

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 7, 2006**

I. Chair's Announcements

ISSUE/REPORT: Chair Wu briefed members on Council's resolution on academic freedom, which states that issues of academic freedom would be raised if the Regents were to deviate from the principle that no unit of the University has the authority to prevent a faculty member from accepting external research funding based solely on the source of funds. Professor Wu explained that the Regents had asked for the Academic Senate's advice, which specifically concerned tobacco funding. In a letter to President Dynes ([The Academic Senate's Resolutions on the Research-Funding Issue](#)), Senate Chair John Oakley noted that the Assembly not only approved Council's resolution, but also made two additional, but related, resolutions as well: (1) Assembly members expressed "deep disapproval of funding arrangements in which an appearance of academic freedom belies an actual suppression of academic freedom"; and (2) "The Assembly asserts its conviction that past funding arrangements involving the tobacco industry have been shown to suppress academic freedom."

Non-resident Tuition

Chair Wu also reported that Academic Council received an update on non-resident tuition (NRT) from Office of the President (UCOP) senior management. Beginning next year, NRT funds will be identified when they are returned to the campuses.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed their efforts to obtain data on NRT funding on the campus level. A number of members reported difficulties in obtaining clear answers to CCGA's inquiries. After some discussion, the committee felt that two numbers are required: (1) the amount of money generated from NRT; and (2) the amount of this money that is going towards graduate student stipends. While members agreed that obtaining this data is important, they also felt that obtaining this data would be problematic simply because this money is not tagged as NRT at this time. Members proposed that some kind of transparent mechanism needs to be created that would send NRT money directly back to the graduate divisions, rather than to the executive vice chancellor (EVC). Members acknowledged that NRT money is already in the system and is currently being used for other campus priorities (faculty retention, undergraduate instruction, housing, etc.). One member questioned the efficacy of recycling all NRT funds directly to the graduate divisions without a written commitment from the graduate deans to use this money for graduate support. It may also be a hard sell to argue that all NRT money should go back to the graduate divisions given other competing priorities. Members noted that most competitive universities have eliminated NRT or never instituted it in the first place. One member argued that some percentage of funding be tagged and be used to eliminate NRT gradually over time; simply shuffling existing money around will not be sufficient. Members cautioned that reducing NRT could also reduce the amount of research grants by about \$20 million, portions of which are often used to pay for NRT. Chair Wu reiterated that first, it is important to find out how much money is generated by graduate NRT. Second, what is the fraction of the NRT that is being paid by research grants?

The discussion shifted to the total amount of NRT money that is generated by graduate students. Members surmised that approximately \$40 million (out of the \$80 million total) is the graduate student portion of the NRT. They also noted a difference between domestic out-of-state graduate students, who can claim residence in one year, and international graduate students, who in most cases cannot establish residency. NRT is forgiven for three years after passing to candidacy, which sometimes motivates faculty to accelerate international students to candidacy (students typically advance in 2-5 years). Towards the goal of shrinking that gap, some departments may be advancing some students to candidacy too early only in order to avoid paying NRT.

Members proposed asking the [University Committee Planning and Budget](#) (UCPB) to gather this information. The committee decided to take a two-pronged approach in which members would try to collect this data locally as well as on a systemwide basis through UCPB. Members reached consensus that the amount of undergraduate, graduate, and total NRT money collected for the 2005-06 academic year should be obtained. The rationale for collecting the undergraduate portions of NRT is that graduate NRT money should be used not only for instruction (as it is for undergraduate students), but also for research (which graduate students actively produce).

ACTION: Members voted to collect data on not only the total amount of NRT, but also the amount that is generated by both undergraduate and graduate students for the 2005-06 academic year. This data will be collected in two ways: (1) Members will collect it locally; and (2) through UCPB. Towards the latter goal, Chair Wu will send a letter to UCPB Chair Christopher Newfield asking for this data.

Miscellaneous

Chair Wu asked members to comment on some questions that he has received that relate to graduate program proposals. First, San Diego asked if a Masters of Advanced Study (MAS) can be run through an academic department rather than university extension; and if start-up funding was still available. Members stressed that such questions should really be sent to the divisional graduate council. However, they confirmed that start-up funds are no longer available, but it is possible to develop a MAS program through university extension or academic departments. Chair Wu also received a question from Los Angeles relating to a possible proposal for a Ph.D. in Dance, inquiring whether there is a 'magic number' of faculty members required to run a program. Specifically, UCLA stated that they are planning to support a program of 48 students (after three years) with three to five faculty members. The committee responded that while there is no 'magic number' of faculty members, they stressed the importance of a quality proposal with an appropriate graduate curriculum. In essence, the program proposers must ensure that the program would have a sufficient advising capacity for 'n' of students. The proposal should also block out the courses that would be taught in the program, as well as assigning specific faculty members to specific courses. The faculty should also have sufficient depth so that the program's curriculum is not threatened by the departure of any one given faculty member, or by normal faculty leaves. Finally, Professor Wu proposed canceling the February CCGA meeting, which members agreed to.

ACTION: Professor Wu proposed that the February meeting be cancelled, which members unanimously approved.

II. Council of Graduate Deans Report

ISSUE/REPORT: The Los Angeles member reported on the recent meeting of the Council of Graduate Deans (COGD), which was held on the UCLA campus. COGD members raised the issue of professional certificates, and asked whether CCGA reviews certificates for professional schools. COGD members asked that CCGA provide clarity and instruction on the certificate review process to the divisional graduate councils. There was also some discussion among the graduate deans as to whether graduate students (especially Ph.D. students) should register ‘in absentia’ while they are abroad conducting research. Currently, such students either take a leave of absence or register in absentia. The advantages to registering in absentia are that students retain access to certain university services (library access, email, health insurance). The Los Angeles member noted that it is revenue neutral (students are not paying for services that they are not using) and students continue to be insured. The graduate deans supported in absentia registration, but they have not drafted a formal proposal as of yet.

III. Announcements from the President’s Office, Academic Initiatives

Joyce Justus did not attend the meeting; there were not any announcements from the President’s Office, Academic Initiatives.

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Draft Minutes from the October 3, 2006 Meeting

ACTION: Members approved the minutes with minor amendments.

V. Effects of Proposition 209 on Graduate Education

ISSUE: Chair Wu reported that the Academic Council recently discussed the effects of Proposition 209 on the diversity of UC’s student body. He noted that it has been ten years since this proposition passed and The Regents have commissioned a comprehensive report on its impact. As part of that effort, the Academic Council has asked a number of standing committees to examine this issue in detail. As a point of departure, Council posed two questions to CCGA in this regard: What have been the characteristics of our graduate students since Proposition 209? What issues impact admission, retention, and successful graduation of a diverse graduate student body since Proposition 209?

DISCUSSION: At this point in time, members acknowledged that they did not have the necessary data to answer these questions adequately. Therefore, appropriate graduate enrollment data would need to be gathered for the time period between 1996 and 2006. While members said they would not be surprised if the statistics showed a decline in the enrollments of underrepresented minorities, they cautioned that other factors/variables besides Proposition 209 may be attributable to such a decline. One member noted that UCB and UCLA have instituted a ‘holistic’ admission policy for undergraduates, in which one person reads the entire application. They wondered if any graduate divisions/departments had instituted similar approaches. Reporting on the current climate of diversity in graduate education might also be difficult. That said however, members felt that the committee needs to make a good faith effort to draft a solid report that is both useful and adds value to a larger Senate report on diversity. While the current climate may be difficult to assess, CCGA is certainly the Senate body that can comment on this issue. At the very least, the committee could state that the climate is difficult to assess, or report

that it is good or bad, perhaps providing some characteristics of the climate within the various graduate divisions.

