

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday, May 6, 2008
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland – Room 5320

Telephone: 510-587-6138 Fax: 510-763-0309

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>

I. Chair's Announcements – Chair Schumm

- Academic Council 4/23 Meeting Update
 - The revised CCGA/UCEP Proposal on the Role of Graduate Students was passed by Council, and has been sent to UCOP for inclusion in official policy. The full scheme for promulgating the proposal has not fully lain out.
- Academic Planning Council 4/18 Meeting Update
 - Non-fiscal Impediments to Increasing Graduate Enrollment Growth (see Item VIII. below): The University is very interested in exploring the issue of what it means to expand enrollment and understanding what impediments, excluding graduate student support lie in the way of increasing graduate enrollments.
 - Professional Doctorates: Due primarily to CCGA's reaction to the draft, it was clear to the Provost that that the document was not ready to go forward in its current form; a refined version will be sent out for broad Senate-wide review.
 - Compendium Revisions: There has been a lot of thinking going on about the review of new school proposals and a feeling in some quarters that the proposals are a fait accompli by the time they reach the Senate. UCOP is working to create structures that will allow the Senate and UCOP to work collaboratively on vetting new schools; e.g., doing some upfront analysis to better understand the impact and implications associated with starting new schools.
- CCGA 7/8 Meeting cancelled; our last meeting will be on June 6.

II. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs

Joyce Justus, Vice Provost – Academic Affairs (not in attendance)

Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (not in attendance)

Carol Copperud, Director of Planning and Analysis

Suzanne Klausner, Principal Analyst

Carol Copperud:

- There are discussions going about the role of UCOP and its relationship to CCGA's review of proposals for new schools particularly with regard to the four schools now under review.
- There has also been some talk of forming a "cumulative impacts" committee to vet strategic issues and analyze how these fit into larger enrollment planning, e.g., UC's stance that certain funding conditions be met when recommending schools to The Regents. Also, there is still interest in a future discussion with CCGA on the topic of what it means to be self-supporting.
- UCOP has started a review of administrative responsibilities outlined in the Compendium (Suzanne Klausner is the project manager).

III. Announcements from the Graduate Deans

Gale Morrison, Dean of Graduate Studies, UC Santa Barbara (not in attendance)

Samuel Traina, Acting VC for Research, UC Merced (not in attendance)

IV. Consent Calendar

- A. Approval of the Agenda
- B. Approval of the Minutes from the April 8, 2008 Meeting
- C. Proposed Amendments to APMs: 220-85-b; 335-10-a; 740-11-c; Rescission of APM 350

ACTION: The Consent Calendar was approved with minor corrections to the minutes.

V. Expedited Review of a Proposal for a new School of Medicine at UC Riverside – *Chair Schumm*

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA (along with UCPB and UCEP) reviews new school proposals. Chair Schumm drafted a letter summarizing CCGA’s discussion from the our last meeting, as well as making the point that formation of the School cannot proceed without a concrete commitment of “new” funds from the State or a benefactor. Members are asked to review the draft letter.

DISCUSSION:

- A few members felt that the final proposal needs to explicitly speak to the strength and durability of the partners that will be providing clinical training and include a statement about the commitment of partnering hospitals to build needed facilities.
- There was also a comment that the proposal’s stated level of support (\$500K per faculty) seems ambitious and doesn’t account for start-up costs.
- Chair Schumm proposed that we approve draft letter and he work with Professor Tager to incorporate the above comments, strongly advising that UCOP to delve into CCGA concerns a little more.

ACTION: The Committee voted (10-1-0) to approve the letter with minor changes.

VI. Proposed Fee Policy for Graduate Student in Absentia Registration – *Chair Schumm*

ISSUE: Drafted by the Council of Graduate Deans in collaboration with UCOP’s Student Financial Services and Budget Office, the policy will create greater accountability for counting and collecting graduate student fees. Members are asked to review the proposal.

DISCUSSION:

- Jeff Gibeling, Dean of the Graduate Division at UC Davis provided some background and briefly summarized the proposal. For campuses that have leave policies, *research* would no longer serve as a reason for graduate students to go on leave.
- A member asked about health insurance coverage for students studying abroad. Medical coverage would depend on the individual campus health care plan policies and levels of access to emergency health care which most plans cover.
- Another member asked if we’re missing an opportunity to address problems associated with NRT. The new policy is neutral on NRT; the Graduate Deans also felt not the right place to address NRT.
- Chair Schumm shared written comments emailed by Patrick Linder who could not be at today’s meeting.
- A suggestion was made to reword “from outside California” to “±150 miles from a UC campus” for example.
- A member expressed concern that the policy seems to preclude collaboration with a registered student despite its intent to promote indirect supervision and mentoring. It was suggested that “indirect supervision” might not be the right term, and to substitute the phrase “limited supervision sufficient to evaluate performance in independent learning courses” in its place.
- There was also concern expressed that it might be unclear whose purview ‘residency’ lies. It was suggested that we might want to back away from a making a residency statement and for now use the

phrase “does not meet residency requirements” with the understanding that will be revisited later as part of the normal review process.

