

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting**Tuesday, March 3, 2009****10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.****UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320****Telephone: 510-987-9466 Fax: 510-763-0309**<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>**I. Chair's Report/Announcements – Chair Farid Chehab**

- February 25 Academic Council Update
 - Interim Provost Pitts has suggested that instead of hiring outside consultants, UCOP should issue RFPs for faculty to perform consulting services
 - The Regents voted to approve the Senate's eligibility reform proposal, the Blue and Gold Financial Aid proposal, and the restart of UCRP contributions in April 2010
 - President Yudof suggested that UC is considering adopting new measures in order to make its case about the State renegeing on contributing \$20M to UCRP. The President reiterated that in the past, the strength of UCRP has saved the State 18 years worth of contributions.
 - Academic Council will meet with the EVCs on April 29.
 - Assemblyman Hernandez has proposed ACA-7, a constitutional amendment that would exempt public educational institutions from Proposition 209 and allow them to take race, ethnicity and gender into consideration in admissions for outreach and retention programs.
 - Council voted (9-6-3) to endorse the establishment of the UCD School of Nursing.
 - The Senate office is exploring possible changes in the way faculty are asked to make travel arrangements as a result of the UC Travel overhead charge of \$30 per customer phone call.
 - UC budget shortfall \$150M; EVP Lapp says furloughs are not on the table this year or next.
 - Stimulus package: EVP Lapp's and VP Beckwith's offices are looking at how best to capture some of this money for UC; some near-term opportunities for NIH augmented funds.
 - Prof. Dan Simmons (UC Davis) was elected as Academic Council Vice Chair for 2010-11.
 - Council endorsed the Academic Certificates memo and Graduate Support & Accountability letter put forward by CCGA.
 - Possible topic for Executive Session: How can we encourage faculty to comply with Sexual Harassment training, short of individual punitive actions?

II. Consent Calendar

- A. Approval of the Minutes from the February 3, 2009 Meeting
- B. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.**III. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs –**

Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
Carol Copperud, Strategic Planning, Programs and Accountability
Suzanne Klausner, Strategic Planning, Programs and Accountability

(S. Beckwith)

- VP Beckwith announced that recruitment is underway for a Graduate Affairs Coordinator position that will report to him and that the UCOP reorganization is in process and that various roles in Graduate Studies and Research are still being sorted out.

- With regard to Post Doc/UAW representation, VP Beckwith noted that his role on the UC negotiation team is to pay attention to issues of academic culture and values; and that he is not certain that union model is right fit for Post Docs.
- He commented that UC has tremendous talent distributed across campuses. He discussed problems of scale associated with attracting Stimulus Package funds, e.g., single-investigator-type vs. collaborative institutional-type projects and how big problems like climate change, water, health care and transportation can be structured as multi-campus opportunities for UC faculty, e.g., an EMR initiative involving all five UC medical centers.
- Members discussed ways for the campuses to come together in opposition to WASC imposing onerous requirements for program reviews and inserting its organization in the approval process of graduate programs with implications for CCGA. The concern is that WASC oversight may be a prerequisite for federal funding.

IV. Proposed Policy on Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate/ Professional Degree Programs – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: In January, CCGA agreed to form a subcommittee with the modified charge of producing a document limited in scope to serve as a starting point for the Senate’s future consideration of the larger UC policy implications associated with Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate/Professional Degree Programs. Questions and issues that were discussed at the meeting included:

- 1) *What are the primary academic and other benefits of self-supporting programs to students, the campus, and the state?*
- 2) *What fundamental principles or rationales should determine whether a graduate degree program should be, or is eligible to be, self-supporting?*
- 3) *What specific criteria should guide the decision to make a program self-supporting?*
- 4) *Are there criteria that should determine that a graduate program should receive a state subsidy?*
- 5) *Is the oversight process for the establishment and review of self-supporting programs clear, and does it continue to be appropriate?*
- 6) *Is current policy adequate to ensure that the self-supporting program is staffed with comparable levels of ladder-rank faculty?*
- 7) *On what basis should student fee levels in self-supporting programs be set? What are the ramifications when fees in self-supporting programs are at the same level as, or lower than, fees in regular PDF programs?*
- 8) *What is UC’s commitment to providing financial support to students in self-supporting programs?*

