I. **Chair’s Announcements** – Chair Schumm
   - Academic Council May 27-28 Meeting Update
     
     *May 27 (Vice Chair Chehab):*
     - The search for a successor to retiring Executive Director Mariá Bertero-Barceló is in process.
     - There was a General Counsel presentation on a legal case involving a UCI faculty member who claims they were denied a merit increase for speaking out at a faculty meeting.
     - Council adopted a modified version of the BOARS’ Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy; it next goes before Assembly.
     - Council discussed funding of the Faculty Salary Plan (salary lag v. Comp 8, off/above-scale salaries) as well as 10% across-the-board campus budget cuts.
     
     *May 28 (Chair Schumm):*
     - Request to form joint Administration/Academic Council follow-on committee for graduate student support: VP Beckwith was to take this up with the PDPE Subcommittee.
     - The Request for a Special Committee for Remote and Online Instruction was postponed.
     - The proposed In Absentia Policy was postponed. It may go out for full Senate review and seems unlikely that it will be available for 2008-09 though UCOP could in principle decide to move ahead on this since Council is advisory on this issue.
     - The UCR Medical School Proposal was approved contingent on new funding from the State.
     - The UCR Public Policy School Proposal was approved.
     - There was a presentation on Student Mental Health; Chair Schumm noted that graduate student mental health could be a major issue for CCGA next year.
     - Initiative for a Systemwide School of Global Health: The review process and selection of the lead/host campus will be on the June Council agenda; Chair Schumm to suggest that a preliminary internal review by the local Divisions and Senate Committees before comments are forwarded to GHS; then to the Compendium Committees and Council for review, accompanied by External Review.

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)*
   *Suzanne Klausner, Principal Analyst*

   There were no announcements.

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*
   
   - The Regents voted to raise fees for resident graduate academic students by $7,986/year. Half of the increase relative to last year will be returned to need-based financial aid, which will somewhat increase the total funds available for financial aid.
The Graduate Deans submitted a white paper to VP Steven Beckwith on what they would like to see UCOP do with respect to graduate support. Chair Schumm will forward the white paper along with a background document from Jeff Gibeling to committee members.

There is concern among the Graduate Deans on the proposed Graduate Student In Absentia Registration, particularly as it relates to graduate student retention.

IV. Consent Calendar
   A. Approval of the Agenda
   B. Approval of the Minutes from the May 6, 2008 Meeting.

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

V. Proposed Amendment to State Law: 5150 Psychiatric Holds – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: The proposed amendment to State law “. . . (the Welfare and Institutions Code) would require hospitals that have admitted college and university students on 5150 (psychiatric) holds to inform campus housing officials, upon request, on the timing of the student’s release. HIPAA (the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, the federal law regulating patient privacy and the release of medical records) permits such disclosure when state law requires it.” The proposed amendment is one of the recommendations from the UC Student Mental Health Workgroup of the Campus Security Task Force.

DISCUSSION:
- Chair Schumm gave a synopsis of campus comments and outlined the potential issues from his vantage point.
- One member felt that the amendment should be accompanied by a clear University policy statement, implementation procedures and information controls.
- Another member suggested that CCGA elect to not make specific recommendations and instead convey its concerns in detail, e.g., how information will be used and student privacy will be protected.
- There was some disagreement on the urgency for this amendment and the feelings on campuses as to whether this should happen sooner than later.

ACTION: Members agreed that the draft letter should state that CCGA assumes campus structures exist for handling this type of information, and if not the case, it would urge that the campuses have policies and procedures in place before such legislation goes forward and suggest that it would be good idea to have UC-wide policies for handling this information. Chair Schummm will draft a letter incorporating these comments and acknowledging that the campuses have raised a number of issues that should be addressed and that we believe this is an important issue.

VI. Review of QB3, the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: The appropriate Senate committees have been invited to provide comments on the Five-Year Academic Review of QB3 to Council by October 2008.

ACTION: Professor Watkins volunteered to work with Vice Chair Chehab on the review over the summer.

VII. Five-Year Perspectives from the Campuses (2008-2013) – Chair Schumm

ISSUE: The Five-Year Perspectives, which each campus submits annually to UCOP, provide information that UC is required to submit each year to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) used in its annual review of the plans of the state’s three public institutions of higher education. The Five-Year Perspectives also provide an opportunity to promote the coordination, synergy, and specialization possible when UC operates as a system of inter-related campuses.
DISCUSSION:
− Chair Schumm noted that there are a couple of programs listed that look more like “Extension-like” or self-supporting programs and wondered if this represents an expansion of self-supporting programs.
− Vice Chair Chehab suggested that CCGA might want to invite UCOP staff to comment on this expansion.

ACTION: No action taken.

VIII. Access to Differential-Fee and Self-Supporting Programs – Chair Schumm and Consultant Kate Jeffery, Director Student Financial Support
ISSUE: At our last meeting, 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).

DISCUSSION:
− Chair Schumm summarized major points from the sub-committee report and their recommendations for specific data elements and frequency of analysis. He is inclined to separate the data-collection component from the analysis component, so that we can get the data collection started.
− Members discussed specific questions that CCGA would like to see answered (e.g., data that might shed more light on socio-economic background) and being able to collect enough data to do longitudinal analyses.
− Kate Jeffery noted that a bigger challenge is getting comparative data.

ACTION: The committee unanimously agreed to develop more specific questions to help UCOP understand what it is we’re after and what data would be most useful in providing answers. Chair Schumm will take this information along with a request for UCOP to begin collecting these data elements to Council in June.

IX. 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., and J.D. program proposals.

DISCUSSION:
− Chair Schumm summarized the main points of a letter that he drafted. He noted that the historical documents did not differentiate ‘initial review’ from ‘oversight’ and that CCGA’s prior decision to relinquish its authority was not made with an appreciation of the distinction between the approval and oversight roles of the Senate.
− There was a discussion on whether or not CCGA is the appropriate review body for these degree titles. Members had questions about the various campus bodies that now review these and if any of these issues point to a need to revamp the whole system and review structure? There was some agreement on the lack of apparent Senate oversight and that there ought to be.
− One member suggested moving both the recommendation for external review and the foreground paragraph to the first part of the letter.
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**ACTION:** Members voted (7-2-0) to generally support the principles contained in Chair Schumm’s draft letter. He will incorporate editorial changes suggested by the Committee, and then inform Council of CCGA’s decision to reinstate its authority to review and approve proposals for these degree titles, effective immediately, while leaving the oversight of established degree programs to the professional schools that house them.

**X. Proposed Program Name Change: Atmospheric Sciences (to Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences) at UCLA – 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.

**ACTION:** After a brief discussion, members voted (8-0-1) to approve the name change as a reviewed name.

**XI. Proposed Program Name Change: Statistics and Stochastic Modeling (to Statistics and Applied Mathematics) at UC Santa Cruz – 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 suggested that CCGA should consider asking an external reviewer to assess the extent of the change in emphasis (e.g., enough to trigger higher Senate attention or higher-level review).
- Other members commented that it’s not altogether clear and a little confusing as to what the letter is requesting and that there seems to be more then a question of emphasis at issue here.

**ACTION:** Chair Schumm will consult with an Applied Math expert within the UC system and report back to CCGA in the fall.

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

**ISSUE:** Following our last meeting, Vice Chair Chehab and Chair Schumm revised a draft 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.

**DISCUSSION:** Vice Chair Chehab went over the revised draft memo. A number of changes were suggested including: substituting Graduate Council for Divisional Academic Senate where mentioned; combining related numbered items on both lists; specifying that proposals follow the same format used for other graduate degree programs; and stipulating that the 2-page summaries are due by February 1, 2009 to local Graduate Councils.

**ACTION:** Members voted (8-1-0) to approve the draft memo with modifications. Vice Chair Chehab will inform Council and request that the memo be disseminated to local Divisions, Graduate Councils, Grad Deans, and Registrars.

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

**REPORT:** Professor Watkins shared her findings since our last meeting and summarized the main points from her draft letter.

**ACTION:** Members voted (8-1-0) to send this letter forward representing CCGA’s views on the proposal.

**XV. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review**
A. Proposal for an M.S. and Ph.D. in Bioinformatics at UC Los Angeles – Lead Reviewer Anne Myers Kelley (UCM)

**REPORT:** Professor Myers noted that overall the proposal was very good; it received positive reviews from all four reviewers. The reviewers had very few criticisms and there was no commonality among them on these. The comments were varied – from the program not having enough science – to it not including enough computation.

**ACTION:** Members voted (9-0-0) to approve the proposal contingent on receipt of acceptable by-laws.

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

**REPORT:** Professor Jacobsen was not in attendance; Chair Schumm indicated that he will follow up on requesting an edited proposal from Irvine and suggested that CCGA pick this up again when Gary can be present.

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

**REPORT:** This was approved at the last meeting. (Eric: See revised letter)

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

**REPORT:** Professor Springer was not in attendance but Chair Schumm reported that she is preparing her final report and that they would work with CCGA members to try and approve this over email.

E. 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:** No report.

F. 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 reported that letters had been sent to outside reviewers and that at least one person had declined. Chair Schumm will follow-up with Sue Carter (the new CCGA representative from UCSC to serve as the Lead Reviewer as Professor Urban will not be returning in the fall.

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

**REPORT:** Chair Schumm summarized salient points from the draft letter that he and Professor Mimura worked on.
ACTION: The committee unanimously voted to accept the draft letter.

H. New Proposal for a Ph.D. in Management at UC San Diego – Ken Rose

REPORT: Professor Rose reported noted that the underlying parameters of the proposal were good, though some parts seemed hastily thrown together which could potentially cause glitches later in the review process, e.g., if key information is found to be missing. Potential reviewers have been identified.

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

REPORT: Professor Mimura noted that the proposal was very thorough and that it had been carefully vetted by the local Graduate Council. The case that this type of program is needed was well-researched. He will follow-up with the proponents on the issue of accepting applications now for summer 2009. Chair Schumm added that in doing so, they will need to make it clear that admission contingent is on approval of the program. He also indicated that they will also need to provide faculty CVs. Professor Mimura noted the proposal is ready for external reviews. It should be noted that since this is a new degree title on the Berkeley campus, CCGA is not last stop in review process; the proposal will also need to go to Academic Council for review, adding roughly another month to the timeline.

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