into the CCGA Handbook.

### **III. Consent Calendar**

#### **A. Approval of the February 7, 2006 Minutes**

**ACTION:** The February 7, 2006 minutes were approved with minor edits. Members expressed their preference to have the draft minutes distributed via email (rather than inclusion in the meeting agendas) for reasons of confidentiality.

#### **B. Name Change for the UCD Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program in Medical Informatics**

**ACTION:** The name change was approved.

### **IV. Independent Course Responsibility**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Guests Ellen Switkes and Mark Westlye reported to the committee about this issue, and Ellen Switkes described the four options available to the Senate. She described the first option as confirming and continuing the status quo, in which some graduate student instructors (GSI's) do serve as instructors of record. The main problem with the status quo is the fact that the Faculty Code of Conduct does not cover graduate students (since they are not faculty members). A second option would be to extend Senate approval as instructors of record to GSI's who teach lower-division undergraduate courses. A third option is simply to not allow GSI's to serve as instructors of record at all. In this scenario, GSI's would still be allowed to offer full courses of instruction, but they would be supervised by a faculty member who would serve as the instructor of record. Finally, GSI's could be appointed as 'lecturers', which would allow them to serve as instructors of record. Ellen added that summer sessions should be handled differently than the regular academic year. She noted that many GSI teach courses in the summer that would normally only be taught by faculty members in the academic year. She said that there is a title called 'Lecturer in Summer Session', which could be used for GSI's who teach in the summer.

**DISCUSSION:** The Berkeley member noted that the Section 150-0 of the Faculty Code of Conduct states that GSI's are covered by the Faculty Code of Conduct even though they are not specifically referred to as "GSI's". Ellen Switkes clarified that that section specifies "non-Senate faculty appointees", who are also subject to the Faculty Code of Conduct. However, since graduate students are not faculty members, this section would not apply to them. Some members mentioned that one option would be to simply expand the Faculty Code of Conduct so that it covers GSI's as well. With regard to the specific titles employed in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), one member pointed out that these titles are somewhat obviated by collective bargaining agreements.

Members of the special subcommittee presented their proposal on independent course responsibility of GSI's. Their proposal categorically opposes using GSI's as instructors of record. They specified that three main categories should be used (although the specific titles can vary across campuses): GSI's, teaching fellows, and a third category for non-Senate faculty appointments. They advocated expanding the role of the GSI's somewhat, but insisted that they would be heavily supervised by faculty instructors of record. Teaching fellows, the second category, would require some kind of an advanced degree or advancement to candidacy for Ph.D. students. Teaching fellows would also be supervised by instructors of record, but less stringently than GSI's. Finally, their proposal allows for graduate students who have held non-Senate appropriate titles prior to their matriculation in graduate school to be considered for non-

Senate faculty teaching positions, but they would need to be appropriately compensated if hired into such positions. They also recommend expanding Senate approval to include all instructors teaching lower-division undergraduate courses.

Members discussed the advantages of allowing GSI's to teach courses as instructors of record. While such appointments obviously better prepare graduate students for faculty positions, they noted that it is not necessary for students to officially serve as the "instructor of record" in order to list such appointments on their curriculum vitae. Members also noted that not allowing GSI's to serve as instructors of record may provide a buffer to critics, who may claim that UC should not allow graduate students to teach undergraduate courses on their own. Another member expressed concern that the responsibilities of the instructor of record need to be delineated. In response to this concern, members from the special committee said that while Senate regulations are generally vague, the language in the APM is very clear. The problem is that the APM is no longer a document of record due to the collective bargaining agreements. This is because the job descriptions listed in the campus-specific contracts (which were the result of collective bargaining with the unions) are different than what is listed in the APM. While such a delineation of responsibilities for instructors of record would not be appropriate in a Senate regulation (which are intentionally too general for this purpose), Ellen Switkes assured the committee that it would be possible to formally document the duties of instructors of record in another place. Members also discussed the specific requirements for teaching fellows. While most members agreed that teaching fellows should either have an advanced degree or have advanced to candidacy, they considered the special case of foreign language instructors. Some members argued that even in these cases, the faculty member still serves as the instructor of record as it is he or she that selects the text books, designs the curriculum, etc. Finally, members discussed the timeline of this proposal. After this proposal is finalized, it will go back to the divisional graduate councils for comment before it is submitted to Academic Council for consideration. It is anticipated that these discussion will result in some kind of Senate regulation and/or APM change. Future discussions will include how a graduate student moves from a GSI to a teaching fellow, as well as what to do about summer sessions. At this point, most committee members feel that independent course responsibility in summer sessions should be treated differently than it is during the regular academic year.