DISCUSSION: Members discussed a wide range of issues associated with SSPs including: the need for UC to remain competitive, meet educational growth needs and keep talent in California; the retention of working professionals; the distinction and tension between professional and academic programs; leveraging profit-making potential of SSPs; the principle that SSPs should not compete with state-supported programs for resources and space; the relationship of SSPs to the research mission of the University; how to reconcile the contradiction between successful SSPs and the view that therefore less state support would be needed; the need to know for whom are we making the argument; and the need for departments to develop SSPs to sustain their academic enterprise. Members questioned the persuasiveness of arguments to mainstream SSPs as central to academic mission. Some members viewed the professional argument as more credible, while acknowledging that there are inherent “grey” areas where programs can be either academic or professional or a hybrid of both. There was general agreement that SSPs should not be geared toward Ph.D.s or used to restrict student access to state-supported programs. Members also questioned the role of ladder-rank faculty and adjunct faculty in SSPs. One member cautioned of

the slippery slope of regarding adjunct faculty as second-rate to ladder-rank. There was general agreement that the criteria should be that the faculty play a major role in the curriculum of the SSP irrespective of title (e.g., ladder or adjunct) and demonstrate that their participation does not take away from their teaching duties. It was noted that not all SSPs are hugely profitable and that fees are limited to what the market will bear. Members also questioned if we have same expectations for diversity and access to SSPs as we have for non-SSPs. Members generally agreed on the need for SSPs to have a plan for the provision of financial aid, e.g. some variation of a “return-to-aid” model with a prescribed minimum level of funding set aside for need-based aid to be phased-in after three years and linked to the program’s profitability.

ACTION: No action was taken; additional issues will be discussed at the next meeting.

V. “Doctoral 2A” Status Follow-up Discussion – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: In January, one member suggested “Doctoral 2A” Status as a topic for future CCGA discussion. “Doc 2A” Status refers to graduate students who are enrolled beyond nine quarters or six semesters after advancement to candidacy and who by long-standing UC policy are ineligible for state funding (about \$11K per student). While these students remain enrolled and continue to use campus resources to varying degrees, campuses receive no funding for them. As homework: Chair Chehab had asked that members check with their local Graduate Council to gauge extent of concern on their campus with “Doc 2A” status and associated issues, if any (or status similar to “Doc 2A” regardless of the name designation).

DISCUSSION: Director Copperud shared a handout with data from all campuses. Members discussed findings from the campus/UCOP data): UCB (300); UCI (105); UCSC (39); UCSD (42); UCLA (300); UCSF (63); UCM (N/A); UCSB (90); UCD (54); UCR (35). She suggested that the variance between campus and UCOP data bears looking into, e.g., definitional problem? The impetus for original policy had to do with the notion of the “professional” student. Members suggested that the issue doesn’t seem to be a problem on campuses.

ACTION: No action taken at this time.

VI. Proposed Fee Policy for Graduate Student *In Absentia* Registration – Chair Chehab

ISSUE: Ongoing discussion with Graduate Dean Jeff Gibeling (UC Davis) regarding modifications to the proposal to revise *In Absentia* Registration. When last discussed, CCGA reviewed key revisions with Dean Gibeling and agreed to: limit the table to data on the number of students registered *In Absentia*; include the points on the fiscal impact of policy; add Global Health to list of students likely to take advantage of the policy; retain the “outside of California-state boundary” for first three years subject to evaluation; and incorporate language on the filing fee. Members were asked to review revisions to the enclosed letter, policy, table, and sample forms.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed the revised materials and Dean Gibeling’s suggested changes. He noted that NRT is unaffected by this policy.

ACTION: CCGA unanimously voted to approve the policy and accompanying materials as modified.

VII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program in Geophysics (Earthquake Sciences and Applied Geophysics) between UC San Diego and San Diego State University – Lead Reviewer Ken Rose (UCSB)

REPORT: Prof. Rose has conferred with the proponents regarding up-to-date support letters. He has two external reviewers and one internal reviewer confirmed.

B. Proposal for a Ph.D. degree program in Communications at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Liz Watkins (UCSF)

REPORT: Prof. Watkins has received two reviews to date, both of which are mostly positive with some stated concerns about the impact of the Ph.D. program on the Master's program. She is expecting two other reviews and hopes to have a draft summary report ready for discussion in April. Chair Chehab suggested a need for existing Ph.D. programs to have provisions/minimum criteria requirements/clear policy for awarding Master's degrees. Director Copperud suggested that this could be incorporated into the revision of the Compendium.

C. Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program in Evolutionary Biology between UC Riverside and San Diego State University – Lead Reviewer Lowell Gallagher (UCLA)

REPORT: Prof. Gallagher reported that he has two internal (UCSC, UCLA) and two external (Texas and Duke) in-hand or forthcoming. He will also try to get a review from UC Davis. The two reviews he has received are mostly positive with some minor concerns about space and the geographic distance from Riverside to San Diego. He mentioned that there are some concerns about SDSU's ambitions and the growing number of JDPs there. A few members suggested the need for a broader discussion on the impact of these JDPs, the implications for UC, and the need for criteria specifying a lead role for UC in JDPs.

D. Proposal for a Master of Science degree program in Science and Technology Studies in Medicine at UC San Francisco – Lead Reviewer Ira Tager (UCB)

REPORT: Prof. Tager reported that he three reviews (a UC campus, MIT, Brown) in-hand. The reviews are overall supportive but raise concerns about the degree requirements, unspecified criteria for electives and the compressed one-year timeline. Members suggested that dropping the Medical student option and changing the thesis to a Capstone requirement might mitigate these concerns. Prof. Tager will serve as the second UC reviewer and will write a draft summary for the next CCGA meeting.

E. Proposal for an Interdepartmental Graduate Program leading to the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Materials Science and Engineering at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Jim Carmody (UCSD)

REPORT: Prof. Carmody reported that he has not received any response yet to a request for clarifications.

F. Proposal for a joint UC San Diego/SDSU Ph.D. degree program in Engineering Sciences (Bioengineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Structural Engineering) – Lead Reviewer Valerie Leppert (UCM)

REPORT: Prof. Leppert gave an overview of the combined proposals and noted that the three programs are being treated as a single review. Three of the four reviews she has received cite the benefits to UC, student and workforce diversity, and the complementary nature of facilities. All three reviews note the high quality and sufficient academic rigor of all three programs. One reviewer felt compensation was insufficient for mentoring faculty and raised a question regarding how they intend to share intellectual property, e.g., MOUs, guiding policies. She will seek an additional internal reviewer in the Geotechnical area. A review from Berkeley is forthcoming.

G. Proposal for a M.S./Ph.D. degree program in Technology and Information Management at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Jang-Ting Guo (UCR)

REPORT: Prof. Guo summarized findings from the four reviews and new information provided in response to requested clarifications. He feels that the proponents have sufficiently

addressed the major concerns raised by the committee and by the internal/external reviewers and recommends CCGA approval at this time.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, the committee voted (10-0-1) to approve the proposal.

H. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Management leading to M.A./Ph.D. degree at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Sue Carter (UCSC)

REPORT: Prof. Carter summarized key findings from three of the four reviews she has received. The reviews were uniformly positive and very strong with few minor concerns. She recommends that CCGA approve the proposal at this time.

ACTION: After a brief discussion, the committee voted (10-0-1) to approve the proposal.

I. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Computational Science, Mathematics, and Engineering leading to M.S. degree (Computational Science) at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Andre Knoesen (UCD)

REPORT: Prof. Knoesen reported that he is waiting for a response to request for clarifications.

J. Proposal for a Master of Professional Accountancy degree program (M.P.Ac.) at UC Berkeley – Glen Mimura (UCI)

REPORT: Prof. Mimura reported that he expects to have a significantly revised proposal in-hand by March 20 and will work on preparing his summary report for discussion in April.

VIII. Update on Past and Present Allocations of the \$10M to Graduate Student Support Funds – Chair Chehab and Director Kate Jeffery, Student Financial Support

ISSUE: *When CCGA last discussed this item, it formed a number of recommendations on how the money should be allocated, spent and accounted for, including: 1) new funds for graduate students be distributed towards fees, stipends and tuition (including NRT) by whatever means the campuses choose to distribute; 2) any allocation for graduate student support be incorporated into the permanent budget allocation at each campus so that it can be continuously made available to graduate students; 3) justification for future additional funds should be aimed at increasing the competitiveness of recruitment packages for graduate students; 4) funds for graduate students ought to represent new allocations rather than a reshuffling of existing resources and not be at the expense of cuts from other forms of graduate student support; and 5) Graduate Deans in consultation with EVCs, should be accountable for reporting annually to their divisional Graduate Council or Divisional Senate on the expenditure of these funds on their respective campuses.*

DISCUSSION: Director Kate Jeffery recapped where we have been and where we are going with regard to the annual \$10M in Graduate Student Support funds, all of which are reallocated funds set aside by UCOP under the condition that the campuses match this with a \$10M allocation in new campus funds. In 2007-08, the \$10M was initially limited to fellowship support. Her office is in the process of tracing the provision of campus matching funds. In 2008-09, the decision was made to leave the decision to campuses on how to reallocate the \$10M (essentially as an unfunded mandate for fellowships, fee remissions, etc.) For 2009-10, UC budget for now includes \$10M in reallocated funds for Graduate Student Support. If the \$10M survives in the systemwide budget, one approach UCOP could take would be to specify a dollar amount as an unfunded mandate for the campuses. This may all be moot should the budget situation deteriorate. Graduate support remains a Regental priority and will likely remain in the budget albeit as an unfunded mandate. No increase in graduate NRT anticipated.

ACTION: No action was taken at this time.

IX. New Business

X. Executive Session (members only)

No notes were taken during the Executive Session.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Attest: Farid Chehab, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Eric Zárate, Committee Analyst