

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – JANUARY 10, 2006**

I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey*

REPORT: Chair Lindsey announced that Professor Quentin Williams (former CCGA Chair) will be attending the February meeting to provide an update on the Task Force on Graduate Planning. He also noted that the UC executive compensation controversy is ongoing, and the California State Senate has scheduled a hearing on this issue in the near future. A comprehensive compensation audit is also likely. He reported that the Governor's budget has bought out the tuition increases that were planned for 2006-07.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: CCGA Consultant Julius Zelmanowitz announced that he will be leaving UCOP on March 1st, and returning to UCSB as a professor in the Mathematics department at UCSB after a sabbatical. He reported that the two planning groups (of interest to CCGA), the Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education Committee (PDP) and the Graduate Student Aid Committee (GSAC), are continuing their work. GSAC has met twice, and has conducted an analysis of the various strategies proposed for funneling additional funds into graduate student support. This analysis examines these strategies' impact on the various stake holders, as well as their associated costs and/or trade-offs. A PDP subcommittee is currently considering a revised law school proposal from UCI, and will be making a series of recommendations in the near future. The revised proposal comes in response to CPEC's rejection of the original proposal (Academic Council did approve it in 2001 however), and it addresses many of the criticisms that CPEC made about the original proposal. The revisions do not significantly change the original proposal; it not only highlights the ways in which a law school at UCI will be distinctive, but also stresses some of the arguments for adding a law school at UCI, such as population growth and the lack of seats currently available to law school applicants.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the revised UCI law school proposal. They expressed the concern that although CCGA did approve the original proposal in 2001, significant changes to the proposal and/or the passage of time may necessitate another CCGA review. Consultants Julius Zelmanowitz and Karen Merritt agreed with the committee that the revised proposal would be forwarded to CCGA.

Members also discussed the Education joint doctorate programs. They were interested in the qualitative impact that the passing of the SB 751 will have on the existing joint doctorate programs in Education. It was noted that the CSU will most likely develop a number of independent Ed.D.'s. Specifically, members inquired into the CPEC criteria that would be used to evaluate any new CSU Ed.D. Educational Leadership proposals. Consultant Karen Merritt pointed members towards the CCGA handbook, where criteria for reviewing proposed Joint UC/CSU doctoral programs are listed (although this does not specifically list the CPEC criteria). Members reiterated that they are mainly concerned with the process by which these new proposals will be approved. Consultants also noted that there may be some CSU campuses that may want to divorce themselves from the existing Education joint doctorate programs, and it will

be up to the two systems to ensure that any divorce(s) be amicable by ensuring that the quality of doctoral training in this area does not diminish. Along these lines, consultant Julius Zelmanowitz is proposing that a PDP subcommittee be established that will determine UC's future contribution towards doctoral training in the field of Education (especially in the field of special education). At this point, there are only a few joint programs between CSU and UC that focus on special education (UCB and UCLA), although UC does offer a few degrees of its own in this area (UCR & UCSB). He said that initially CSU is trying to limit the number of campuses that will offer an independent Education doctoral program to about five or six campuses, and most of these programs will probably be located at campuses where existing joint doctorate programs are already in place. That said however, Julius Zelmanowitz foresees that over the next couple of years only a few of the joint doctorate programs will experience significant changes and/or withdraw from existing partnerships, and many others will continue for the short-term future. Finally, market forces themselves may limit the future development of the CSU independent Education doctorates. CCGA members also mentioned the legislative oversight that was built into SB 751, which mandated a legislative review sometime after the establishment of these independent programs. Members agreed that it will be important to watch the development of these programs, and follow-up on whether such a review actually does take place.

Members also discussed the role that CCGA plays in the work that the PDP is currently engaged in. Julius Zelmanowitz stressed that the PDP does not develop implementation plans, but its charge stipulates three functions: (1) Deal with the immediate threats to the Master Plan such as audiology; (2) Look towards future threats such as special education and physical therapy; and (3) Complete a long-term needs and capacity analysis of UC in this area. He noted that one of the ultimate goals of the PDP is to create a library or data base, which CCGA can utilize as it does its business. PDP reports to the Provost, however CCGA has a liaison who sits on the committee (former CCGA Chair Quentin Williams). Members agreed that Professor Williams is an excellent choice as the CCGA liaison, but felt that there should be some mechanism by which CCGA's collective knowledge could be funneled into PDP's activities and policy proposals.

ACTION: Consultant Karen Merritt will forward both (1) the revised UCI Law School proposal, and (2) CPEC's rejection of the original proposal from 2001. Quentin Williams' attendance at the next CCGA meeting will be confirmed.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the November 15, 2005 Minutes

ACTION: The November 15, 2005 minutes were approved with minor edits.

B. Proposed Name Change for the UC Berkeley School of Information Management & Systems.

ACTION: CCGA approved the name change. Duncan Lindsey will send a letter to Council Chair Cliff Brunk.

C. UC Berkeley Educational Leadership Joint Doctorate Dissertation Committee Policy Exception Request

ACTION: This item was moved off the consent calendar.

IV. UC Berkeley Educational Leadership Joint Doctorate Dissertation Committee Policy Exception Request (*moved off the consent calendar*)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Nadine Lambert, the UCB CCGA member, requested an exception to the policy described in the CCGA Handbook for the Creation of the CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs (JDP), which requires that both the Qualifying Examination Committee and the Dissertation Committee be composed of two CSU faculty members and two UCB faculty members. At Berkeley, doctoral degree committees—both for the Qualifying Examination and the dissertation—require an outside member. For the JDP, the Qualifying Examination Committee at Berkeley would be composed of five members: two CSU faculty members and three UCB faculty members, at least one of whom must be from outside of the Graduate School of Education. She specifically requested that the dissertation committee for the JDP in Leadership for Educational Equity be composed of three faculty members, the same as the dissertation committee composition for other doctoral degrees on campus. The proposed composition would be one faculty member from CSU, one faculty member from the Graduate School of Education at UCB, and one outside faculty member from UCB, for a three person committee. Professor Lambert said that five-person dissertation committees have become unworkable, due to the time commitment required for faculty and the burden placed on JDP students, who are also working school administrators.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the original philosophy behind the joint doctorate dissertation committee policy, as well as the recent exception (to this rule) granted to the UCSB/Cal Poly JDP. They noted that the original intent of this rule was a pedagogical balance between CSU and UC on the dissertation committees. The UCB member noted that when the UCB Graduate Council originally approved this program, it did so under the Berkeley 1:1:1 dissertation committee rule, as well as the CCGA 2:2 rule, which created the five-person dissertation committees. She also cited the recently approved exception for the UCSB/Cal Poly JDP, and argued that the UCB case is quite similar, noting that workload demands are making it increasingly difficult to field the five-member dissertation committees. Members discussed both the importance and the level of engagement of the external member on these dissertation committees. While some members stated that in their experience the external member is not as engaged as the other members in the dissertation process, the UCB member stressed that within Berkeley Education dissertation committees, the external member is quite engaged, and actively participates in the research. The reason for this is that an Education dissertation focuses on a subfield of Education (such as language development, linguistics, reading, cognitive science, etc.), and the external member serves as the expert in this field. The UCB member also mentioned that the UCB Education Planning Committee Board (which includes the CSU partners) have agreed that this dissertation composition (1:1:1) achieves the balance that CCGA originally intended when it passed the 2:2 dissertation committee rule. Members agreed that an exception would be acceptable if the minutes from this board meeting contained evidence of CSU consent.

ACTION: UCB Member Professor Nadine Lambert will forward the UCB Education Planning Committee Board minutes to CCGA. Members voted to approve the exception to the rule contingent on the receipt of evidence of the consent of the CSU partners.

V. UC Merced Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics

ISSUE: The UC Merced (UCM) member presented the policies, procedures, and bylaws for the UC Merced Graduate Group in Applied Mathematics to the committee. He explained that there are six initial graduate groups at UCM, which require policies, procedures, and bylaws that govern the graduate programs at UCM. There is currently a core group of applied mathematicians who are requesting formal recognition of this graduate group under the Individual Graduate Program (IGP) umbrella authority, which expires in two years. He added that if the UCM graduate groups do not come up with formal proposals, then they will cease to exist.

DISCUSSION: The committee asked if their approval of this group would mean that CCGA is recommending to the Regents that this group be given authority to grant Ph.D.'s in Applied Mathematics. The UCM representative replied that this would not be the case, as a student would get a Ph.D. in an individualized course of graduate study (diplomas will read "individualized graduate program"). Members also had a number of queries about the policies and procedures. First, the committee pointed out that there is not a capstone requirement for the M.S. degree, and noted that a Plan II Masters' program always requires a capstone. Members also remarked that the second bullet on page 10 of the "Policies and Procedures" document appears incomplete (it ends with a semicolon). They also referenced Senate Regulation (SR) 762, which does not allow graduate credit for undergraduate courses. Section 5.2.1 should be revised to reflect this regulation. Section 5.1 states that "M.S. students must be registered as a full-time student for at least one semester before advancement to candidacy." One member thought that this might be clarified. He felt that this statement might be true for students who enter the Ph.D. program with a prior M.S., but he was not sure that it applied to students who did not already have an advanced degree. Another member sought clarification regarding the qualifying exams. He remarked that the "Policies and Procedures" document notes that there is an oral and a written part of the qualifying exam. However, the written portion of the exam is really only the dissertation proposal. Members asked if the dissertation proposal is indeed part of the qualifying exam, or if there is a separate written section.

ACTION: Professor Shawn Kantor will seek clarification on the issues raised in the discussion above. Members will consider and vote on this graduate group proposal at the February meeting.

VI. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review (final action)

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

ACTION: *This proposal was moved to VII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review (in progress).*

B. Proposal for a M.S. in Civil Engineering/M.S. in Urban and Regional Planning at UC Irvine -- Lead Reviewer Shrinivasa Upadhyaya (UCD)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Upadhyaya reminded members that the unit requirements for the concurrent degree remained a central issue in this review. He noted that the M.S. in Civil Engineering (MSCE) portion of the degree requires 36 units; the M.S. in Regional Planning (MURP) portion also requires 36 units. At first, Professor Upadhyaya

did not understand how this arrangement would make the concurrent degree any more efficient than if students completed these degree programs separately. This issue was clarified when he learned that the MURP requires 72 units if students are pursuing it as a stand-alone program. Another concern is the assumption that this concurrent program can be completed in two years. The proposers replied that according to their surveys, students complete the MSCE on average in 1.48 years. On the suggestion of Professor Upadhyaya, the proposers have now revised the proposal to reflect a new normative time of 2.5 years (although the proposal states that students can complete the degree in as little as two years and some students may take up to three years to complete it). Based upon the resolution of these two issues, Professor Upadhyaya recommends this proposal for approval.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that there is a two-year time limit for earning a single masters' degree. However, Professor Upadhyaya assured members that this rule did not apply in this case since students would be earning two degrees.

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the program and seconded. Members voted without dissent to approve the program. Professor Upadhyaya will forward a final report to the CCGA Analyst.

C. Proposal to Establish the Graduate Group and the Master of Advanced Study (M.A.S.) Degree Program in Clinical Research at UC Davis – Lead Reviewer
Duncan Lindsey

ISSUE/REPORT: CCGA Chair Duncan reminded members that this proposal originally came to CCGA in March of 2005, but its review has been delayed until now. He noted that CCGA has received two reviews for this proposal (one internal and one external), both of which are supportive of the program. He reported that there is a definite need for the program, as medical practitioners who design clinical trials increasingly must have medical investigative skills, which this program will provide. The structure of the program is also strong. Based on the reviews, as well as his own reading of the proposal, Professor Lindsey recommends this program for approval.

DISCUSSION: Members were concerned about the funding of the program. Professor Lindsey assured them that the program will be self-supportive and it will be funded through both clinical funds and research funds to support the program. The Davis Medical School (through which the program will be administered) is also pursuing K-30 funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which reviewers are confident that it will receive.

ACTION: A motion was made to approve the proposal and seconded. Members approved the program without dissent.

VII. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review (in progress)

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Sharrer noted that this review is taking longer than originally anticipated due to problems finding reviewers. He reminded members that one external review has been received and was discussed at the November meeting (please see the [Academic Senate Document Database](#) for this review). He also has not been able to find any internal reviewers, but he is continuing to follow-up on current leads. These difficulties aside, he reported that he has just received confirmation from another external reviewer, which the committee can discuss at its February meeting.

ACTION: Professor Sharrer will forward the external review to committee members, as well as continuing to look for internal reviewers.

B. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Horticulture and Agronomy at UC Davis

ACTION: The committee selected Professor Albert Stralka (UCR) as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

C. 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 received one internal review and one external review. She is currently following-up with a second external reviewer. She noted that the reviews received thus far have been fairly positive.

ACTION: Professor Lambert will follow-up with the second external reviewer and report on the reviews at the February meeting.

D. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Developmental Biology at UC San Francisco for the Ph.D. and M.S. Degree – Lead Reviewer Anne Wuerker (UCLA)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wuerker was not present at the meeting and therefore did not provide an update on this review.

E. Proposal for a Ph.D./M.A. in Education at UC Irvine – Lead Reviewer Thomas Patterson (UCSD)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Patterson reported that he has received two external reviews for this proposal. While both reviews express enthusiasm for the proposed program, they do voice some areas of concern. First, they commented that the current faculty composition is unbalanced with a higher number of junior faculty members than senior faculty members. Professor Patterson noted, however, that UCI can easily address this issue. Reviewers also remarked that more detail is needed on the course work outlined in the proposal.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the next steps for this review. They debated the need for internal reviewers. Members concluded that it will depend on the response from the proposers to the concerns raised by the external reviewers.

ACTION: Professor Patterson will send a letter to the proposers noting the areas of concern.

F. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Music at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Stralka reported that he has received two internal reviews and two external reviews. While all reviews are positive, they did discuss the polemics of musicology (and how they might affect the proposed program). Basically, the reviewers debated whether musicology encompasses all types of world music, or whether musicology primarily studies European-based music. Professor Stralka said that the proposal seems to indicate that the program would study the former definition of musicology. Another concern is the future job market for musicologists.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the need for graduates of this program. Professor Stralka noted that this would be a very small program that would not produce a large amount of Ph.D.'s, so the net impact on the job market would be small. He added that the addition of a Ph.D. program would significantly improve the undergraduate and masters' degree programs in music at UCSC, as the Ph.D. students will serve as teaching assistants (TA's) in many of the undergraduate courses.

The committee's discussion was complemented by the presence of a CCGA alternate, who happened to be a faculty member within the UCLA Department of Ethnomusicology. He described the history and the different subfields within musicology. He stated that traditionally musicology studied the Western canon. On the other hand, comparative musicology in the 19th century was the study of world music. In the 1950's and 60's, comparative musicology became ethno-musicology, which studied everything but Western music. This division became compounded with the incursion of cultural studies into musicology, while ethno-musicology is based primarily on field work given its anthropological bent. He also said that there is an advantage to having both subfields within one department (as Santa Cruz proposes to do). This is currently the trend within the field and it would make graduates of the Santa Cruz program more marketable.

ACTION: The CCGA alternate agreed to write an internal review of the proposal. Professor Stralka will write a summary of the reviews for the February meeting.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Chehab has received five reviews for this program (three external and two internal). He said that while there are three similar programs in the country, this program has a unique focus on the Arts. All of the reviewers praised the faculty that has been assembled for the program as strong. However, four out of the five reviewers raised the issue of the language requirement. They felt that there is simply not enough time to fulfill the language requirement (proficiency in at least one South East Asian language) given the length of the program (two years). In addition to the language

requirement, this program requires a considerable amount of course work (five courses and four seminars), as well as a thesis. Another issue is the library holdings. One reviewer pointed out that the current library holdings are quite poor. The reviewers also believed that the proposers' forecast for job placement is overstated. Another possible deficiency in the proposal is the lack of a budget, thereby making it impossible to know for certain if the program will be sufficiently funded. Student support could be another issue, as it is often difficult for Masters' students to get fellowships (as opposed to Ph.D. students).

DISCUSSION: Members inquired about the number of faculty members for the program. Professor Chehab responded that there are eight faculty members, and they appear to be well-balanced in terms of rank/seniority. One member suggested that the proposers might want to define "proficiency" of the language requirement in terms of the number of quarters required.

ACTION: Professor Chehab will write a letter to the proposers noting the principal concerns of the committee. He will also include the five reviews.

H. 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 has confirmed one external reviewer and one internal reviewer for this proposal. Although the proposal does not contain bylaws, he did mention that Cal Western and UCSD have an "association agreement", which seems to be a high-level understanding between the two institutions for collaboration in certain areas. He noted that graduates of the program will essentially receive two degrees, one from Cal Western and one from UCSD. While the degree itself would be academic in nature, the program will be administered by University Extension given their expertise in certain administrative areas (i.e. marketing). The program is targeted towards mid-career professionals (lawyers, and health care professionals); not necessarily towards law students or medical students (although such applicants would not be excluded). One of Professor Kantor's main concerns is the core curriculum. For example, one of the initial courses for medical professionals is a class on how to think about the law. Likewise, the lawyers enrolled in the program will be taking a class that will teach the basics on how to successfully complete medical school course work. Professor Kantor is concerned that this will not be adequate to prepare students (especially lawyers without a medical/biology background) to successfully complete the course work that will come later in the program.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired into the nature of the health science courses. They noted that if these courses were more policy related, then it is plausible that lawyers would be able to complete them.

ACTION: Professor Kantor will send a letter to the proposers stating CCGA's concerns and requesting a response addressing these concerns.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Heckhausen reported that she has received a total of seven reviews (five internal and two external) for this proposal. Although this program is termed “interdisciplinary”, most of the course work is completed within the students’ home departments, so there is actually very little interdisciplinary work. While the program involves many academic disciplines, psychology and linguistics are predominant in terms of both faculty participation and courses offered. Faculty research in human development is also similarly unbalanced. She noted that out of the 31 faculty members listed as being associated with the program, only 17 had a discernable research interest in human development, with the bulk of these coming from the field of psychology. The proposal also does not include a list of bylaws, admission procedures (between the programs), an administrative structure, or a budget.

Reviewers were unanimous in their assessment that the faculty members associated with the proposed program are outstanding. However, several reviewers felt that the current proposed program structure (with most of the degree requirements being rooted in the students’ home departments) would compare unfavorably with other programs in human development. In fact, the external reviewers encouraged the proposers to consider creating a stand-alone interdisciplinary Ph.D. program rather than the interdepartmental model that is present in the proposal. Another concern is the large breadth of the field of human development, which the program is attempting to cover. A better strategy would be to capitalize on the strengths of the faculty members at UCSD (cognitive development, developmental linguistics, and developmental neuroscience), thereby limiting itself to these specializations within human development. Another issue is the number of methodological requirements. Reviewers commented that there is only one required course in statistics, which is surprising given the sophisticated methods of data collection and analyses have been developed in this field.

Professor Heckhausen feels that while the proposal contains many positive elements (excellent faculty, etc.), its current version is under-developed and needs substantial revisions. Specifically, she feels that the program proposal could benefit from a greater incorporation of true interdisciplinary components such as course requirements, a thematic focus, and an independent (stand-alone) structure.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired into the paradigm of human development. As an expert in the field herself, Professor Heckhausen responded that human development encompasses cognitive, social, emotional, and personality development throughout the human life span. It also includes the various influences on human development, such as biological, societal, and cultural factors. In sum, she noted that the field of human development is very large, so any one campus is unlikely to cover the full range of relevant fields of expertise. For example, she mentioned that there are programs that only cover education and career development, but such a program would specialize in this area throughout the entire life span. Members discussed the possibility of renaming the program to reflect a more specific focus. Above all, professor Heckhausen stressed that the program should avoid a “cafeteria approach” in which students pick courses

haphazardly. Members were also interested in seeing samples of the kinds of research that the program proposers anticipate from the students enrolled in this program.

ACTION: Professor Heckhausen will send a letter to the program proposers, noting both CCGA's and the reviewers' concerns, asking for a response to these concerns.

J. Proposal for an on-line Master of Science (MS) in Engineering at UCLA – Lead Reviewer Reen Wu (UCD)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wu reported that he has received two external reviews for this program. Essentially, this program is simply taking an already existing degree program at UCLA and moving it to an on-line environment. Planned initial enrollment is 20 students per year, with future growth depending on the market. It is not only a self-supporting program, but it is designed to support the Ph.D. program. There are also incentives for the faculty to teach their courses on-line, mainly in the form of financial incentives (initially set at 1/9 of faculty salary for new courses; 1/18 of faculty salary for repeated courses). He also mentioned that exams will be given on-line, but proctored face-to-face at a physical location.

One of the reviewer's main concerns is the faculty compensation for the delivery of the on-line courses. One reviewer feels that the stated compensation underestimates the amount of time and effort required to deliver these courses in an on-line format. Dean Jacobson (the program proposer) responded to this concern by stating that these compensation figures are initial estimates, which could be subject to later revision. Another issue is whether on-campus students can take on-line courses as part of their degree (or vice versa). Dean Jacobson responded that this is possible (for both on-line and on-campus students), but traditional M.S. degree holders may only pursue the on-line M.S. if it is in a substantially different area of study.

DISCUSSION: Members were concerned about the level of faculty compensation for teaching the courses on-line. Some members agreed with the reviewers that the proposed compensation is insufficient given the amount of time that is typically required when delivering on-line courses. Citing one external reviewer who said that each on-line student is equivalent to perhaps five to ten on-campus students in terms of the demands on faculty time, one member argued that students enrolled in the on-line program would suffer a significant loss in contact time when compared to their counterparts enrolled in the on-campus program (especially given the compensation rate of 1/18 for repeated courses). Special mention was also made of CCGA's recent drafting Senate Regulation, which, although still in draft form, would require all on-line courses to have the same amount of contact time as face-to-face on-campus courses. Quality of the courses remained another chief concern of members. Some argued that unless adequate compensation is offered, the quality of the courses would suffer. Members also felt that ideally this program proposal should have received more reviews. Given that one external review contained significant concerns, they felt that additional reviews may be warranted.

Beyond compensation and quality, members noted a number of other miscellaneous concerns. The proposed budget also does not include any allowance of the proctoring of exams at physical locations. The “design project” is also not properly specified in the proposal. Members observed that the transfer of an on-campus design project to an on-line environment could prove to be problematic. Finally, there seems to be a general lack of faculty experience in the delivery of on-line courses.

Given these concerns, members suggested either provisionally approving the program, or approving it with a specified review date after a couple of years. It was generally felt that any approval should be accompanied by a strong commitment of support from the UCLA Engineering Department. Other suggestions included allowing the UCLA Graduate Council to set-up a provisional program, which CCGA would review in two or three years’ time.

ACTION: Professor Wu will request clarification from Dean Jacobson regarding (1) the design project, and (2) the compensation issues. Approval of the program has been subsequently tabled until the February meeting.

K. 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 program proposers are still considering CCGA’s response to their proposal.

DISCUSSION: Members considered setting a firm deadline for a response to CCGA’s concerns. However, they concluded that it might be better not to set a firm deadline, but rather to ask for a response by February.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will write the proposers asking for a response to CCGA’s concerns by February 1st.

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

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