**ACTION: Members of the special committee will revise the proposal and present it at the next meeting.**

#### **V. UC Davis Dismissal Case**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** The UCD member noted that this case concerns the petition of a graduate student at UC Davis who was dismissed in 1993. The student's dissertation was originally rejected by his committee in January 1993 on academic grounds, and he was disqualified on January 28, 1993. The student appealed the decision, and the UC Davis Graduate Dean asked the dissertation committee to reconsider the revised dissertation in March 1993. The committee did so and rejected it again, and the student was disqualified for the second time on the basis of academic merit. The student filed a second appeal in 1997 that was also rejected by the Special Committee on Student Petitions. However, the Davis Division voted in favor of the student at its February 2005 meeting, asking the Graduate Council, Graduate Dean, and the concerned Graduate Group to work together to reinstate him. Finally, the student wrote to the Chair of the

Academic Assembly George Blumenthal. The student did not receive a satisfactory response and petitioned the current Parliamentarian of the Assembly, which he forwarded to Academic Council Chair Brunk.

**DISCUSSION:** At issue is which person or body has authority to decide this case. Members opined that the Graduate Dean, with advice from the divisional Graduate Council, has jurisdiction over graduate students and the disposition of graduate degrees. Members noted that this particular student has exhausted all of his appeals. They also remarked that given the thorough appeal process, it would set a bad precedent to allow students to petition the Academic Assembly once they had already exhausted all of their appeals. Members further clarified that under the systemwide [Academic Senate Bylaw 311.C\(2\)](#), only matters of “general concern” should come before the systemwide Senate through the mechanism of the Academic Assembly. The student’s petition does not fall under this category and should be referred back to the divisional Graduate Council.

**ACTION:** Given that the student in question exhausted the appeal process, CCGA members ruled unanimously that this case should be referred back to the Davis Graduate Council for a final resolution, as it does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Academic Assembly or the systemwide Academic Senate. CCGA also requests a ruling from UCR&J on this case as to whether it is appropriate for the Parliamentarian of the Assembly to accept such petitions. Analyst Todd Giedt and Duncan Lindsey will draft a letter to Council Chair Oakley.

## **VI. The Special Committee for Scholarly Communication (SCSC) White Papers**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** John Ober, who is the Co-Director of the Office of Scholarly Communications at UCOP, provided a brief overview of the five white papers. He highlighted the copyright resolution as one of the major issues that affect not only faculty members, but also graduate students. Historically, many publishers have required authors to transfer complete copyright as a condition of publication. The resolution aims to change this model, by which UC faculty members will transfer a non-exclusive limited right to the University to place their publications in an open-access repository. Other issues include monograph/book publishing, the role of scholarly societies, promotion and tenure processes, evaluation activities, and the encouragement of new formats and venues of publication for scholarly publications.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the issue of copyright within the context of the 2005 NIH controversy. John Ober explained that at the urging of Congress the NIH drafted a policy, which stipulated that all NIH-funded scholarship must be placed in an open on-line depository (called “Pub Med Central”) within six months. Following congressional lobbying, the NIH weakened the policy and changed it from a requirement to a request and extended the timeline (to deposit the materials) from six to twelve months. In order to meet that request, authors must retain the right to deposit the scholarship in an open depository. He added that the SCSC wrote a letter to the sponsoring members of Congress and the NIH, urging the policy’s adoption.

Members noted that ever-increasing high journal prices are impacting graduate education in a negative way. They asked John Ober about the specific mechanisms that SCSC envisioned in order to correct market failures in publishing and to moderate prices. He replied that the Special

Committee is fairly neutral about specific mechanisms, but he cited the Public Library of Science (PLOS) journals as a working business model that is providing open-access to scholarship. He also said that over the last couple of years UC libraries have become increasingly efficient. Libraries have cut costs by pursuing these efficiencies, but they are at the limit in terms of cost savings in this area. Another issue is the double-charging of faculty members for using scholarly journal articles (sometimes even their own scholarship) in their course materials.

Members remarked that the copyright proposal could have negative implications for faculty members, especially junior faculty, in tenure and promotion decisions. In particular, one member reported that his division had concerns with the granting of a license to the Regents to place a faculty member's work in an open-access on-line repository. He reported that they felt this wording was too strong, and they would like to change the wording of the proposal from "the faculty member must retain the right..." to "the faculty member is encouraged or urged to retain the right..." John Ober clarified that faculty members could opt-out of the policy if they wished to do so in order to successfully publish their research. Members noted that in its current draft, the policy proposal does not make this clear. Another member commented that it might be a good idea to strengthen the opt-out clause by requiring the co-signature of the department chair whenever the opt-out clause is invoked. Finally, members were concerned about how the language of this resolution might affect authors who receive royalties from their scholarship (such as text book and trade book authors).

**ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt and Chair Lindsey will draft and send a letter to Academic Council Chair Brunk that will (1) endorse the principles and intent of these white papers; (2) note that ever-increasing journal prices are impacting graduate education in a negative way; (3) suggest adding the following sentence at the end of the copyright proposal: "If the publishing company rejects the author's scholarly work solely on the basis of its claim to exclusive copyright, the faculty member can accept the publisher's request provided the department chair approves the request."**

## **VII. UCI/UCR Law School Proposals**

**ISSUE:** In connection with the announcements from the President's Office, Chair Lindsey said that he was offered the opportunity to review the criteria for the comparative review. He rejected the offer because he would not be allowed to share the criteria with the other members of CCGA. He shared his viewpoint that CCGA should be actively involved with the review of these two proposals from the beginning. He also sees these proposals as essentially new, since so much time has elapsed since their original submission and approval by CCGA.

**DISCUSSION:** Members supported Chair Lindsey's position that the criteria for a comparative law school review should be sent to all members of CCGA, and not only to the CCGA Chair for review. They also agreed that the best way to handle the comparative review would be to allow the divisional Graduate Councils to review the individual proposals first, proceeded by a formal review by CCGA. Members were also interested in looking at the criteria for the comparative review. In order to prevent this type of thing from happening again, the committee talked about creating a sunset clause for CCGA approvals. There was also some discussion about the process by which CPEC approves new programs and schools. Consultant Karen Merritt clarified that the Office of the President (OP) engages CPEC in negotiations from the beginning in order to ensure

CPEC concurrence. She said that it is rare, but not unprecedented, for nonconcurrence by CPEC. In the case of the law schools, this process was prematurely stopped due to the budget problems at the time, which probably accounts for the nonconcurrence.

**ACTION: CCGA unanimously approved three resolutions: (1) That Provost Hume forward the individual graduate school proposals to the divisional Graduate Councils for an initial review along with a subsequent review by CCGA; (2) That CCGA has the opportunity to review the criteria for the comparative review; and (3) That CCGA program or school approvals expire after three years if students have not been admitted into the program or school by that time, with the provision that the life of the review approval could be extended by one year.**

#### **VIII. Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on International Exchanges/Education**

**ISSUE:** Members suggested that an ad-hoc subcommittee on International Exchanges/Education should be formed to better organize the logistics of international exchanges in graduate education and to facilitate their implementation.

**ACTION: Members selected Professor Jutta Heckhausen (UCI) as Chair of this subcommittee, and Professors Thomas Patterson, Harvey Sharrer, and Shrinivasa Upadhyaya as members.**

#### **IX. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *Final Action***

##### **A. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Music at Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Stralka presented his final report. He noted that the reviewers were unanimous in their praise of both the UCSC Music Department and its faculty. They also stated that establishing a program in musicology with a capital “M” (i.e. one that fuses the musicological and ethno musicological approaches to the discipline) is a laudable goal, but one that they think the UCSC Music Department, with its outstanding faculty and collegiality, can accomplish. It is anticipated that graduates of the program will be able to teach in programs in music at colleges around the country. He recommended approval by CCGA.

**DISCUSSION:** One member wondered why the performance aspects were not highlighted in the proposal (which is a typical component of music programs). The UCSC member clarified that the Santa Cruz Graduate Council instructed the Music Department to limit themselves to a specific program in musicology rather than establishing a graduate program that tries to do everything.

**ACTION: Members voted unanimously to approve the Ph.D. in Music at UCSC with one abstention.**

##### **B. Proposal for a M.A. in East Asian Studies at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab (UCSF)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Chehab updated the committee on CCGA’s outstanding concerns regarding this program proposal that were raised in the last meeting. The first

of these was the lack of adequate library resources to properly support the program. He reported that the program has indeed received a grant of \$150,000 (\$50,000 per year for three years) to build its library resources. Another issue is the language proficiency of the students. Reviewers asked two questions in this regard—first, how is language proficiency assessed? And second, what happens to students who enter the program without any prior knowledge of a Southeast Asian language? The proposers responded that they have four tracks planned: (1) Students could take two years of course work in their chosen language with a grade of "B" or better; (2) Students could take a combination of summer intensive courses and regular academic course work (passing the final course in a two-year series with a final grade of "B" or better); (3) Students could take summer intensive courses through an intermediate level and then take a final examination at UC Riverside; and (4) In cases where neither academic courses or summer intensives are available or feasible, students could arrange for individual tutoring in their chosen language.