- One member felt that the 15% fee is a steep amount that could force some students to drop out. A suggestion was made to strike the statement “research leave of absence” if it can be done without undermining the passage of the proposal.
- Others spoke in favor and felt that reduction to \$2,500 is significant and a huge benefit to students.
- Finally, one member suggested that it would be helpful to see an analysis of pros and cons – ways that the proposal would advantage/disadvantage students (or the Administration); it would also be helpful to have information on similar policies at other universities for comparison.
- Dean Gibeling expressed willingness to consider changing the term “indirect supervision” to something more along the lines of “limited supervision sufficient to evaluate performance in independent learning courses”, and removing the section on residency.
- A concern about the impact of the remaining (15%) fee on disciplines with limited extramural support emerged after Dean Gibeling left the meeting.

ACTION: Chair Schumm will inform Dean Gibeling that there was not unanimity on this among CCGA and consult with Council in late May.

VII. UCOP Report: Professional Degree Programs Compliance with Requirements Related to Fees and Affordability – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Following our last meeting, CCGA convened a subgroup to review the report and bring back recommendations. The 2008-09 fee levels approved by The Regents for nine of UC’s 32 professional degree programs will result in total fees that are inconsistent with the new requirement that total fees not exceed those of “comparable degree programs at comparable public institutions.”

DISCUSSION:

- Chair Schumm reported that subgroup had met twice and outlined near- and long-term goals associated with the collection of data from the campuses including specifying uniform data standards for campuses to provide to UCOP (short-term) and requesting periodic analysis of the this data by UCOP every 3 years or so (long-term).

ACTION: Chair Schumm will draft a proposal for CCGA consideration in June.

VIII. Non-fiscal Impediments to Increasing Graduate Enrollment – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: At the last meeting of the Academic Planning Council, Provost Hume expressed an interest in understanding what impediments, excluding graduate student support lie in the way of increasing graduate enrollments. It would perhaps be enlightening to have a discussion about this within the local Councils, bringing salient observations back to CCGA.

DISCUSSION:

- A few members indicated that would take this back to their campus GC and that they suspect that money and space are the top issues.
- One member shared the opinion that available resources should go to strengthening existing programs rather than new programs.
- Another member said that there ought to be guiding criteria for making decisions on funding new programs or shoring up older ones.

ACTION: Chair Schumm asked members to keep the issue in mind and take it back to their local GCs for possible discussion.

IX. Request for Special Committee for Remote/Online Instruction – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: At our last meeting, CCGA members tentatively agreed that a Special Committee might be appropriate, given a well-conceived charge. Chair Schumm has worked with CCGA/UCEP/UCCC on developing a charge for a Senate Special Committee that incorporates these comments and also on generating a request to Academic Council for establishing the committee. Members are asked to review the draft request.

DISCUSSION:

- One member questioned the Systemwide requirement statement and asked which elements would be determined centrally; and which ones left to the campuses to develop.
- Another asked if there is any research that we can look at and suggested that determining the types of courses that would be successful in meeting stated educational goals would be first charge of committee.

ACTION: Chair Schumm will incorporate above comments and confer with UCEP and UCCC in revising the draft. Members supported taking the request to Council if no substantive changes to the revised draft are needed.

X. Proposed Revisions to Section 102.05 of the Systemwide Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: The proposed amendments do not constitute a change to existing University policy; they are intended to further clarify that: (i) the “abuse of University computers and other University electronic resources” already identified in the Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline as ‘grounds for discipline’ specifically includes ‘copyright infringement’ (for example, the unauthorized file-sharing of copyrighted materials);” and (ii) the University has the right to suspend access by students to network resources consistent with the provisions of the Electronic Communications Policy and other UC guidelines...” Members are asked to review the proposed revisions.

DISCUSSION:

- Though most members supported the amendment, there were widely differing opinions on this issue.
- Members considered the various sanctions and protections available under the legal system versus the academic system, i.e., campus disciplinary procedures, and how the two systems intersect. They also discussed if the existing policy was appropriate to begin with.

ACTION: Members voted (9-2-0) to recommend the proposed revisions; Chair Schumm will draft response and include the minority view that “this unduly broadens purview of administrative authority”.

XI. Proposed Name Change: Computer and Information Systems Graduate Program (to Electrical Engineering and Computer Science) at UC Merced – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA provides consultation to the campuses/local Councils on proposed name changes and is involved in determining whether a name change is ‘simple’ or not.

DISCUSSION:

- Chair Schumm indicated that didn’t see this as insignificant name change and asked members if CCGA should request a ‘paper trail’ justification or if they felt that local process was adequate?
- Professor Anne Myers (Merced CCGA member) noted that the name change better reflected group and that the paper trail did indeed exist.

ACTION: Members voted (10-1-0) to accept the proposed name change as an appropriate name change in view of our purview.

XII. 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: The proliferation of professional doctorates has cast new light on the role of Senate review on professional degrees however. Members are asked to review the letter drafted by Chair Schumm and the historical background re: CCGA’s prior election to not review M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., J.D. program proposals and discuss whether CCGA should reconsider this, and what the parameters of that reconsideration would be.

ACTION: This item was postponed.

XIII. Certificate Programs – Vice-Chair Chehab

ISSUE: Following our last meeting CCGA directed Vice Chair Chehab to draft a memo [requesting Council send a letter] to Graduate Deans, Graduate Councils, Divisional Chairs informing them of our interpretation of SR-735, that CCGA will review SR-735s that meet these criteria and that all others not meeting these criteria would fall to local Graduate Council for review.

DISCUSSION:

– Members discussed and offered the following suggestions: make it explicit the requirement that a full proposal be submitted for new programs and for old programs; the requirement that a 2-page summary be submitted that includes prior evidence of campus GC review; curriculum, faculty expertise, assessment, completion requirements, admission requirements; number of students admitted, number of graduates, normative time; be clear that CCGA only plans to review “Certificate of Completion of Graduate Curriculum”(735s); and a reminder that we’re just enforcing 735. Chair Schumm will ask Chair Brown if wants to take this to Council before anything is sent to campuses.

ACTION: Vice-Chair Chehab will work with Chair Schumm to revise and finalize the memo.

XIV. Proposal for a new School of Nursing at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Elizabeth Watkins (UCSF)

REPORT: Professor Watkins shared her initial impressions of the proposal; she noted that the financing for the School seems strong and merits our support. It was suggested that we ask: 1) if the faculty FTE funding amount substitutes or supplements state-supported (19900) funds and 2) if the projected applicant pool is viable?

ACTION: Professor Watkins will summarize questions and concerns regarding the proposal.

XV. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. New Proposal for a Ph.D. in Management at UC San Diego – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA reviews new Graduate Degree Program proposals. Members are asked to review the proposal. The proposal is located in the Academic Senate Document Database: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/docs/>

ACTION: Ken Rose volunteered to be Lead Reviewer.

B. New Proposal for a Master of Professional Accountancy degree (M.P.Ac.) at UC Berkeley – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA reviews new Graduate Degree Program proposals. Members are asked to review the proposal. The proposal is located in the Academic Senate Document Database: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/docs/>

ACTION: Glen Mimura volunteered to be Lead Reviewer.

C. UC San Francisco Master of Science in Global Health Sciences/UCSF Response to CCGA – Ira Tager (Lead Reviewer)

ISSUE: Per the Compendium, CCGA reviews the new Graduate Degree Programs proposals. Members are asked to review the response and supporting materials submitted by UCSF in response to questions previously raised by CCGA and determine CCGA response to proposal in view of new information submitted by UCSF.

REPORT: Professor Tager summarized the UCSF revisions, which were substantial. He indicated that he has no further concerns and thinks CCGA should support the proposal.

ACTION: Members voted (9-2-0) to approve the proposal.

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

REPORT: Professor Kelley has received one of four reviews and expects to have the others by next meeting.

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

REPORT: Professor Jacobson summarized the reviews. All three reviewers identified the following as ‘big’ issues: absence of internship; governance of program problematic; resources appear under-budgeted. One member suggested that CCGA express support for a designated Dean.

ACTION: Professor Jacobson will draft a summary report and move forward with a site visit.

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

REPORT: Professor Reiff summarized the findings and major concerns of reviewers. She also mentioned a new sense of urgency to complete review. She indicated that it is good proposal that may or may not have enough faculty. They have a commitment for five faculty FTE from the EVC & Provost. Chair Schumm will look into securing a written commitment from UCI for two additional faculty members, raising the total number of faculty from five to seven.

ACTION: CCGA members voted (10-1-0) to approve the proposal contingent on written evidence of support for the additional faculty members.

G. Proposal for a Master of Science in Environmental Policy and Management at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer Patricia Springer (UCR)

REPORT: Nothing to report; letters all in; she will be setting up a site visit in next few weeks.

H. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Computational Science, Mathematics, and Engineering leading to M.S. degree (Computational Science) at UC San Diego – Matt Ferrens (UCD)

REPORT: Professor Ferrens noted that the proposal is well-done. It was suggested that he should get external reviewers to evaluate and get their take on concept of disciplinary degrees under Computational Science.

I. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Management leading to M.A./Ph.D. degree at UC Riverside – Mike Urban (UC Santa Cruz)

REPORT: Professor Urban has identified outside reviewers and drafted letters to send.

J. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Human Development at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Glen Mimura (UC Irvine)

REPORT: Professor Mimura shared his initial take on the proposal and that he is not quite sure how to proceed. The proposal was reviewed by CCGA 2 years ago; however no changes have been made it was last submitted. The proposal draws analogies with other IDPs but these are not necessarily valid comparisons. Two of the seven reviews were positive though not overwhelmingly so. From Professor Mimura's perspective, the proposal doesn't appear to meet the minimum requirements relative to comparable IDPs on other campuses and yet it was approved by local GC (again).

ACTION: Chair Schumm will work with Professor Mimura to craft an appropriate response.

XVI. New Business

XVII. Executive Session (members only)

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

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