Another issue is the relative low level of student aid typically offered to incoming UC graduate students, which adversely impacts diversity in the graduate student populations. Relative low amounts of aid would have a larger impact on disadvantaged minority students than more affluent students. Members also remarked that other universities are much more aggressive than UC in their recruitment of minority students. In the same vein however, they noted that graduate student aid is much more complicated than student aid for undergraduates given the presence of grants, etc. Therefore, it may prove difficult to accurately quantitatively assess the degree in which graduate student aid has fallen or risen from all sources since 1995.

Recognizing the complexity of this task, members noted the need for a coherent charge to the committee. While basic enrollment statistics would certainly be needed, members argued for the inclusion of admissions criteria as part of the data that CCGA collects. Specifically, they agreed that it would be useful to collect the following data (within the various ethnic categories): number of applications, number of admittances, and graduation rates. Members remarked that gender could also be included as a possible category for diversity (especially in certain areas). In order to answer the question on student sentiment, members mentioned that the results of any student surveys might serve as a source of data. Finally, members acknowledge that although program reviews (conducted every seven years) typically pay special attention to diversity issues, it would simply be too labor intensive to mine them for information on diversity. After further discussion, members agreed to concentrate on questions three³ and five⁴.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a charge for the committee and distribute it members.

VI. UC Irvine-Italy MOU Agreement

ISSUE: Chair Wu reminded members that UCI had mistakenly believed that this agreement had been approved by CCGA last year, when it had not. Apparently, the former CCGA Chair informally approved the agreement (or at least the concept of such an agreement). However, the actual approval of the agreement did not appear in the final minutes from last year, and the committee did not send out an approval letter to that effect. He emphasized that in order for a program or agreement to be approved, two conditions must be met—(1) the final minutes should note the approval; and (2) an approval letter must also be sent.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed with Chair Wu that an approval letter from CCGA is required for final approval. While members were inclined to approve the agreement, they noted that as it stands now, the agreement is in violation of current residency requirements, which are outlined in [Senate Regulation \(SR\) 694](#). Right now, students must spend three quarters in residency in

¹ What have been the characteristics of our graduate students since Prop. 209? What issues impact admission, retention, and successful graduation of a diverse graduate student body since Prop. 209?

² How do different student groups experience UC with respect to academic engagement, civic engagement, and satisfaction? What evidence do we have about the extent to which the climate at UC is “welcoming” of diverse students?

order to complete a masters' program.⁵ In contrast to this regulation, the agreement states that students must spend two quarters in residence at UCI. One member proposed a variance to this regulation for UCI, however other members were concerned that this variance would set a precedent for other campuses, and the committee did not approve the variance.

Members discussed possible solutions to this problem, and they laid out the following options: (1) CCGA can send a letter to UCI stating that they are in violation of UC SR 694; or (2) the UCI member can go back to his campus and find out if the agreement can be changed to comply with SR 694.

ACTION: The UCI member will find out if the agreement can be changed to conform to SR 694.

VII. Certificate Programs' Subcommittee Update

ISSUE/UPDATE: Members discussed the question raised in the COGD meeting relating to CCGA approval of professional certificates (those offered through university extension).

DISCUSSION: Members confirmed that CCGA reviews certificates that are run through academic departments, which are offered as part of a UC degree. CCGA does not review certificates that are offered through university extension. Members briefly discussed whether university extension has the authority to offer UC degrees, or degrees that have the UC seal on them. They observed that externally, such degrees would be viewed as actual UC degrees. The committee agreed that there is a need for clarification on the certificate approval process, which the subcommittee will examine more closely.

VIII. Senate Regulations 694/695

ISSUE: Chair Wu reported that Academic Council has requested a cover letter, and provided feedback on some of the changes. Regarding 694, Council members noted the following concerns: (1) 'off-campus' is defined ambiguously; and (2) the necessity of notifying CCGA whenever 'any component of the instruction' is shifted offsite. Regarding SR 695, one Council member wondered if the changes to this regulation would take away the authority of the local committees on courses and instruction (giving that authority to graduate councils) to approve these courses.

DISCUSSION: Members discussed Council's concerns. While they acknowledged that the notification of CCGA whenever any component is shifted off-site is a reasonable concern and may be unnecessary in certain cases, they insisted that major program shifts could change the nature of the program. Members thought that this wording could be changed to 'substantial change', which would still give the regulation an appropriate degree of vagueness. However, after further discussion, members proposed that one-third or more of the instruction would constitute a 'substantial' amount. Other substantial changes could include changes in the access to faculty, demand, and a societal need. For example, CCGA would be concerned if a masters' program was moved wholesale to Singapore without its knowledge. In this case, not only would

⁵ No more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements for the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science may be satisfied by off-campus graduate study.

the critical variables of access to faculty, demand, and societal need change, but UC would also be spending state dollars to educate Singapore students (especially if the program was not self-supporting).

Another criticism concerned itself with defining ‘off-campus’ in SR 694 ambiguously. However, members were hesitant to define this more precisely (i.e. not defining it through the negative). Regarding 695, members agreed that this regulation should not limit the authority of which senate committees can approve courses. Finally, members clarified that this regulation does not delineate who can teach certain courses. It only states that UC employees teaching UC courses must adhere to this regulation.

ACTION: In SR 694, members agreed that CCGA should be notified if more than one-third of the program is shifted off-campus. In SR 695, members agreed to change the wording to ‘appropriate campus committee’. Vice Chair Schumm will make the changes and forward the revised regulations to Analyst Todd Giedt.

IX. Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees

ISSUE: Chair Wu introduced the six principles outlined in the proposal. Some of these include (but are not limited to): Professional school fees should not be the sole source of support; revenue from future professional school fee increases should be used to maintain and enhance the quality of the schools and their programs and to maintain access for graduates who choose less lucrative careers in public interest professions, not-for-profit sectors, and underserved communities; and professional school fees for California residents should be set at levels that are comparable to the in-state rates charged at public peer institutions.

DISCUSSION: Analyst Todd Giedt reminded members that last year CCGA requested that Academic Council provide a report/analysis of the student profiles in the self-supporting graduate professional degree programs with students enrolled in non self-supporting professional graduate degree programs by January 2007. Specifically, the committee asked for a comparison of these two kinds of professional programs based on both educational costs and program student composition in terms of race, ethnicity, and family income. One member wanted to make certain that these new fee increases would guarantee at least a 33% return to aid. Members felt that the principles represented a sound policy and contained the correct level of specificity.

ACTION: Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter specifying CCGA’s comments, which will be included on the December consent calendar.

X. UCCLR MRU Response

ACTION: Members approved Vice Chair Schumm’s draft of CCGA’s response, which reiterated CCGA’s earlier opinion that from the perspective of graduate education, the committee sees nothing that would recommend particularly strongly for or against this MRU relative to that of other MRU's that CCGA has reviewed in recent years.

XI. Proposed Modification to Senate Bylaw 205 Part I.A.

ACTION: Members considered this a reasonable request and it is the right course of action.

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

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Egecioglu reported that this is the second proposal coming out of the Brent School of Information and Computer Sciences. The proposers cite the need for a named degree because they want it to be named solely 'computer science' without any other adjectives. As the curriculum is already in place, the only question is whether significant changes are proposed in the transition to a named degree. While a number of letters state that there will not be any new requirements, the proposal states that two additional courses are required for the Ph.D. Professor Egecioglu believes that these letters were originally written for the concentration, which accounts for this discrepancy. He also has a couple of technical concerns. First, the proposal allows for these additional two courses to be taken after advancement to candidacy, which is contrary to Senate regulations. He notes one typographical error with the master's thesis—the proposal states that the student is required to defend his or her thesis according to UCI Senate regulations; however, there is no such Senate rule on theses. He suggests removing that entire sentence. The proposal also states that the maximum time to earn the Ph.D. degree (six years) can be extended through the department advisor. Actually, only the graduate council or a Senate member has the authority to do this. Finally, he made a comment regarding the name 'computer science', noting that there are already three departments/schools at UCI that carry this title ('electrical engineering and computer science' for example), which is very confusing.

DISCUSSION: With regard to the two required courses that students can take after advancement to candidacy, members remarked that a student can take any course they want after advancement to candidacy, but they cannot be forced to do so. Professor Egecioglu explained that the way in which the program is set up makes it impossible for students to take these two required courses before advancement to candidacy. In cases such as these, students would receive a conditional advancement to candidacy pending the successful completion of these two additional courses. Members urged Professor Egecioglu to note this issue in his response to the proposers. While the committee did not feel it was their role to opine on the 'computer science' naming issue, they thought that the report should state CCGA's concern that the potential for confusion exists between programs at UCI that include 'computer science' in their titles, especially for prospective students. One member also noted a couple of typos regarding Type I and Type II masters (section 2.5). He clarified that a Type I masters denotes a thesis, while a Type II involves a comprehensive exam.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the program with one abstention, pending the clarification/correction of the required two courses after advancement to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree.

B. 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: Professor Schumm reported that he has sent a letter outlining CCGA's position and the next steps necessary for a successful resolution of the approval process, but he has not received a response.

DISCUSSION: The Davis member reported that a response has been delayed due to the fact that the program originator, who was the lead Dean and a professor in forensic chemistry, has passed away. He urged a site-visit. Professor Schumm agreed that a site-visit is necessary, however he needs a response before he can conduct the visit.

ACTION: Professor Schumm will send a message outlining a deadline for a response, after which a vote will be taken on the program.

C. 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 sent a letter to the proposers outlining CCGA's concerns. He has received a response from the proposers, which clarifies a number of issues. While these clarifications significantly improve in the proposal, Professor Chehab is still concerned about a few points. The program would have adequate resources and now has a good focus. There is also a new bioengineering department; which has have taken some small steps towards establishing academic-industry relationships. At this point, the proposers are working on picking a focus for the program's focus and making it a 'flagship' for the program. Professor Chehab has also asked the proposers to submit solid evidence of graduate student support. Finally, he has some concerns on the relationship between the M.S. program and the undergraduate program.

ACTION: CCGA will receive the response from the proposers for the December meeting.

D. 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)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Stralka has sent out four requests for reviews, and one external reviewer has agreed to do the review. He noted that the first year of the program has 32 units and one foreign language. What they've done is take those courses and make them available to certain undergraduates if they meet the appropriate criteria. In their senior year, they would take the first year's curriculum of the MIA with the second year in their fifth year. Therefore, the program would be marketed as a five-year program because there is a market for a five-year BA/MIA.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that there are sometimes divisional limitations on undergraduates taking graduate courses. The issue is how many graduate courses one can take while as an undergraduate. The San Diego member clarified that students would be taking both undergraduate and graduate courses throughout their academic career, and they would receive both degrees at the end of the five-year period. Members were also concerned about what is being cut from the typical undergraduate curriculum. The San Diego member responded that many students would come into the program with AP credit, etc. Another member remarked that in most cases, students just don't do a second major.

ACTION: Professor Stralka will obtain reviews for the December meeting.

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

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor Wu reported that this model has already worked with a similar program at SFSU. He noted that there is a tremendous need for the DPT in physical therapy. Per the Master Plan, CSU cannot offer the doctoral degree on its own. He has received two external reviews, both of which are positive. However, reviewers had some concerns about some of the courses. This reviewer doubts the need for the Grand Rounds course, as students would meet the objectives of this course through their active employment. However, Chair Wu believes that this course is important because it gives students some background in research. He emphasized that while this is not a research degree, students should have a good handle on the current research in the field. Professor Wu recommended approval of the program.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the Grand Rounds issue was not that important, and they felt that the program was worthy of approval.

ACTION: Members approved the program unanimously with one abstention.

F. 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)

ISSUE/REPORT: Professor van Dyk reported he has received four reviews, all of which are positive. He also remarked that two-unit research seminars are required every year (even after advancement to candidacy), which he thinks is a good component of the program. Professor van Dyk recommended approval of the program.

ACTION: Members approved the program unanimously with two abstentions.

XIII. 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