The proposers also provided both a detailed budget and bylaws for the program. Professor Chehab presented a letter of support/recruitment letter (see distribution item 1) addressed to Dr. Hendrick Maier, who will be the Director of the program. The letter promises \$50,000 per year for three years for general program support, \$5,000 for miscellaneous supplies, and one staff position. Another letter of support is anticipated from the Dean of Humanities. Proposers anticipate that most of the students will be enrolled in the Ph.D. program, so they will be supported through that program (teaching assistantships, etc.). The program has also recruited two additional faculty members since the program was proposed. The bylaws have been rectified as well, which now contain sections defining core member and affiliated faculty members. They also specify that all amendments and revisions to the bylaws must be submitted to Graduate Council for approval by a two-thirds majority vote. Based on the response to CCGA's concerns, Professor Chehab recommended approval of the program.

**ACTION: Members voted unanimously to approve the program with one abstention.**

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

**A. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Statistics at UC Irvine – *Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Stralka reported that he has secured one internal and one external reviewer.

**B. Proposal for a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Writing at UC San Diego – *Lead Review Harvey Sharrer (UCSB)***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Sharrer reported that he has secured a second internal review. He also presented his draft report, which he will be sending to the program proposers. He reminded members that he has received three positive reviews (one internal and two external) and one negative review. He remarked that this program is requiring a significantly higher number of units for completion of the degree than comparable programs. He noted that 72 units are required for this program with 24 of

those units coming from a teaching practicum (of which only 12 of those 24 units are required). In his draft report, Professor Sharrer asks the proponents of the program if a student decided not to do the teaching practicum in the second year of the program, would only 60 units be required for the entire program? He added that the proposal does not specify a maximum number of units either. Professor Sharrer also listed the other CCGA concerns: confirmation of expansion of the faculty, graduate student support, and library support.

**DISCUSSION:** Members felt that if the teaching practicum accounted for 24 units of the program, then a requirement of 72 units is not unreasonable. Members also asked about a five-year time to degree limit. One member felt that a five-year time limit may not be appropriate, as most M.A. programs stipulate a two-year program with a maximum of three years to complete the degree. Professor Sharrer clarified that the proponents are proposing a three-year MFA with a maximum of five years to complete it.

**ACTION: Professor Sharrer will send CCGA's response to the program proposers.**

**C. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Horticulture and Agronomy at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Thomas Patterson (UCSD)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Patterson reported that he is currently requesting reviews for this program proposal.

**D. Proposal for a Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures at UCSB – Lead Reviewer Nadine Lambert (UCB)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Lambert reported that she has sent the CCGA response to the program proposers, and she is waiting for their response.

**E. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) Degree Program in Health Law at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Shawn Kantor (UCM)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Kantor reported that he received a response from UCSD regarding CCGA's initial query. He said that the Association Agreement is a high-level document, which pledges cooperation between the two institutions. The program will be governed by three faculty—one from the UCSD medical school, one from the Cal Western Law School, and another lawyer from Cal Western. The program will be housed administratively in UCSD extension. Professor Kantor reminded members that the syllabi did not contain reading assignments. He said that Professor Deftos assured him that reading assignments will be added by the time the program begins. One reviewer felt that the expectations for the capstone project were not appropriately specified. Professor Deftos replied that the capstone project will be customized to each student's specific capability and background. Another CCGA concern is the fact that this program will need to accommodate students with very different professional backgrounds. The proposers state that they might team up students with legal backgrounds with students with medical backgrounds. Professor Kantor stressed his concern that there is only one core course for the MAS students; the other courses seem to be already existing courses at either Cal Western or UCSD.



**DISCUSSION:** Members felt it was reasonable to insist upon the course topics, sequences, syllabi, and outlines for at least three or four core courses. They emphasized that these courses should be described with greater specificity as well. Until that time, CCGA should not act on the proposal. Members remained concerned that the courses (as outlined in the proposal) will be suitable to students with such different backgrounds.

**ACTION: Professor Kantor is waiting on another internal review; he will also be soliciting a second external review.**

**F. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Human Development at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Jutta Heckhausen (UCI)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Heckhausen did not have anything new to report on this proposal.

**G. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and Joint Doctorate in Criminal Justice Sciences (Ph.D.) with CSU Fresno and UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Bruce Schumm (UCSC)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Schumm reported that the proposers have substantially modified their proposal. It has been reshaped into a Ph.D. program that stresses the underlying scientific aspects of criminology. He feels that the proposal needs to go back for a full CCGA review—including new external and internal reviews (two internal/two external reviews).

**ACTION: Professor Schumm will initiate a full CCGA review.**

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

Attest: Duncan Lindsey, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst