

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES– OCTOBER 11, 2005

I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey*

Introductions

Chair Lindsey asked members to introduce themselves. He also provided an overview of CCGA's charge and its logistical operations.

[“The Decline of UC as a Great International University”](#)

Chair Lindsey noted that the Academic Council had voted to endorse and forward this white paper (written by last year's CCGA Chair, Quentin Williams) to President Dynes and Provost Greenwood, and publish it on the [Senate website](#).

Competitiveness of UC Graduate Education

Chair Lindsey brought the committee's attention to a report from a Regents' Commission on Graduate Education (from 2001), which showed that over the past several decades UC graduate education enrollment has remained flat while undergraduate enrollments have significantly increased. Therefore, the ratio of graduate students to undergraduate students has also fallen. He pointed out that UC is trying to compete with other research institutions that have not only maintained those ratios, but have also strengthened them. He noted that multi-year financial aid packages for graduate students have fallen at UC relative to other research institutions, which indicates that UC is no longer competitive with a number of research institutions. He specifically mentioned that the “Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee” is currently addressing this issue. Return to aid and non-resident tuition (NRT) for international students are two main concerns of this committee. For the purpose of tuition, UC is currently looking at the possibility of treating international students as in-state students when they advance to candidacy. Such a plan would accelerate the time towards advancement to candidacy and alleviate some of the costs. Members noted however, that there is already a 75% NRT fee reduction for international students upon advancement to candidacy for a three year time period. Therefore, this proposal would only eliminate the remaining 25% non-resident tuition fee. Vice Provost Zelmanowitz (consultant to CCGA) encouraged members to look at the [Provost's Presentation to the Regents on the Importance of Graduate Education to California and UC](#), which she made last January. He also made a distinction between the short-term and long-term effort to deal with the crisis in graduate education funding. He said that the aforementioned Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee will look not only at immediate corrections, but also try to develop a long-term strategy.

ACTION: The committee agreed that the data book from this special committee should be posted on the CCGA website.

SR 694 Sub-Committee Update

Vice Chair Reen Wu and Farid Chehab were added to this committee. Total committee membership now includes Bruce Schumm (Chair-UCSC), Duncan Lindsey (UCLA), Reen Wu (UCD), and Farid Chehab (UCSF).

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will inform Professor Wu of his appointment to this committee.

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

SB 724

It was announced that an amended version of [SB 724](#) was passed by the California state legislature and signed by the governor. SB 724 grants the California State University (CSU) system the right to offer the independent Education doctorate (Ed.D.) Vice Provost Zelmanowitz noted that the final bill represented a compromise which excluded other applied doctorates, and *only* included the Ed.D.

Audiology/Other Applied Doctorates

Audiology and physical therapy were mentioned as areas in which there is a need for applied doctorates, with audiology currently being studied by a special UC task force. Vice Provost Zelmanowitz made note that the total state need for doctoral training Audiology is small however. He also said that long-term strategy in this area is currently being addressed by the Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education. Access to new resources for these applied doctorate programs is program specific. With the joint-Ed.D.'s, UC funded them from its existing budget, which meant that they came at the expense of UC's overall educational operation. In the case of audiology, there is an understanding with the governor's office that special funding for the program will be entertained. Need and demand for these applied doctorates were also discussed. In cases of state licensure (as in audiology), determining need is relatively easy. However, in fields such as education (where licensure is not required), determining state societal need is much more difficult, especially in the presence of a certain level of demand on the part of individuals. Vice Provost Zelmanowitz also mentioned that UC recently completed a health sciences study that looked at medicine and the related allied health sciences. Specifically, it looked at the state need for these fields and is developing a strategic implementation plan this year in order to secure the resources for increasing training in medicine and related health sciences.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the pros and cons of instituting some of these applied doctorate programs.

Graduate Education Funding Proposals

Vice Provost Zelmanowitz outlined the funding proposals that the Budget Office is making for the next academic year (2006-07):

- Elimination of the last 25% of NRT: As mentioned above, this would remove the last 25% of NRT upon advancement to candidacy.
- No Increase in the NRT: Per the Compact, the graduate student education fee will go up 8%, but the NRT will not go up.
- Return-to-Aid: The Return-to-Aid for graduate students will not change from last year, and is likely to remain at approximately 50% (on the incremental 8% increase—see above).
- Strategic Sourcing Initiative: Allocating all savings from the Strategic Sourcing Initiative to graduate student support. This initiative advocates strategic sourcing in purchasing to create savings on everything from office supplies to travel. At this point, it is unclear how much

money in savings will be generated from such strategic sourcing. It is also unclear how these savings will be captured on the campus level and be converted to graduate student support.

Comparisons were also made to the funding models at other research institutions. For example, the University of Michigan and the University of Virginia heavily recruit out-of-state undergraduate students, who must pay high out-of-state tuition rates. Therefore, the difference between UC and these other institutions lies in the number of out-of-state undergraduate students. While the University of Michigan may have a 50% out-of-state undergraduate student enrollment, UC typically only enrolls about a 5% (or lower) out-of-state undergraduate students.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the June 6, 2005 Minutes

ACTION: The June 6, 2005 minutes were approved.

B. Discontinuation of the UCI Graduate Program in Comparative Culture

ACTION: Members reviewed the documentation for this discontinuation and did not have any objections.

C. CCGA Representation in a Joint UCIE-UCEAP Working Group: EAP Programs for Graduate and Professional Students

ACTION: Harvey Sharrer was appointed as the CCGA representative on this working group.

D. Graduate Program Proposal Jacket Draft

ACTION: Members agreed to use this kind of jacket as a summary sheet for all graduate program proposals. Analyst Todd Giedt will maintain the program proposal jackets and post them on the CCGA website.

E. Appointment of CCGA/Graduate Deans Liaison

ACTION: Farid Chehab appointed as the CCGA/Graduate Deans Liaison. He will attend the first meeting on October 18th.

IV. Independent Course Responsibility

ISSUE: CCGA invited Ellen Switkes, Assistant Vice President (AVP) for Academic Advancement, to discuss the independent course responsibility issue. AVP Switkes provided some background to the issue, noting that UC has many graduate students instructing undergraduates as teaching assistants (TA's) leading discussion sections, managing laboratories, teaching elementary writing and foreign language, etc. This issue pertains to those graduate students who have independent course responsibilities for which there is no faculty instructor of record. The frequency of this phenomenon varies from campus to campus and occurs for a number of different reasons. AVP Switkes also reported that there are many different titles under which this occurs. Titles for graduate student instructors vary by campus and include graduate student instructor, teaching assistant, associate teaching fellow, and acting instructor (available but currently not in use). Central to this matter is the issue of academic freedom. The current policy states that academic freedom is restricted to faculty members, and concerns itself with a faculty member's professional experience in the field. The question at hand is whether this type of academic freedom should also be accorded to graduate students, and if so, should graduate students be made UC faculty members? With regards to reclassifying graduate student instructors, if students were to be reclassified as actual faculty members, there would also have to be changes made to their respective bargaining unit. For example, graduate students with

independent course responsibilities would need to be moved from bargaining with the United Auto Workers to the American Federation of Teachers.

She also asked CCGA to review the current approval process that allows graduate students to have independent course responsibilities. Currently, the Senate divisional Committee on Educational Policy (or a similarly named divisional committee) approves graduate students to teach upper-division courses on a case by case basis. For lower-division courses, the authority seems to rest solely with the department. One option is to amend the approval process so that both upper-division and lower-division courses must be approved by the divisional Committee on Educational Policy.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the importance of all instructors adhering to a faculty code of conduct. At the present time, graduate student instructors are not subject to a faculty code of conduct. It was emphasized that the faculty code of conduct not only ensures the integrity of the classroom, but more importantly, protects students so that they do not need a students' bill of rights. One member pointed out that Senate Regulation (SR) 750 precludes the right of graduate students to teach courses without a faculty instructor of record. Members noted that SR 750 may need to be amended or even rescinded. Financial implications were also discussed. AVP Switkes said that it is currently cheaper to hire a graduate student than a lecturer. However, if graduate student instructor titles were to change, then this would most likely benefit graduate students financially. Depending on the campus and the department, there could be some adverse financial impacts on departments if such a change were enacted. Reappointments could become another issue, especially for students who serve for extended periods of time as graduate student instructors (particularly in the humanities).

ACTION: CCGA will look at this issue in-depth at its future meetings. It will be placed on the November meeting agenda.

V. University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) Proposal for a Systemwide Statement on Diversity

ISSUE: Members reviewed UCAAD's statement on diversity.

DISCUSSION: Members suggested removing "abilities" from the last sentence in the first paragraph. They noted that abilities should not be included in a statement on diversity, as the committee felt that the degree of an applicant's ability should not be ruled out as selection criteria for admission to UC. On the other hand, "disabilities" should be included in the statement.

ACTION: The committee voted in favor of the statement, with one abstention and zero opposed, but they wanted to make note of the editorial suggestion above. Chair Lindsey will send a letter to AC Chair Brunk noting that the word "abilities" should be removed from the last sentence of the first paragraph of the statement.

VI. Announcements from the Academic Senate Office

ISSUE/Presentation: Academic Senate Chair Cliff Brunk, Vice-Chair John Oakley, and Executive Director Mariá Bertero-Barceló introduced themselves to the committee. Director

Bertero-Barceló provided a brief overview of the Senate office. She noted that the duties of the committee analysts include more than just producing committee meeting agendas and minutes, but also drafting committee correspondence and white papers (excluding program reviews). Analysts are also expected to regularly write articles for the Senate Source. She also updated members on the Senate web policy. Members were informed that anything to be posted on the public side of the website must be approved by Academic Council. A pass-word protected website will also be established by the November CCGA meeting, which will give members the opportunity to post committee documents, graduate program proposal review materials, etc. She also briefed members on the current Senate travel regulations, and reminded them to use UCLA Travel for their travel arrangements.

Chair Brunk stressed the importance of CCGA to the overall mission and research of UC. He noted that because CCGA is a “Council” committee, Chair Duncan Lindsey would sit on the Council and be the CCGA liaison to the Council. Professor Brunk outlined a number of key issues of concern to CCGA:

Strategic Sourcing

Professor Brunk briefly recounted the history of graduate education support and mentioned that this issue has reached a critical junction due to a couple of key issues such as the high NRT fees and the limited resources from which departments can draw on to support international graduate students. Generating private monies for graduate support through fund raising is extremely difficult—much more so than raising money for the hospital or a building. Other proposals, while imaginative, only seek to move money from one place within the university to another place. Not surprisingly, departments/units from where this money would be taken are reluctant to endorse such proposals. Perhaps the proposal that shows the most promise for additional money for graduate support is the Strategic Sourcing Initiative. Proposed by President Dynes last year, it commits all savings from this initiative to graduate student support. One issue is how to “capture” these savings and redirect them towards graduate education. At this point, there is no clear consensus on any particular method to capture such savings across the system. Subsequently, Chair Brunk is asking the UCOP Administration for a plausible plan to capture these savings.

Taskforce on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education

Professor Brunk reminded members that part of CCGA’s charge is to identify emerging fields in which UC will play a leading role in preparing a workforce with doctoral or professional training in order to sustain California’s lead as an international economic force. He said that CCGA should have a representative on this taskforce, even though former CCGA Chair Quentin Williams is currently a member. CCGA Chair Lindsey noted that Professor Williams will be a liaison between this taskforce and the taskforce. The committee was informed that this taskforce is currently in the process of visiting all of the campuses for the purpose of information gathering.

Review of the Education Abroad Program (EAP)

Chair Brunk informed committee members that a formal review of EAP is underway. He emphasized that there may be opportunities for EAP to further develop graduate program offerings. He also mentioned the 10+10 Initiative (not directly related to EAP), which is being

spearheaded by Gretchen Kalonji, Director of International Strategy Development. The 10+10 Initiative will partner ten UC campuses with ten prominent Chinese universities to explore new models of integrated research and education.

VII. Five-Year Perspectives

ISSUE: Committee members reviewed the Five-Year Perspectives, but declined to comment on them.

ACTION: Chair Lindsey will send a letter to Council Chair Brunk noting that CCGA does not wish to comment on the Five-Year Perspectives.

VIII. Graduate Certificate Programs

ISSUE: Analyst Todd Giedt presented this issue, which concerns the ability of UCSF to run certificate programs of durations of less than 3 quarters. At issue are certificate programs that may have international or on-line components to them, so that the actual “time” of the certificate program at UCSF may only be one or two quarters. The rest of the study for the certificate program would take place off-site. Certificate programs with durations of less than three quarters would violate [SR 735](#).

ACTION: Since many of the issues are related to those that the Residency Requirements Subcommittee (SR 694) Subcommittee are addressing (i.e., they involve “residence” issues), the committee agreed that this committee would add this issue and potential regulation change to its charge.

IX. UCSB/Cal Poly SLO Joint Ed.D. Doctorate

ISSUE: At issue is whether students enrolled in the UCSB/Cal Poly joint Ed.D. doctorate program will be allowed to waive the current dissertation committee member required ratio of 2:2 (two members from Cal Poly and two members from UCSB) in favor of a 2+1 model with only one member coming from Cal Poly. UCSB would provide the other member with a third member coming from either institution. The UCSB Education department supports this new configuration and is requesting the waiver described above.

DISCUSSION: It was noted that the Joint Doctoral Board prescribes a three member dissertation committee, while the Joint Ed.D. Board required four member dissertation committees with two members from each institution. Members agreed that the current arrangement is not only hurting the program, but is also not in the best interests of either the UCSB or Cal Poly faculty members involved in this program. They also supported the proposal from a CSU cost stand-point.

ACTION: Members voted all in favor (0 abstentions) to approve the waiver granting Cal Poly to implement the 2:1 dissertation committee model with just one required member each coming from Cal Poly and UCSB and the remaining member from either institution.

X. Proposed Degrees and Programs for Review

A. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Developmental Biology at UC San Francisco for the Ph.D. and M.S. Degree

ACTION: Professor Anne Wuerker (UCLA) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

B. Proposal for a Ph.D. in Music at UC Santa Cruz

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

C. Proposal for a M.A. in East Asian Studies at UC Riverside

ACTION: Professor Farid Chehab (UCSF) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

D. Proposal for a Ph.D. in East Asian Languages and Cultures at UC Santa Barbara

ACTION: Professor Nadine Lambert (UCB) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

E. Proposal for a M.A./Ph.D. in Education at UC Irvine

ACTION: Professor Thomas Patterson (UCSD) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

F. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) Degree Program in Health Law at UC San Diego

ACTION: Professor Shawn Kantor (Merced) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

G. Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program in Human Development at UC San Diego

ACTION: Professor Jutta Heckhausen (UCI) was selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal.

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

ISSUE: Professor Sharrer updated the committee on his progress in obtaining both internal and external reviewers.

DISCUSSION: One member noted that although the proposal lists a high number of tracks of study at the beginning of the proposal, the proposal limits itself to only two tracks on page ten. This raises the question of further review for future tracks of study. There are also not any commitments from the proper resource holders for this program. Finally, it was unclear whether graduate credit can be given for undergraduate course work per Senate regulations, as noted in the proposal.

ACTION: Professor Sharrer will continue to contact external reviewers and obtain the remainder of the internal reviews. Professor Schumm will locate the specific Senate regulation(s) that govern the granting of graduate credit for undergraduate course work to ensure that this proposal conforms to established Senate regulations.

I. 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: Professor Schumm briefed the committee on the external reviews that he has received regarding this proposal. While external reviewers felt that such a program would both find a demand and a need, their reviews raised some issues:

- **Nature of Degree:** External reviewers felt that in its current form this program may be closer aligned with a professional/applied doctorate model than with a Ph.D. degree model. In particular, reviewers expressed concerns that such a program, which would matriculate working professionals at two geographic locations, would not be able to provide and sustain Ph.D. level research.
- **Curriculum:** While external reviewers generally liked the idea of interdisciplinary programs, they felt that the three study options (social science, behavioral science, and natural science/forensics) did not complement each other nicely. Specifically, they felt that this approach did not give students enough background in any one particular area.
- **Connections to Criminology Programs/Associations/Faculty:** Reviewers felt that better connections to criminology associations/groups, as well as to other criminology programs (such as the UCI criminology program), would bolster the program.
- **Doctoral Level Forensic Science:** One reviewer felt that a senior hire needed to be made to better “anchor” the program in doctoral level forensic science education.
- **Resources/Resource Allocation:** Commitments for resources should be obtained. Also, a MOU should be generated, which would spell out how the resources would be divided between the two institutions.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will send an initial response to the program proposers with a list of concerns and further queries.

XI. Executive Session - Members only

Time did not allow for an executive session.

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

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