

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MEETING MINUTES – OCTOBER 3, 2006**

**I. 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 briefed members on the history of this proposal. In September 2005, CCGA sent a report to the Davis division, which was critical of the original proposal. The Davis division submitted another proposal, which was forwarded to external reviews for a second review. The program has been renamed as a “Ph.D. in Forensic and Behavioral Sciences,” with a focus on the science behind criminology. With the exception of one negative review, he now believes that the current proposed program is both viable and exciting. He lists the strengths of the program are both the CSU faculty, who have expertise in the science of criminology at CSU, and the Davis faculty, who have expertise in forensics. That said however, the proposal is still missing some components.

One issue is the normative time required to get through the program, which the proponents estimate to be four years. He said that it usually takes longer for students to get through most Ph.D. programs. Student support is another issue. While the MOU from the Davis Graduate Studies Dean refers to a budget, the CSU portion of that budget is incomplete. CCGA also needs to see letters of support from deans, etc. He mentioned that a site visit will probably be required.

**DISCUSSION:** Members were interested in the estimated normative time of four years. Bruce clarified that the original proposal was unclear as to whether this program was more professional or academic in nature. He remarked that although the proponents have redrafted the proposal as an academic Ph.D. program (thereby eliminating some of the more ‘professional’ aspects), they retained the four year normative time to graduation. Members also asked what Bruce expects in terms of support. He responded that there are two issues -- the size of the cohort and graduate student support, specifically the number of graduate teaching assistantships. As this is a CSU-UCD collaborative, the proposal is not specific as to which institution will be providing teaching assistantships. Therefore, statements are needed for guaranteeing teaching assistantships, even if they are only from Davis. Members also asked about CSU support. He said that at this point, the CSU support is unknown. CCGA can and should insist on evidence of support from both institutions.

Members also commented on the reviews received, stating that some are not overwhelmingly positive. Professor Schumm is reluctant to block the proposal again, and he feels that the program is ready to go because of the quality of the faculty at both institutions. That said, what is currently lacking are the organizational resources.

**ACTION:** Bruce will schedule a site-visit; he will also send out the report to the program proponents.

## **II. Announcements from the Academic Senate Office**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Chair Oakley thanked members for volunteering for Senate service. He emphasized the importance of Senate service at this critical time for the University. He commented that the relationship between the Academic Senate, the Regents, and President Dynes is good at this time.

### NRT Memorial

Chair Oakley noted that the Academic Senate's NRT Memorial to the Regents was passed by 86% of the faculty via a systemwide mail ballot. He said that the Regents have acted on this memorial by asking the Office of the President (UCOP) how the NRT could be eliminated, as well as how much it would cost UC. He noted, however, that there are legal impediments imposed by the California legislature to the outright elimination of NRT (by law UC must charge out-of-state students the actual cost of instruction). Essentially, the Regents agree with the faculty that NRT does not make good policy, which pushes away the best and the brightest students in the world from UC. He commented that one of the main obstacles to eliminating NRT is the public perception's that graduate education is simply an enhanced version of undergraduate education. By and large, the public does not understand that graduate students play a vital contributing role towards the functioning of the University in terms of both its research and teaching. Therefore, the University needs to figure out a way to recycle the monies that are distributed systemwide, returning the money collected through NRT back to its source (the academic programs that are paying it). There are a number of funds that are directed to UCOP, and then redirected back to the campuses to the general fund, which is under the discretion of the appropriate executive vice chancellor (EVC). The EVCs use these funds according to local priorities (off-scale salaries, retention, starting new programs, etc.). Therefore, the issue is not whether the NRT monies go back to the campuses, but more importantly, if these funds go back into the academic departments from which they came. NRT money does not represent new funds either; any redistribution back to the various academic departments essentially takes money away from other campus priorities. Following that, he urged members to contact their respective provosts to lobby for 100% recycling of the NRT revenue back into the academic departments.

### Graduate Student Support/Ratio

Chair Oakley remarked that UC currently has about an 80:20 ratio between undergraduate to graduate students, however other comparable institutions have ratios on the magnitude of 60:40. Historically, UC has been building up, but to do so, the University has predominantly relied upon undergraduate enrollment growth. Between 2010 and 2011, undergraduate enrollment growth is forecasted to level off. At that time, UC will be in a better position to address this graduate support.

### Compensation

Executive compensation, and tracking that compensation, has been very controversial this past year at UC and in the media. Currently, the University is in a period of counter reaction. However, what has emerged is an acute perception that if the University is going to meet its high standards, UC must not only do a better job in responding to the public, but more importantly, develop greater transparency by improving its information technology systems. In fact, this was one of the major recommendations of the Task Force on UC's Compensation, Accountability,

and Transparency. In terms of tracking, UC's first priority is improving its human resource systems across the campuses, which currently do not have the ability to address inquiries through a single system. He stressed, however, that this is not done overnight, nor is it cheap. Related to executive compensation is faculty compensation. Chair Oakley emphasized that UC must provide adequate pay for high-quality professors across the spectrum of academic disciplines. To that end, he added that the Regents are committed to raising cash salaries for faculty.

#### UC System Identity

Another issue is whether UC is a university co-op that shares costs, or is it one University with ten campuses. There are good reasons why the systemwide model is consistent with a tradition that offers equal access to education at all UC campuses. That model has never been a centralized command-and-control model. There is real virtue in having some degree of autonomy at the campus level. He added that this autonomy shields the campuses from dealing with many of the systemwide issues that face UCOP.

#### UCRP Contributions

Chair Oakley noted that there is no immediate plan to reinstate contributions to UCRP because a large segment of the staff are represented by unions. Until union agreements can be reached, UCRP contributions cannot begin because the Regents have emphasized that asymmetric contributions are not an option. He emphasized that initially faculty and staff would not notice any increase in their contributions within the first year, as the UCRP contributions would simply take the place of the current 2% DC plan contributions. Because the annuity is based on the last 36 months of compensation, increases in salaries would also affect the pension. On a related note, health care premiums are under tremendous pressure and will continue to increase.

#### Proposition 1D

Chair Oakley explained that Proposition 1D is the education bond measure, which includes both K-12 funding as well as higher education funding, totaling about \$17 million. Although Governor Schwarzenegger has endorsed this bond measure, recent polls show that only 54% of the voting public supports it. He noted that it is a tough environment to argue for increases in the investment in higher education. That said, he acknowledged that even though we are in a period of short-term focus, Governor Schwarzenegger is receptive. He said that about approximately \$3 billion is needed to properly fund the higher education system, which should be done across sectors (UC, CSU, and community college). While California still spends more on higher education than many other states do; the system is still under funded nonetheless.

#### International Initiatives

Chair Oakley noted that 60-70% of international graduate students stay in California after they graduate, and contribute to the California economy. Therefore, it makes good sense for UC to pursue international initiatives that promote UC abroad. To that end, he reported that he recently participated in a trip to China, where he met with six out of the 'ten plus ten' UC partners.

**ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will forward Gretchen Kalonji's presentation on UC's international initiatives to members.**

#### Senate Process

Director Maria Bertero-Barceló reminded members that Chair Oakley and Vice-Chair Brown are ex-officio members of this committee and should be invited to CCGA meetings as the need arises. She stressed the importance of Bylaw 40, which states that when a standing committee wants to make a recommendation to the President, it must present the report/memorandum to Academic Council. She also recommended that the committee try to complete all of its memorandums, reports, etc. by April; otherwise, it could easily stretch into next year. She also made a reference to the [Guidelines for Systemwide Senate Committees](#), noting that members must go through their faculty representatives when communicating with administrators. She stressed that these are closed committee meetings; therefore all guests must be formally invited through the Chair of the Senate. Once approved, minutes are public documents and posted on the Senate website. She advised members that student representatives are not protected under privilege and client information. Finally Analyst Todd Giedt urged new members to read the [CCGA Handbook](#), which contains useful information on CCGA policies and procedures. Another useful document is the [Acronym Glossary](#), which lists the acronyms commonly used by the Academic Senate and UCOP.

**DISCUSSION:** One member asked why the NRT could not simply be collected at the local level, thereby eliminating OP altogether. Chair Oakley responded that in UC's budget, revenue (which included NRT) is highly tracked by the legislative analyst; therefore it must be accounted for at the systemwide level. Another member argued that money distributed to the campuses should be tracked as percentages of the NRT as well as various other fees, sources of revenue, etc. He also inquired into the possibility of fund raising specifically for graduate student support. The third point is a longer-run issue, which is to change the accounting that currently does not account for the production of research (UC only accounts for instruction now). Chair Oakley responded that in terms of creating an efficient pipeline back to the academic departments, OP is facing challenges from EVCs, who have various conflicting commitments and priorities. To that end, Chair Oakley noted that the Chair of the Academic Senate holds an annual meeting with the Chancellors and the EVCs on an alternating year basis (this year he will be meeting with the EVCs).

Members made a number of points regarding the accounting practices of the University and fund raising. One member argued for labeling and tracking the money that goes to campuses as percentages of the NRT, fees, etc. The University also needs to account for the production of research (UC only accounts for instruction now). Such an accounting system would recognize that graduate students not only teach undergraduates, but also produce research. Another point is fund raising. Chair Oakley said the question is to decide which things can be better served by fund raising. Because fund raising for international graduate students is much less viable than raising funds for other things, the EVCs should have a rationale for devoting more money from the general fund (some of which comes from NRT) towards international graduate student support. He also said that UC does not have a tradition and/or history of subsidizing international graduate education through fund raising, remarking that most people want to pay for buildings. He added that fund raising also has the potential of further disaggregating the various campuses, as the system includes some flag-ship campuses in high-visibility urban areas (that presumably have natural advantages in terms of fund raising over those campuses located in more rural areas). If we disaggregate the University, then campuses will stratify themselves, and we will not be able to guarantee new students that they will have equal access to a UC education.

Adding to the members' comments on accounting for the production of research, he remarked that UC is also subsidizing its undergraduate teaching through the use of graduate teaching assistants (TAs), which means that the full cost of undergraduate instruction is also not accounted for.

Finally, one member asked about the status of the governor's stated policy that graduate tuition should be 50% higher than undergraduate tuition. Chair Oakley responded that this statement stems from the misunderstanding that a graduate education is just an enhanced form of an undergraduate education. What is missing is the understanding that graduate students significantly contribute to the research and teaching missions of the University. To that end, UC is making incremental progress towards showing how graduate programs are different and unique from undergraduate programs.

### **III. Chair's Announcements**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Chair Wu made introductions. Chair Wu referenced the annual report, noting the high number of program reviews completed in the 2005-06 academic year. He emphasized CCGA's role in reviewing new graduate program proposals, and he anticipates that the committee will review its normal amount new program proposals (last year the committee completed 12 reviews). Any comments on the annual report should be directed to Analyst Todd Giedt.

#### Non-Resident Tuition (NRT)

Reminding members that CCGA targeted NRT as one of its main objectives last year, he updated members on its current status. As it stands now, most NRT monies are being redirected into each campus's general fund. Once a student passes his or her oral exam and advances to candidacy, the NRT fees are eliminated for three years. Previously, non-resident graduate students were only responsible for the last 25% of NRT upon advancement to candidacy.

**DISCUSSION:** Members recalled that the Academic Assembly passed the "[Memorial to the Regents on Non-Resident Tuition for Graduate Students](#)" in May, which states that NRT should be abolished altogether. Director Bertero-Barceló clarified that while the Regents did agree to this Memorial in principle, the University is constrained by state law, which dictates that UC must collect NRT from its non-resident students. That said, there are ways around it without violating the law. One such way is the redistribution of NRT monies back to the campuses and their respective departments. Members highlighted this issue as a crucial issue for the recruitment of graduate students. One member pointed out that it is often difficult to fund-raise directly for international graduate students. Another way might be to persuade deans to create fellowships for foreign students. Fellowships for foreign students are more important than out-of-state students because out-of-state students are able to become residents after one year (while international students cannot). Therefore, UC may need an advertising campaign to show why international students are so important for UC. One member noted that the Davis provost has decided to give 25% of the NRT and student fees back to the principal investigator (PI). They cautioned that NRT is not really identifiable as a separate revenue stream from other revenue; it is lumped together with student fees and other sources of miscellaneous revenue, and goes into the each campus's general fund. While acknowledging that the California legislature would be reluctant to give up NRT altogether, some members argued that it may be willing to restrict it to

the initial year of graduate study, thereby treating international students like out-of-state students. Finally, members reiterated that the estimated total cost of giving up NRT is approximately \$40 million.

**ACTION: Members will ask their respective graduate deans for a report on the amount/percentage of NRT that is going back to each academic department.**

#### Graduate Student Support

Chair Wu noted that there is about a \$2,000 gap between UC graduate student support packages and those offered by comparable institutions.

**DISCUSSION:** One member reported anecdotally that some private institutions, such as Princeton, are eliminating graduate student tuition altogether. Their economic reasoning is that quality graduate students attract grants, which bring more money to these institutions than the collection of tuition. Instead of collecting tuition, these institutions essentially give scholarships to incoming Ph.D. students. Other members contrasted this approach with the use of block grants, which UC uses to support its graduate students.

**ACTION: Members asked to see some more information on this practice to determine whether it is only anecdotal or more systematic in nature. Analyst Todd Giedt will contact the chair of the Council of Graduate Deans, Lisa Sloan (UCSC), to gather information on UC's competitor institutions.**

#### Miscellaneous

Chair Wu reported on a number of miscellaneous issues, including diversity, Senate regulations (SR) 694/695, and the Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education (PDPE). He also noted that the co-drafted (with UCEP) "[Proposal on the Role of Graduate Student in University Instruction](#)" is currently out for Senate review.

**ACTION: Members requested that (1) Academic Council forward comments on SR 694/695 in time for its November meeting; and (2) that Quentin Williams be invited to come to one of the CCGA meetings to report on both the activities of the PDPE and its Allied Health Subcommittee.**

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

*Joyce Justus did not attend the meeting. Consequently, there were not any announcements from the President's Office, Academic Initiatives.*

#### **V. Consent Calendar**

##### **A. Name Change for the UCD Graduate Program and M.F.A. Degree Program in Textile Arts and Costume Design**

*This item was taken off the consent calendar (see item VI.).*

##### **B. Select representative to attend Council of Graduate Deans (COGD) meeting at UCLA on November 2, 2006**



**ACTION:** Members selected Roger Savage (UCLA) as the CCGA representative to attend this meeting. Professor Schumm will ask the new COGD Chair to come to some CCGA meetings.

## **VI. Name Change for the UCD Graduate Program and M.F.A. Degree Program in Textile Arts and Costume Design**

**ISSUE:** The Davis Graduate Council has approved a proposal from the graduate program in Textile Arts and Costume Design for a simple name change from “Textile Arts and Costume Design” to “Design.” They assert that this is a ‘simple name change’ and that there is no associated fundamental change in the nature or direction of the degree program, or any need for substantial new resources.

**DISCUSSION:** Members disagreed with this statement, opining that this change implies a change in degree requirements, which is a significant change in the program. Specifically, they cited former Graduate Council Chair Andrew Waterhouse’s letter to Dean Jeffery Gibeling of July 5, 2006, which notes that the new program has made degree requirement changes and a curriculum change from a one-track to a three-track program. This letter also mentions that additional faculty FTEs have been added. The Davis member clarified that the main issues were lack of faculty, lack of support, and lack of space (which is why admissions were suspended). In the past two years, the program has been moved to the division of humanities and these problems have been addressed. Members suggested an informal and fast-tracked procedure to approve what seems to be a new program. They requested a new program proposal, which would show student demand, new faculty FTE, student, support, degree requirements, etc.

**ACTION:** CCGA will send a letter recommending submission of a new program proposal, which would be fast-tracked and not requiring external reviewers, etc. Michael Hanneman will draft a letter that would go through the committee.

## **VII. Ed.D. Re-Review Process**

**ISSUE:** Vice-Chair Bruce Schumm briefed members on the current state of the joint Ed.D. programs. He reminded members that former UC President Atkinson set aside a significant amount of funding to establish these joint programs. UC responded to the stated need for educational leadership with nearly all campuses (with the exception of UC Riverside) sending up proposals for joint Ed.D. programs to CCGA for approval. A number of new faculty FTEs were also hired. Since the passage of SB 724 however, CSU has pulled out of some of the joint programs, and it is probable that CSU will pull out of others. UC Ed.D. proponents interviewed by Vice Chair Schumm have gotten the sense that CSU campuses starting stand-alone Ed.D. programs will not be permitted by CSU leadership to continue to participate in joint Ed.D. programs, while the remaining campuses may be permitted to retain participation. He noted that this legislation represents a change to the Master Plan, along with implications for different fee structures and faculty salaries. At this point, it is also not clear if current CSU fees can support stand-alone Ed.D. programs. Especially in cases where a CSU withdrawal will significantly weaken existing joint Ed.D. programs (but also as a matter of course for all reconfigured joint Ed.D.s), it will be necessary for CCGA to re-review them. To that end, Professor Schumm drafted a set of Ed.D. re-review procedures (see distribution item 1)

Professor Schumm summarized his draft of the re-review procedures. First, newly disaggregated programs would be allowed to admit two cohorts of new students before being required to submit a proposal to CCGA for re-review. He also differentiates between Class I and Class II program reviews. A Class I program would be one that can demonstrate that the academic goals of the original proposal can be met with the new configuration. Such a review would only be reviewed internally by CCGA, and it would not be subject to external reviews. Proponents would be instructed to provide members with supplemental materials that make reference to the original proposal (which would also be included as background material). A Class II review would essentially be a review of a new program proposal; however the prior proposal should be made available to CCGA. As in any new program proposal review, it would be subjected to a full external review. Other requirements would include appropriately modified bylaws and MOUs.

**DISCUSSION:** Members briefly discussed the implications for other UC-CSU joint programs, and specifically whether CSU may try to start (or pull-out of) other joint-degree programs (outside of Ed.D. programs). In that regard, they noted that it would be difficult for CSU to pull-out of clinical programs because CSU needs the clinical components that only UC can provide at this time. They added that the current CSU fee structures are inadequate to support these types of expensive programs.

One member asked if the Compendium includes review procedures for programs that are making significant changes. Members reiterated that they would perform the reviews (especially Class I re-reviews) with an emphasis on expediency. They felt that a Class I re-review could be concurrent with the graduate council review with the understanding that CCGA would not act before the graduate council (if both the proponents and the graduate council agreed to this). In this way, significant concerns could be communicated to the proponents immediately and in a collaborative fashion.

**ACTION:** Analyst Todd Giedt will consult the Compendium for program re-review procedures. Professor Schumm will redraft the proposal, which Analyst Todd Giedt will forward to the graduate councils in time for a December CCGA discussion. Vice-Chair Schumm will also forward it to Professors Heckman and Levine for their comments as well.

#### **VIII. UCI Law School Proposal Update**

**ISSUE/UPDATE:** The Irvine member reported that the LA Times article, which stated that UCI had pulled its proposal, was in error. The California Postsecondary Education Commission's (CPEC) concerns with the proposal had to do with the quantity of lawyers ('degree production capacity of lawyers'), and not with the quality of lawyers that UCI will produce. CPEC expects a response, but not a new proposal, from UCI.

#### **IX. Certificate Programs**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu presented the letter from the UCSF Executive Director of the divisional Senate, who asked for clarification on the procedures and policies relating to certificate programs and their governance. At issue is whether CCGA should review academic certificate programs.



CCGA currently does not have oversight of professional certificate programs, which are typically run out of UC Extension.

**DISCUSSION:** Members suggested that UCOP could define the nomenclature of certificate programs. There are professional certificate programs that come from extension; others fall under a department; and finally, some seem to come from a campus without a specific association with a department. One primary criterion is what constitutes an ‘academic’ certificate program as opposed to a professional one. Members felt that one way to stratify these programs is to determine whether they fall under established graduate programs. Another issue is the amount of units required and whether they are transferable. Members cited examples of academic certificate programs as the certificate in [Global Health Sciences at UCSF](#) and [Science Writing at UCSC](#). Students in such certificate programs should meet the local Graduate Division's general admissions criteria

Members felt that one strategy would be to enforce SR 735 from this point forward, regardless of what has happened in the past. Another is to decide what should be reviewed by CCGA and whether the committee will apply this regulation retrospectively. SR 735 currently states that academic certificate programs should be reviewed both by the respective graduate council and CCGA. Members made the observation that they have not reviewed many certificates, which suggests that either the campuses are not developing new ones, or they have not been forwarded to CCGA for review. One member proposed that if a certificate falls under an existing degree program, CCGA may not need to review it. However, other members objected that a new certificate program may or may not be part of an already-approved program; therefore it should be subject to CCGA review. They clarified that if the new certificate is indeed associated with a graduate program, it could come to the committee as a consent item.

Members considered possible actions. The first is whether CCGA should reaffirm the existing SR 735 and enforce it. Alternatively, CCGA could decide to reject the current regulation, amending it to allow certificates to be approval on the divisional level. The configuration of a special subcommittee to examine the certificate approval process should also be decided, which would look into whether certificate students are considered FTEs, and if campuses should receive the marginal cost of instruction for such students. Another issue is the mechanism for handling advanced graduate students who are not visiting scholars, but want to take courses. Members remarked that European scholars often collaborate with each other in this way; however UC really does not have an efficient mechanism for this type of thing.

**ACTION:** Members approved a motion that after October 3, 2006, all new certificate programs must come to CCGA. They also formed a task force to investigate the certificate approval process. Professors Bruce Schumm, Catherine Constable, David van Dyk, Farid Chehab, and Reen Wu were appointed to the subcommittee with Professor David van Dyk serving as the chair of the subcommittee. Members anticipate that the subcommittee should report back to the larger committee by December.

**X. System-wide Review of the Universitywide Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) Report “Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at UC: IRB Operations and Researcher’s Experience”**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu directed members attention to Professor Heckhausen’s letter on this subject (see distribution item 2), which recommends “the development of a review format specifically for the social and behavioral sciences and humanities.”

**DISCUSSION:** One member noted that the two things that distinguish social science surveys is that nothing is injected into your arm, and one always has the freedom not to answer a question. This is almost always overlooked. The [American Association for Public Opinion Research](#) has a code of ethics, which could help inform language that would establish a review format and/or protocol. It would also be helpful to define what an ‘ethical survey’ is. Members agreed to Professor Heckhausen’s statement and the committee endorsed it.

**ACTION:** Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter based on Professor Heckhausen’s statement.

**XI. “In Association” Degrees**

**ISSUE:** Professor Wu explained that the University Committee on International Education and the Education Abroad Program (EAP) are proposing ‘in association with UC’ degrees, which could be offered to foreign reciprocity students who study at UC for a substantial amount of time. Reciprocity students are foreign or international students who study on UC campuses through the framework of EAP, but are not formally accepted in graduate programs. UCIE envisions that EAP partner institutions would add such language as “in association with the University of California” to their degree certificates/diplomas.

**DISCUSSION:** Analyst Todd Giedt explained that reciprocity students are usually at a graduate level, and end up taking graduate courses and seminars on various UC campuses. Members suggested that this might be used proactively to develop a mechanism whereby departments would have input into the admission process for reciprocity students (if they are indeed taking graduate courses and seminars). They envisioned a review process similar to the admissions process for graduate degree programs. In other words, departments should play a larger role. Departments should also be able to initiate this process, thereby selecting/recruiting students in addition to looking at those who submit an application.

**ACTION:** Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a response and send it out to committee.

**XII. UCCLR MRU Response**

**ISSUE:** Professor Wu noted the objection of two other systemwide committees (UCORP and UCPB), which stated that UCCLR does not really operate as an MRU but rather mainly as a re-granting agency.

**DISCUSSION:** Members recalled that CCGA had opined that while they agreed with the reviewers that this MRU was of high quality, there was not sufficient justification for UCOP to increase relative funding for this MRU over any other MRU. Members reminded each other that CCGA usually concerns itself only with issues relating to graduate education when looking at

these reviews. However, given the nature of the other two negative reviews, it may be worthwhile to clarify CCGA's original comments on this MRU.

**ACTION: Professor Bruce Schumm will draft a response.**

**XIII. UC Irvine Agreement – a Master of Science in Information and Computer Science (Concentration in Embedded Systems) with the Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche, Istituto di Cibernetica “Edoardo Caianiello”**

**ISSUE:** Chair Wu presented the agreement, noting that it has been presented to CCGA as an 'information' item.

**DISCUSSION:** Members felt that this should be an action item, as such agreements should be subject to CCGA review. Members also wondered how the two quarters of required residence stated in the agreement relates to the three quarters' residence requirement for Masters' degrees. Members also asked how NRT is factored into this agreement; and how does the admissions process works.

**ACTION: Members agreed to treat this as an action item; the Irvine member will get clarification on the agreement for the November meeting.**

**XIV. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – Initial Discussion**

**A. Proposal for Master's and Ph.D. Degrees in Computer Science at UC Irvine**

**ACTION: Members selected Ömer Egecioglu as the lead reviewer.**

**XV. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review – *In Progress***

**A. Proposal for an Interdepartmental Graduate Program Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Bioengineering at UC Riverside – Lead Reviewer Farid Chehab (UCSF)**

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Chehab reported that he has received two internal reviews and one external review (see distribution items 4-6). The external review (Review #1) was negative, raising serious concerns that were echoed in parts of the internal reviews. Professor Chehab believes that the proposal has the following strengths: (1) bioengineering is on the rise and has a promising future; (2) there are many faculty members affiliated with the program; (3) although UCR is a late player, it has discipline strengths in plant biology; (4) the proposal enjoys institutional support; and (5) UCR already has an existing undergraduate program from which it can draw students from. The weaknesses are (1) high competition from competing programs; (2) UCR is late in developing a program in this area (relative to other programs); (3) the proposal lacks specifics as to how it will become a high quality program; (4) the program lacks a distinctive discipline or 'flagship' discipline or a plan on how to make plant biology its flagship discipline; (4) the program will somehow need to distinguish itself from other programs; and (5) this is really a patched program—there is not one core course that addresses both disciplines of biology and engineering. Professor Chehab identified funding as another serious issue, as the proposal does not include a dedication of specific FTE's or training grants to the program (although there is some money set aside for teaching assistantships).

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the interdisciplinary aspects of the program, with some members pointing out that the external reviewer may not fully understand the graduate group concept at UC; therefore the ‘patchwork’ nature of the program could actually be viewed as a strength. Professor Chehab clarified that while the interdisciplinary nature of the program is indeed a strength, the proposal fails to show adequate interaction between various departments and faculty members. Other members highlighted the lack of an integrated core course, which they felt was very important for interdisciplinary programs.

**ACTION:** Professor Chehab will send a letter to the program proponents highlighting CCGA’s concerns and those of the reviewers.

**B. Proposal to Establish a Combined Five-Year Degree Program: B.A. in International Studies and a M.A. of International Affairs at UC San Diego – Lead Reviewer Albert Stralka (UCR)**

*This review was tabled until the November meeting.*

**C. Proposal for a Joint Doctorate in Physical Therapy (DPT) with UC San Francisco and CSU Fresno – Lead Reviewer Reen Wu (UCD)**

*This review was tabled until the November meeting.*

**D. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies Leading to M.S. and Ph.D. Degrees in Statistics and Stochastic Modeling at UC Santa Cruz – Lead Reviewer David Van Dyk (UCI)**

*This review was tabled until the November meeting.*

## **XVI. 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

Distributions:

1. Ed.D. Re-Review Proposal
2. Professor Jutta Heckhausen’s IRB Letter to CCGA
3. CCGA UCR Bioengineering Status Report
4. UCR Bioengineering Ph.D. Review #1 (Matsudaira)
5. UCR Bioengineering Ph.D. Review #2 (Simon)
6. UCR Bioengineering Ph.D. Review #3 (Gough)