

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MEETING MINUTES – APRIL 3, 2007**

**Present:** Erin Bardin (student representative), Farid Chehab (UCSF), Catherine Constable (UCSD), David van Dyk (UCI alternate), Omer Egecioglu (UCSB), Todd Giedt (analyst), Michael Hanemann (UCB), Joyce Justus (consultant), David Kelley (UCM), Suzanne Klausner, Roger Savage (UCLA), Bruce Schumm (Vice Chair), Albert Stralka (UCR), Shrinivasa Upadhyaya (UCD), and Reen Wu (Chair)

**I. Chair's Announcements**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** At the last Academic Council meeting, the Office of the President (UCOP) senior management said that non-resident tuition (NRT) monies are going back to campuses. They will also be traced. President Dynes indicated that he wanted to meet with campus chancellors regarding the purpose of this trace. He also remarked that the NRT is highly variable between campuses, with certain campuses being more negatively affected than others. He also remarked that as of late, other issues have taken priority over NRT in Academic Council.

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

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Joyce Justus noted that the research position outlined in the research report, 'Structure, Function, Leadership, and Development Trajectory of Research Support Functions at the UC Office of the President,' is the new position of 'Vice President of Research' (see below). It is a part of the reorganization of the Office of the President (UCOP). In the past, different people had held the responsibility for working with graduate students in various research capacities. In part, this position pulls together some of those roles. But more importantly, it intelligently reconceptualizes what this position should be within UCOP. She also reported that UCOP is in the middle of the budget hearings. Last week, the initial hearings for the 2007-08 UC budget were held in both houses of the Legislature, with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Academic Council in attendance. She noted that the Legislature traditionally supports undergraduate enrollment growth; however a more complete understanding of research by members of the Legislature is still needed.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked how systemwide positions look different than campus positions. Joyce responded that the main difference is the lack of students, however there are certain linkages. Members remarked that the functions in this position have been separated out (Graduate Dean and the Vice Chancellor of Research) at both Berkeley and San Diego. At UCOP, the graduate student portfolio is very different simply because there are not any students. Joyce reminded members that there is a general focus on reducing the size of UCOP, and added that this does not mean that this position automatically overlooks graduate studies. This position is scheduled to go to The Regents in May.

On a related subject, one member remarked that the University still does not separate out the research function from undergraduate/graduate instruction on an accounting basis. For example, costs associated with time spent, equipment, and other resources dedicated to the research endeavor should be counted as such. To do otherwise, implies that research is costless. Joyce

responded that this is a topic of ongoing discussion with the Legislature. UCOP has worked to inform the Legislature about enterprise of research at UC. Since there is a genuine lack of knowledge about the role and importance of research at the University among members of the Legislature, there is a real danger in separating it out, as it could become an easy target for budget cuts. For instance, when UC separated graduate students out from undergraduate student in the early 1990s, the former became a target for cutbacks simply because the Legislature did not really understand this class of students. It was only when UC began to classify ‘a student as a student’ that this log jam was broken. That said, it is a delicate balancing act, but there is an increasing recognition that the University must find ways of discussing the budget beyond just undergraduate enrollment.

Members also asked about performance evaluations of senior management. Joyce responded that it varies within the divisions at UCOP, as it does on the campuses. She remarked that within Academic Affairs, there is an emphasis on performance evaluations however. The Regents are also moving in this direction. Performance evaluations aside, some increases in pay are fostered by competitive offers.

### **III. Consent Calendar**

#### **A. Approval of the Agenda**

**ACTION: Members approved the agenda.**

#### **B. Draft Minutes from the March 6, 2007 Meeting**

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

#### **C. Addition of the Master’s of Science Degree Title to the Ph.D. Program in Management/Change of Degree Title for the M.A. in Social Sciences (Ph.D. in Political Science) to an M.A. in Political Science, UCI**

**ACTION: Members approved this addition.**

#### **D. June Meeting Date Change to June 19, 2007**

**ACTION: Members approved this schedule change. Members will have dinner immediately following the meeting.**

### **IV. UCOP Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu recounted that the committee had discussed this issue previously and drafted a response letter, which was included in the agenda packet.

**DISCUSSION:** One member sought clarification on the rewording of the second point. They felt that the correspondence should simply state that “CCGA would like to reword the second point as follows: ...”

**ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will make the modifications to the response letter.**

### **V. UCEP/CCGA’s Proposal on the Role of Graduate Student in University Instruction Update**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Vice Chair Schumm reported on the recent teleconference with UCEP on this issue, which included Al Stralka Chair Wu, Dick Weiss, and Keith Williams. The subgroup outlined a number of core principles, which include academic freedom (especially the

implications for graduate student instructors (GSIs) and the manner in which they teach courses), the faculty code of conduct, and summer instruction. On the latter point, he noted that all of the UC campuses have received state funding for summer instruction, which is supposed to ensure that the summer quarter/semester has the same instructional ‘face’ that is presented during the other quarters/semesters of the academic year. At present, this is really not the case. He reminded members that the original draft of the memo did not address summer instruction, but it was included in a later draft.

Special guest Carol Copperud, who is Acting Director of Academic Planning and Budget at UCOP, reported on the recent developments in summer instruction. She reiterated that summer instruction is now an integral part of UC’s academic enterprise. Although this policy proposal (specifically ‘the Role of Graduate Student in University Instruction’) emerged out of other issues, summer instruction cannot be excluded. Although it can be treated as ‘different’, it cannot be treated as separate. There must be an acknowledgement and understanding of what it means to have state funds for summer instruction, as opposed to using student fees to fund this enterprise, as was done in the past. She noted that almost 30% of summer instruction is done through graduate instructors acting as the instructors of record (see distribution item 1). Summer is also skewed towards undergraduate instruction. Lecturers are also used in the summer. A lecturer is defined as a separate position; it is simply someone who is hired on to teach a specific course. A UC graduate student could also be hired as a lecturer for the summer. If this was done en masse however, it would also put graduate students in a different union, which may not align well with their interests. The real concern is whether there is any way of assuring the State that UC is being funded by an appropriate amount for summer instruction. While there are good reasons why faculty do not teach in the summer, UC must show the Legislature that summer instruction is of UC quality.

**DISCUSSION:** Members briefly discussed the event that led to this mandate, which involved the case of a Berkeley graduate instructor, who was responsible for an undergraduate writing course. Basically, the course description included an inappropriate statement to the effect that persons of other political opinions than his own should not enroll in the course. In the aftermath, a white paper from Robert Post was also commissioned. Members requested that this white paper be included in the May agenda.

One subcommittee member remarked that the Administration was the impetus of the comments regarding the negotiations with labor unions. He imagined a situation where the Administration might view the Senate’s involvement with this issue as constraining in some ways. He stressed that the Senate retain its independence from any potential disagreements/negotiations with unions, and concentrate on the academic principles at hand. He added that the existing contract negotiations with the labor unions are ongoing (the timing varies campus by campus), but this is not something that should concern the relevant Senate committees at this time. Another member remarked that in her view, much of the criticism of the original document came from faculty members who felt that as it is currently written, the memo actually weakens faculty oversight and quality control. Implementation is another point of contention.

Regarding summer instruction, members requested breaking out the data by both undergraduate and graduate courses, as well as lower- and upper-division courses (see distribution item 1).

Carol reported that summer undergraduate courses are evenly split by lower- and upper-division. Members also asked if UCOP has thought about staggering nine-month faculty positions. Vice Chair Schumm said that either uniform standards must be put into place; or UC needs to continue to treat summer instruction as extra-ordinary. While it is clear that summer instruction is not a substandard product, standards for selection and review must be elucidated nonetheless. It was noted that lecturers are reviewed by the department, while graduate students are reviewed by the Senate. The standards could also be very different in humanities departments, as opposed to science departments, especially with regard to instructors of record. One of the big problems with the instructors of record is that faculty would be forced to take responsibility for something that they did not really control. In effect, some faculty members feel that they would have to constantly look over the shoulder of GSIs that they had hired to independently teach a course.

Members also discussed academic freedom, and whether it should be applied to graduate students. Vice Chair Schumm reminded the committee about the key aspects of academic freedom, as noted in the UCAF statement on academic freedom. This document contains language that could be interpreted as faculty maintaining considerable oversight of courses. If academic freedom was bestowed on GSIs, one member asked if GSIs would also be subject to the faculty code of conduct. Vice Chair Schumm replied that they would indeed have to follow the faculty code of conduct if this was the case. He specifically asked the committee if graduate students should be accorded academic freedom, and if so, under which principles. One member remarked that academic freedom in a foreign language course is different than academic freedom in political science course. The graduate student representative added that there is also a difference between expert knowledge of a subject and the ability to teach a course well. While GSIs may not be as well-versed in the subject matter as professors, they do sometimes have better teaching skills. Vice Chair Schumm commented that while this is tangential to the topic at hand, it is important, and it should be added to the subgroup's agenda to consider as a separate part of the final memo.

Members also separated out the approval process (of both the course and the GSI teaching the course) from the academic freedom of GSIs teaching a course. Another member said that many of these problems would be solved if faculty members were required to attend 2/3s of the courses that are taught by GSIs. However, such a provision is very impractical and probably would never pass; if it did, UC would simply hire lecturers. Vice Chair Schumm clarified that academic freedom does not allow faculty members to teach anything or say anything that they want. If a faculty member were to teach something outrageous, then the peer review process would correct this. Some members advocated that academic freedom should be extended to a certain class of students, who would be known as 'instructors of record'. One member said that once a graduate student is elevated to an instructor of record, that student's peers become other faculty members for that courses, and not fellow graduate students. However, other members equated the capacity of instructors of record more with lecturers than faculty.

Vice Chair Schumm summarized the discussion thus far. The committee favors giving instructors of record much greater academic oversight and responsibility, but not giving them full academic freedom. Members agreed that this is also the most pragmatic solution. That said, there must be appropriate diligence taken at the appointment stage, with explicit faculty involvement. Once the GSI is appointed as an instructor of record, he/she would be held to some

subset of the faculty code of conduct. Members also emphasized that not every graduate student can handle the responsibility of being an instructor of record. He noted that this revision will be redrafted within the smaller group.

**ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter requesting a deadline extension to next year (fall). The Post white paper will be included on the May agenda. Members were invited to send comments to Analyst Todd Giedt to forward to the smaller working group.**

**VI. Review of the Research Report, “Structure, Function, Leadership, and Development Trajectory of Research Support Functions at the UC Office of the President”**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu introduced the report, reminding members that they need to respond to both the report and job description described therein. Joyce Justus also provided some background on this position. She noted that historically, there has been a long-standing position of a Vice Provost for Research at UCOP. That position withstanding, research has been attached to various units within UCOP (i.e. agriculture, lab research, etc.). This position is an attempt to bring in most of these research functions under one position (agriculture will probably remain separate however). It was also recommended that this position be elevated a vice presidency.

**DISCUSSION:** One member observed that research interests systemwide are slightly different than those on the campuses (liaisoning with other university systems, etc.). Members noted that the job description contains some functions and roles directly related to graduate education that are new and are not currently covered by the current vice provost position. While they applauded this as a positive step, they cautioned that CCGA representation is necessary. They also remarked that if the decentralized model was implemented, a rotation of this position would be a detriment to the representation of the interests of graduate education, as it would exclude the graduate deans.

**ACTION: Members endorsed the report and the job description as written with the caveats listed above.**

**VII. Interdepartmental Program Bylaw Requirement**

**ISSUE:** Analyst Todd Giedt reminded members that the remaining issue is whether CCGA would retroactively require interdepartmental programs (IDPs) to have bylaws.

**DISCUSSION:** Members suggested that this requirement be made at the time of an IDP’s Senate re-review. Members agreed to this provision (see below). The UCLA member also updated the Los Angeles Graduate Council’s discussions on this topic, noting that it is adopting a similar requirement.

**ACTION: A motion was made that “CCGA requires that new IDP proposals include bylaws. In view of this policy, CCGA also requires that existing IDPs comply by adopting bylaws by the time of their next regular Academic Senate review.” A memo will be sent to the divisional chairs/Grad council chairs.**

### **VIII. Comparison of Students in Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs with Students in State-Supported Graduate Degree Programs**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu reminded members of CCGA’s resolution from spring 2006, which expressed concerns of accessibility and requested additional data on this issue through Academic Council. This report represents UCOP’s response to the committee’s request.

**DISCUSSION:** Members wanted to know if any funds directed to these programs are used for scholarships for professional degrees. The Berkeley member remarked that the Berkeley Masters in Financial Engineering (MFE) does have a limited number of scholarships. Members generally agreed that there should be a small number of scholarships for professional students, especially for those programs whose graduates will earn substantially less than most law and business graduates. Joyce responded that this has become a much bigger issue, not so much in terms of state support but in differentiation among professional school fees. The argument against differential fees is that you disadvantage those students who want to pursue careers in public service. As you continue to increase fees, the question becomes who UC is excluding from these professions. As one example of fee differentiation, she pointed out that the Dean of the Berkeley law program is arguing for higher fees than the Davis law program.

Members remarked that the committee should also evaluate and respond the statistics provided in the report. The data did not look incriminating. One member said that only 12% of students received gift aid, which is probably concentrated in a few areas, such as nursing. Table 11 shows that 83% of nursing students did receive gift aid, but overall this is a small number of students and small amount of funds (only \$300,000). The committee felt that a proper response should note that the statistics indicate that the current state of affairs is appropriate and acceptable, but CCGA would like to continue to monitor these data every five years. This requirement will also be placed in the Guidebook. The response will also emphasize keeping these programs accessible.

**ACTION:** The Berkeley member will send some language regarding scholarships in the MFE program. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter to Academic Council. The requirement for a five-year review cycle will also be noted in the CCGA Guidebook.

### **IX. Systemwide Review of The Regents’ Proposed RE-89 – Adoption of Policy Restricting University Acceptance of Funding From the Tobacco Industry**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu introduced RE-89, which is a proposed Regental policy that would restrict the University from accepting tobacco-related research funding from the tobacco industry. He noted that the committee is instructed to respond to Academic Council with an ‘up’ or ‘down’ vote on RE-89. He also referred members’ to CCGA’s earlier position on this issue.

**DISCUSSION:** Without speaking to the ethical/moral argument against tobacco companies, one member remarked that the committee should vote against RE-89 (no restrictions on tobacco funding) purely on principal. He noted that such policies should never state a specific organization (such as tobacco companies), but lay-out principles that would dictate if and when a ban should be enacted. Another member proposed simply endorsing Senate Chair Oakley’s letter to Regent Moore’s memo (and Council’s response to the five questions posed by Regent

Moore). However, other members urged that the committee come forward with an up or down position while citing specific issues and portions of this response.

As a starting point, members took a straw vote, which resulted in a vote of ten members opposed and one member in favor of RE-89. In the ensuing discussion most members argued against RE-89, noting academic freedom as the primary concern. Tangentially, they also stated that this is a slippery slope, as significant portions of the faculty would have moral/ethical objections to the practices of a number of companies/organizations. That said however, one member strongly felt that tobacco companies have applied pressure to researchers that they had funded in order to produce results favorable to their interests and/or industry. Members did agree that the behavior of tobacco companies could be considered objectionable on ethical grounds; however, it is not the only example of ‘bad’ organizations/companies out there. For example, one could easily make a moral argument against pharmaceutical companies as well.

For the purposes of buttressing CCGA’s response, members suggested citing the third page of the response from the Academic Council’s working group, which was specifically convened to address this issue. CCGA considered the working group’s responses to Regent Moore’s questions on the relation between the proposed ban and APM 010 as especially important. Members felt that the following citations were relevant to its response: “Because the APM must provide a broad framework of policies and procedures necessary to guide and regulate faculty conduct, it is intentionally non-specific. Amending it to proscribe a single source of funding could distort that purpose.” Also important was the working group’s response to the second question (How might the proposed tobacco funding policy be amended to be consistent with APM 010?): “...a policy could be devised that allows for heightened scrutiny under a set of narrowly constrained circumstances so that, for example, no research funding can be accepted from illegal entities like the cocaine cartel or from legal entities that have been found to have engaged in a certain set of behaviors such as racketeering.”

However, one member strongly argued in favor of RE-89, objecting to the actions of tobacco companies. Specifically, this member urged the committee to draft alternate language that would allow a ban on tobacco funding to co-exist with APM 010. Towards that end, this member made a motion to suggest that if ‘distributors’ (thereby leaving ‘manufacturers’) were removed from RE-89, the committee might support it. However, no one seconded the motion and it failed. After further discussion, another member made a motion to include the following in CCGA’s response to Council: “However, some members of the committee would consider supporting a ban on the acceptance research funding if it were appropriately framed, as recommended in the letter to John Oakley by the working group, so that it calls ‘for heightened scrutiny under a set of narrowly constrained circumstances.’” This motion failed on a vote of six opposed and four in favor.

**ACTION: Members voted against RE-89 by a vote of ten to one.**

#### **X. Proposed CCGA Proposition 209 Diversity Study Taskforce**

**ISSUE:** Chair review reminded members of CCGA’s review of the effects of Proposition 209 on graduate education. He opened the discussion by noting that after examining the data, he did not see any real effects on the diversity of the graduate student population after Proposition 209.

**DISCUSSION:** After reviewing the data, members concluded that the enrollment pattern of under represented minority groups (URMs) in graduate programs did not change significantly in the years following the enactment of Proposition 209. Specifically, members looked at the number of URM admits to UC. This data did not show a decrease in URM admits in the years immediately following 1997, but a general and slight increase in URMs from 1999 to 2005 (with a small down turn in 2004). Furthermore, the number of URMs as a percentage of domestic graduate student admits has also been relatively stable over time. Members did note that this percentage did drop off somewhat in 1998, but it rebounded a couple of years later in 2001. They speculated that UC may have addressed this through financial support for those programs that tend to attract URM students. Showing a similar trend, the number of URM applications has also increased from 2000 to 2005 (again with a small down turn in 2004). However, some members remarked that actual URM enrollments is what the committees should be interested in (and how they were admitted), not URM applications.

Members also examined the differential between UC's enrollment of URMs and similar enrollment of its competitive institutions. Although UC leads URM enrollment, it lags in the enrollment of African American graduate students. Members surmised that regional differences could explain UC's lower African American enrollments (and higher Latino enrollments). They did express some concern about the level of URM populations in the pipeline however. They noted that the inadequacy of graduate support would negatively impact URM populations--UC pays about \$2,000 less than comparable institutions. It could be that UC is strategically investing money in programs that typically attract URM students. Although the committee could not discern a downward trend in URM graduate populations, the committee is concerned that UC has not increased its proportion of URM students given the changing demographics of the State of California. They also noted that graduate support has been dropping over the past ten years (which is separate from Proposition 209). If one is going to assert that 209 has discouraged graduate students, CCGA recommends that UC study data from other universities. CCGA's impression is that private institutions have increased their recruitment of minority graduate students through better support packages. Members expressed the view that it not just Proposition 209, but private institutions have recognized this as a comparative advantage.

Members lamented the fact that the climate could not be addressed. The student member commented that antidotally there are perceived effects among graduate students, but that CCGA did not have the requisite tools to address this issue. One member mentioned that URM students are probably more attracted to those campuses/universities that are more diverse, and less attracted to those that are less diverse.

The committee agreed that the following statement could be submitted: "CCGA expresses concern that the effect on the undergraduate pipeline could eventually impact graduate education, but thus far the committee could not discern a real effect on graduate education enrollment directly related to the effects of Proposition 209. We are concerned about the levels of inadequate graduate support"

**ACTION:** Members agreed to send a letter reflecting the discussion points made above.

**XI. 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 reminded members that he conducted a site visit in January. At that time, he reported that while the behavioral sciences half of the program was sound, the forensics side still needed work. He set forth a number of stipulations that both UC Davis and CSU Fresno would need to meet in order to make this program acceptable and viable from the standpoint of CCGA. Towards that end, both campuses have instituted a number of changes to the forensics side of the program. These include a new position on each campus in forensics; additional CSU release time; numerous letters of interest and support (including two letters from the California Attorneys General). A revised proposal was also submitted. A recent MOU has also been drafted and signed. That said however, the MOU lacks explicit statements about how funding will enter the University. He also didn't completely get the sense that CSU has completely made the transition from a professional degree to an academic Ph.D. However, because of its partnership with UC Davis, he is satisfied that this transition is possible. Therefore, he recommends approval of the program. The Joint Graduate Board will look at this program in May.

**ACTION: Members voted to approve (10 in favor; 2 abstentions).**

**B. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Music for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Roger Savage***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Savage has received two internal evaluations (including the internal letter included in the proposal); and he is expecting three external reviews before the May meeting. He remains concerned about the level of graduate financial support, as well as the three tracks (or three programs) in the graduate program. At present the proposal indicates that the advisory exam will only be administered to students in composition and musicology. The proponents can address the latter point if the advisory exam can be given to students in all three tracks (composition, musicology, and ethnomusicology). The other issue is whether ethnomusicologists can complete the program in five years.

**ACTION: Professor Savage will report on the reviews at the May meeting.**

**C. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside – *Lead Reviewer Donald Brenneis***

**ISSUE/REPORT:** The committee did not receive an update on this proposal because Professor Brenneis did not attend the meeting.

**D. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Film & Digital Media for the Ph.D. Degree at UC Santa Cruz – *Lead Reviewer Shrinivasa Upadhyaya***

**ISSUE:** Professor Upadhyaya noted that the UCI letter of review is very supportive (the proposal included internal letters from Davis, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, and Berkeley). Two external reviews have also been requested; Professor Upadhyaya hopes that he will receive them before the May meeting. He noted that the proposal requires 108 units, which might be too much. There really is not a masters program either (along the way to the PhD), but a masters

degree will be given to students who do not pass their preliminary exams at the Ph.D. level, but do pass them at the masters' level (if they fail the Ph.D. level exam twice). He suggested that the entrance requirements should explicitly state a 3.0 GPA is required. Another issue is the low number of transfer units granted to students who enter the program with a pre-existing master's degree (only ten units).

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the required 105 course units for the program. There was some speculation if this included research units as well. Although the proponents supplied a course list, they did not assign units to each course. Members noted that this should be approximately three years of course work. They wondered if this included any units associated with directed research.

**ACTION: Professor Upadhyaya will update the committee on the external reviews at the May meeting (if he has received them by that time). He will also find out if the 105 course units included directed research.**

**E. Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Environmental Systems at UC Merced**

**ACTION: Farid Chehab was chosen as the lead reviewer; Michael Hanemann is the alternate.**

**XII. New Business**

**A. UC Merced Ph.D. in Physics and Chemistry**

**ISSUE:** The Merced member noted that UC Merced operates under the individual graduate program (IGP), which doesn't allow for graduate programs within disciplines. There is a CCGA mandate to eventually offer discipline-specific graduate programs; the proposal for a 'Graduate Program Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Environmental Systems' is the first of these. The IGP allows UCM to grant degrees, but it is a poor recruiting vehicle. He added that UCM also only has a minority of senior professors (there are only 17 senior faculty out of 90 total faculty members). Therefore, attracting top graduate students has been problematic. UCOP has also not provided sufficient resources to create new graduate program proposals, so the growth rate is slower than anticipated. One option is to try to continue to operate under the IGP, but this was conceived as temporary two-year program, which would allow UCM to bring out new disciplinary and multi-disciplinary graduate programs. This has not occurred due to the aforementioned slower than expected growth rate. Another difficulty is the lack of adequate building space for science and engineering, which will be full at the end of this year. Alternatively, UCM could create broad interdisciplinary programs. For example, UCM has a physics and chemistry graduate group, but it does not have a critical mass of faculty in either discipline to form a discipline-specific graduate program. Therefore, one option on the table is the formation of a physics/chemistry Ph.D. program.

**DISCUSSION:** Members commented that UCM might want to target strengths in specific areas. The Merced representative replied that there are a certain number of faculty members who fall between divisional lines. These people would not have access to graduate students and therefore become disenfranchised. Another member asked if it would be appropriate to form partnerships with departments at other UC campuses. This has also been suggested. The pro is

that it allows UCM to come up to critical mass; the con is the logistics of the situation, as graduate students would certainly not want to take their courses at one place and TA at another place. Inviting emeriti guest faculty was another idea. UCM does have a number of adjunct faculty located at Livermore National Lab, who do come to the campus to teach graduate students. The Merced member specifically asked the committee for their opinion of developing a Ph.D. degree program in ‘physics and chemistry’. Members responded that the proposal could be constrained to a specified time period (perhaps five years). Members suggested creating provisional programs with specific and clear plans that anticipate Merced’s growth towards critical mass. Towards that end, the Merced member noted that the physics/chemistry graduate group does have a fairly comprehensive strategic five-year plan, which will facilitate the development of solid program proposals.

**B. Masters of Education Degree at UC Santa Barbara**

**ISSUE:** The Santa Barbara Graduate Council inquired if the Masters of Education degree (MEd) could be offered outside a department of education, which would be similar to the example of the MFA, which is offered in both Theater and Art. In this case, the Department of Counseling/Clinical/School of Psychology (CCSP) recently split off from the Department of Education on that campus. Before these two departments split, counseling/clinical/Psychology was offered as a PhD program in the Department of Education with an ‘emphasis’ toward the MEd. The CCSP would now like to offer the MEd on its own.

**DISCUSSION:** The Santa Barbara member remarked that there was some confusion within his Graduate Council as to what the CCSP is trying to here. Members requested that the CCSP should submit a graduate program proposal to its Graduate Council.

**ACTION: The Santa Barbara member will communicate this recommendation through his Graduate Council.**

**IX. 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: Reen Wu, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst