

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS  
MEETING MINUTES – JUNE 6, 2006**

**I. Chair's Announcements – *Duncan Lindsey***

**REPORT:** Chair Lindsey asked members for discussion topics for President Dynes' lunchtime visit. He also asked the committee for comments on UCAF's document entitled 'Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles'.

**DISCUSSION:** Members identified non-resident tuition (NRT) and the proposed law schools as the most important topics to discuss with President Dynes. Other issues included the graduate student aid formula (for campuses), as well as accounting for the research output produced from graduate student work.

Regarding UCAF's 'Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles', members opined that there is enough overlap between the documents to warrant further discussion between UCAF, CCGA, and UCEP before the Academic Council ratifies this document. Given that the CCGA-UCEP memo has just been submitted, members felt strongly that a small group composed of key members from these three committees should meet to agree on language in the second and third paragraphs on page four of the UCAF statement. While the UCAF document is more general and the CCGA-UCEP memo is more nuanced, members thought that it is important for both Senate documents to be aligned.

**ACTION:** Chair Lindsey will submit a letter to Academic Council Chair John Oakley expressing CCGA's comments on UCAF's 'Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles.'

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

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Consultant Karen Merritt reported on the last meeting of the Task Force for the Planning of Doctorate and Professional Education (PDPE). Regarding the two law school proposals, she noted that the Ad-hoc Law Review Committee has a tentative time table for completing its review by the beginning of July (including site visits); and the Legal Education Advisory Subcommittee (LEAS) is working on its final report, which will also be forthcoming by the beginning of July. The Allied Health Subcommittee has also made progress in developing new programs in the field of audiology. There are also two new proposals for the joint UC-CSU audiology doctoral programs—one between UCLA and CSU Northridge and another between UCSF and San Francisco State University. In addition, the UCSD audiology program is being encouraged to expand its size. She said that CCGA can expect to see new degree proposals in audiology next year. There is a report coming out of the Subcommittee on Physical Therapy. She remarked that in the case of audiology, there was considerable evidence to show that the upgrade to a doctorate actually was needed in order to practice as a professional audiologist. However, in the case of physical therapy, the argument for the doctorate (DPT) as the entry-level degree into the field is not as strong.<sup>1</sup> She also mentioned that the Education Sub-Committee has

---

<sup>1</sup> The American Physical Therapy Association will revisit their accreditation DPT programs in 2010. They did not make the DPT the mandatory entry-level degree in 2005, but it is anticipated that they may do so in 2010.

issued preliminary talking points and recommendations, which she handed out to members (see distribution item 1). Part of the discussion within this sub-committee is the shape and form of the various joint UC-CSU Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership. All UC campuses involved in these joint Ed.D. programs have indicated that they would like to retain them in some form. The sub-committee believes that it is both educationally and politically important for UC to take a strong role in the training of future educational leaders. Karen mentioned that CCGA should see some proposals recasting some of these Ed.D. programs as independent doctorates within the next year or so.

She also submitted policy language for inclusion in the next draft of the CCGA Handbook regarding adding a master's degree to an already approved doctoral program. This is a long-standing UC policy that exists within institutional memory, but has never been codified and written down. The three major points of the policy are (1) the master's program should have the same name as the doctoral program; (2) the courses that will be required for the master's program are substantially the same to those currently offered in the doctoral program; and (3) the master's requirements fall within the typical norms of UC Master's programs (Plan I, Plan II). CCGA reserves the right to do a full review or an expedited review if the proposed master's program has a different title than its related doctoral program, requires significant addition of courses, or will have unusual requirements. The respective divisional Graduate Council would also notify CCGA when such a master's program has been approved.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the differences between a terminal master's program and one that students receive along the way as part of their doctoral program. This policy is proposed for non-terminal master's programs.

After further discussion, members agreed to the following policy language:

“Adding a master's degree to an approved doctoral program: On occasion, campus proposals for new doctoral programs may not initially include an associated master's. However, at a later date, a campus may wish to add a master's program to a CCGA-approved doctoral program. In such cases, a campus may add a master's degree to an approval doctoral program without further CCGA review if the following conditions pertain:

1. the master's has the same name as the doctoral program;
2. the courses that will be required for the master's are substantially those currently offered as part of the doctoral program;
3. the master's requirements fall within norms typical for UC master's programs (Plan I/Plan II master's, etc.);
4. the master's is not intended to be a terminal master's program.

If the proposed master's has a different title from the approved doctorate, requires a significant addition of courses, or will have unusual requirements for completion, CCGA reserves the right to require either a full review or expedited review. A campus that wishes to add a master's to an existing doctoral program should, upon approval of the Divisional Graduate Council, send a notice to CCGA and the Office of the President, addressing the four points above.”

**ACTION: Appropriate policy wording for adding a master’s degree to an approved doctorate program will be added to the CCGA Handbook.**

### **III. Consent Calendar**

#### **A. Approval of the May 9, 2006 Minutes**

**ACTION: The May 9, 2006 minutes were approved with minor amendments.**

### **IV. Law School Proposals Review**

**ISSUE:** Members reviewed the law school proposals that have been submitted by UC Irvine (UCI) and UC Riverside (UCR).

#### UC Riverside Law School Proposal

The Riverside member summarized the revised proposal that has been put forward by his division. Drafted by a blue ribbon panel, the original UCR law school proposal emphasized faculty involvement. The revised proposal also benefited from CPEC’s comments generated by the original review in 2001. Therefore, the modified proposal only contains minor changes. He also mentioned that the growth of the ‘Inland Empire’ has been accompanied by the emergence of a number institutions and buildings associated with law. He cited the establishment of the Riverside Justice Center as one example. Second, there is movement towards the development of a satellite campus in Palm Springs. Third, the population growth in both Inyo and Palm Springs supports the creation of a law school.

The law school would be tied to many other departments, programs, and research centers on campus such as the environment, agriculture, and political science. The proposal also enjoys wide-spread support on campus. In some ways, establishment of a law school may prove easier than the development of a medical school, as it does not require sophisticated equipment, laboratories, or groups of researchers/faculty to support it.

#### UC Irvine Law School Proposal

The Irvine member addressed two issues in her presentation: (1) has the law school proposal changed since its original submission in 2001; and (2) does the proposed law school still fit with the academic units and programs at UCI? She noted that the proposal is the same one that was originally submitted in 2001, but its supporting materials have been revised. On the second point, she emphasized that while the proposal made a strong argument for the fit of a law school among the configuration of UCI’s departments and programs in 2001, this convergence is even more compelling now. The law school will specialize in administrative law, international law, and emerging technologies. One of the characteristic features of UCI’s law programs would be inter-professional education in association with the Paul Merage School of Management, the Henry Samueli School of Engineering (including biomedical technologies), and the Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences. There is also a great need for public legal education in Southern California, which is currently underserved. In addition, UCI is emphasizing service to underserved communities and populations, both in terms of providing legal services and high-quality legal education. UCI anticipates a 12-year build-out period for the law school, with an eventual size of 32 faculty members and 600 students. After that time, it is expected that the law school will be self-supporting. Therefore, the budget plan does not rely on UC and the state of California (except for enrollment growth funding). Instead it will be

largely supported by the business and legal communities, as well as through contributions from private donors.

As mentioned above, the law school also still fits well with UCI's academic units and programs. There are inter-disciplinary connections planned with the Department of Criminology, Law and Society, the Schools of Social Ecology, Social Sciences, Biological Sciences, Management, Engineering, Information and Computer Sciences, and Humanities. Since 2001, this favorable synergy has grown even stronger with the significant growth of the Paul Merage School of Management, and the establishment of a Center for Psychology and Law. The Irvine representative illustrated these recent developments by reporting on her own academic unit in Psychology as one example: Four new faculty were hired in the last two years in the field of psychology and law, and three further positions in this field will be filled in the next two years. There are also plans for a master's program in public health, which would provide opportunities for a dual-degree with the J.D. degree.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Lindsey urged members to approve both law school proposals. He observed that both of these campuses are expanding, and a law school on both those campuses would complement their diverse program offerings. He also noted that there is considerable demand for law education in Southern California, as UCLA regularly receives approximately 700 applications for its 300 spaces in its law school annually.

Members also discussed the specificity of the plans for both law schools (including the hiring of faculty members). While they admitted that these plans are fairly broad, that does not take away from the value that both law schools would bring to these campuses or the feasibility of the law schools themselves. One member suggested that a good way to gain breadth in faculty expertise relatively quickly is through the establishment of joint degrees and joint appointments. This method has been successfully used in the past at UC. Although there are some distinctive constraints on law schools in the sense that faculty members must have a J.D. degree, links can still be created with other programs and departments. Members admitted that a law school is different than a typical academic program in that there is a prescribed curriculum and all faculty members must pass the Bar exam.

Overall, members agreed that the two law schools are complimentary to each other. They also noted that there are key differences between the intellectual and cognate components of first-rate law schools located on research universities and private and for-profit law schools. One member observed that UCI is already well-placed with its Criminology, Law, and Society program to provide academic expertise immediately to a fledgling law school. At UCR, the intent is to build a first-rate law school partially through the use of faculty's expertise in such departments as sociology, political science, history, as well as a number of other fields. Another Riverside link is religious studies, particularly Islamic law, through its religious studies program that CCGA approved last year. Members also agreed that it would not be useful to pit these proposals against each other, as each individual law school would add significant value to its respective campus.

**ACTION: Members voted unanimously to support the development of both law schools with the following statement: "CCGA reiterates its support for the law school proposals**

**from both UC Irvine and UC Riverside. We anticipate that there will eventually be law schools on both campuses, and we do not take a position on the relative timing of their establishment.”**

#### **V. Guest UC President Robert Dynes**

**ISSUE:** President Dynes thanked members for inviting him to the CCGA meeting. He summarized and commented on some of the events surrounding UC over the past year, especially the executive compensation issue. He acknowledged that UC made a mistake by not publicly disclosing all details of its recruitment packages over the past couple of years, but he said that UC would change its policy in the future. He also commented on the value of the UC Office of the President (UCOP), stating that it has real value but it does contain some deficiencies. He said that the time is ripe to reassess what should be done centrally, and what should be done at the divisional levels. He also talked a little about academic freedom, noting that it is important for the University to maintain its independence and to protect its long-held values, integrity, and quality.

He emphasized his commitment to graduate education, admitting that UC has had to grow its undergraduate programs over the last decade due in large part to the surge in the population of undergraduate-aged students. He said that UC’s attention to undergraduate growth has hurt the graduate enterprise in two ways. First, commensurate growth in graduate programming has been neglected. Second, existing graduate programs (and support for graduate students) have been under funded. He identified eliminating non-resident tuition (NRT) as the first step towards improving graduate education at UC. Reaching this goal will require movement on two fronts. The first is financial, as the elimination of NRT will ultimately cost the University about \$30 million. The strategic sourcing initiative, which will create new efficiencies and produce savings, is a key part of the plan to recoup these monies. Second, President Dynes noted that politics remains a formidable obstacle. State law stipulates that the State of California cannot subsidize out-of-state students. Therefore, UC must charge both undergraduate and graduate out-of-state students the full cost of instruction. President Dynes recommends putting more money into student aid to counterbalance this law.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the recent controversy surrounding UC. President Dynes emphasized the recent commitment of support from the Regents, which is crucial for moving the University forward. He added that the Legislature has put pressure on UC in certain areas. Members commented that CCGA has also felt legislative pressure with regard to UC’s independent doctoral authority (SB 724). Members recounted that as a result of that legislation, the CSU did receive the authority to unilaterally offer the Ed.D. degree. They agreed with President Dynes that this compromise benefited UC by allowing the University to continue to offer its own Ed.D.’s, along with retaining control over other professional doctorates such as audiology and physical therapy.

Members also discussed NRT further. Chair Duncan noted that at UCLA the NRT for Ph.D. programs is three times more expensive than the resident tuition for these same programs (see distribution item 2). He added that the resident tuition and the NRT for medical students are exactly the same. He urged President Dynes to find a way to lower this ratio even if the law

cannot be changed. He remarked that UC is currently unable to offer competitive student aid packages to international students, which hurts its ability to attract the best and brightest international students. This results in the admission of mostly California state residents, simply because these are the only types of students that UC can afford. President Dynes responded that he is very familiar with these issues—both on an administrative level and on a personal level, due to his experience in managing his research lab. He said that ideally, UC should be able to direct all of the monies that a PI or department pays in NRT back to the department or researcher. He described the current situation as one in which the NRT monies are funneled back into the campuses, which are then used as the executive vice chancellors see fit. Therefore, it is more a question of priorities, and most of this discretionary money is currently being used for faculty recruitment and retention. President Dynes said he is urging the executive vice chancellors to direct more of this discretionary money towards graduate education support. Furthermore, he reported that he is looking for additional sources of money to fund graduate support, such as the Strategic Sourcing Initiative. One member also asked if it would be possible to establish a UCOP graduate student scholarship fund. In response, President Dynes reiterated that he would need the support of the executive vice chancellors to establish such a scholarship fund. Members also directed President Dynes' attention towards developing more partnerships with other research institutions abroad. He said that under the direction of Gretchen Kalonji, UC is moving in this direction both in terms of the development of partnerships and exchange programs, but also in improving the organizational coherency among the campuses in coordinating this effort.

The issue of accounting for research (as opposed to instruction) performed by graduate students was also raised. One member mentioned that the budget does not contain any allocation for the production of research by graduate students, which really undermines the perception of graduate education at UC. While the public looks at graduate education simply as 'education', the truth is that after the first two years, graduate students are significantly involved in producing research. President Dynes replied that he has traditionally refrained from differentiating education from research because the Legislature is primarily interested the cost of education. There was also a short discussion about retaining parity between the older and new UC campuses in terms of their status as top-quality research institutions. President Dynes assured members that every effort is being made to retain this parity.

Another member asked about the return-to-aid formula for individual campuses. He noted that this formula seems to benefit some campuses more than others. For example, he mentioned that UCSF does not have an undergraduate population, which means that graduate student aid funding is regularly short \$1 million per year. As a result, this shortfall must be made up through discretionary monies, which has been granted over the last two years. The member asked about revising that formula given the unique situation of UCSF. President Dynes responded that the budget formula contains other mechanisms that actually favor UCSF over other campuses. Therefore, if the budget formula was changed to correct this imbalance, UCSF would end up losing money in other ways. He added that discretionary money is a good source of funds from which to augment graduate support.

Finally, members briefly discussed the law school proposals from UCI and UCR. President Dynes remarked that UCI makes a solid argument, and is pushing hard for building a school of

law on their campus. At UCR, there is an emphasis on establishing a school of medicine, although a school of law is high on their priority list as well.

## **VI. Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on International Exchanges/Education**

**ISSUE:** Gretchen Kalonji, Director of International Strategy Development, described UC's international strategy to members. She identified UC's unique scope and scale of ten campuses and their related (but as of yet uncoordinated) international research initiatives, the extensive network of UC graduates overseas, UC's experience in new organizational models (Cal ISI's), excellence in public access, and Californian entrepreneurialism as strengths towards developing a dynamic international strategy. She emphasized that UC acting as a system is much stronger than either Berkeley or UCLA (although these two campuses have excellent reputations abroad) acting alone. However, she also noted some UC weaknesses. First, there is a large bifurcation between the international research enterprise and international education at UC. Other weaknesses include a lack of strategic focus, little collaboration across campuses, an inability to develop international research initiatives that work across sectors (government, private sector, etc.), and other structural barriers (NRT, data structures, lack of organizational alignments, etc.).

Gretchen also outlined a number of pilot projects that are underway. These projects were chosen on the philosophy of 'Grand Challenges', which identifies key partner institutions to develop research partnerships that address important problems affecting both California and UC's partner regions and countries. The first of these is called the "10 + 10", which is a partnership with ten Chinese universities that works on common research challenges. Others include an India initiative, a Canada-California project (CCSIP), a partnership with UNAM (National Autonomous University of Mexico) in Mexico, and a partnership with Nelson Mandela Institute and the World Bank to create four African institutes of science and technology. The "10 + 10" partnership is focusing on projects in such areas as the environment, transportation, health, and the film industry. One of the main challenges common to these initiatives is the development of educational models that integrate the involvement of both undergraduate and graduate students directly in the research agenda. Elements of these models include research internships for graduate students, the co-supervision of doctoral students, research collaboration in undergraduate programs, multi-sector internships, post-doctoral opportunities, faculty exchange programs, and summer intensive seminars. Finally, she outlined a number of challenges. These include the curricular constraints of some graduate programs, barriers to increasing reciprocal flows, NRT, a deficiency of agreements with clusters of institutions, visa/insurance issues, raising money for the support of these programs, and different data structures.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed that while many UC campuses have excellent reputations as single entities, UC is much stronger when it acts as a coordinated system. They identified fragmentation of the campuses as a significant impediment to establishing systemwide international initiatives, partnerships, and projects. Members urged Gretchen to develop a central web-based infrastructure that would help to coordinate campus international initiatives and activities. Seed funding for multi-campus initiatives was also encouraged.

Members also asked about the Education Abroad Program's (EAP's) role in these initiatives. Gretchen responded that the EAP model does not really work well for these types of partnerships and exchanges. Reminding members that EAP is currently undergoing a review, she advised

waiting until the review is complete before making a decision on how to structure international graduate research programs.

### **VII. UC Biotechnology Research and Education Program (BREP) MRU Review**

**ISSUE:** Lead reviewer Shawn Kantor reported that BREP has been funding graduate students through its Graduate Research and Education and Adaptive Biotechnology Training program (GREAT), as well as supporting research and education through outreach. GREAT has funded 11 graduate students at \$50,000 per year. He noted that the MRU review committee criticized the director for not doing enough private fund raising. The MRU would like to double the size of the GREAT program over the next several years. The MRU review committee emphasized that the only way to do this would be through private fund raising.

**DISCUSSION:** Members applauded BREP's contribution to graduate student support. They also discussed the potential for private fund raising. They noted that if UCOP had a systemwide development office of its own, it would be able to raise private funding for this and possibly other MRU's. On the other hand, some members pointed out that since the director's role is primarily outreach, she should increase her efforts to do more private fund raising. Members agreed that they would support the notion of encouraging private fund raising, but they would stop short of recommending the hiring of a UCOP development officer for this MRU.

**ACTION: Members voted unanimously to accept Professor Kantor's response to this MRU review. Analyst Todd Giedt will draft a letter commenting on the BREP MRU review.**

### **VIII. Independent Course Responsibility**

**ISSUE:** Professor Schumm reported that a new memo has been drafted by UCEP Chair Denise Segura and himself. He noted that UCEP met yesterday, and UCEP Chair Segura has edited the memo to reflect their discussion. He summarized the current memo as follows. First, 'graduate teaching assistant' (GTA) and 'graduate teaching fellow' (GTF) are the terms used in the memo. Second, the background section was recast to show that while the UC graduate student teaching enterprise continues to be of high quality, there are some issues that need to be addressed at this time. The section on Academic Senate oversight was also changed. Professor Schumm reminded members that under the old SR 750, Academic Senate oversight extended only to upper-division and graduate courses with the appropriate academic committee being required to approve the instructors for such courses. The new formulation leaves out this requirement. The new memo also comments on the GTF position, stating that a teaching fellow must be regularly approved by the appropriate Academic Senate committee (i.e. every year).

**DISCUSSION:** One member criticized the use of the word 'recitation' in the GTA position definition/description. He said that recitation does not actually exist at UC; instead, GTA's conduct discussion sections. He added that there is no differentiation between the different classes; a 'regular class' is not parallel with recitation or quiz sections; and the description does not specify the duration of regular classes. He recommended replacing 'recitation' with 'discussion sections.' Professor Schumm responded that as it stands now, there are GTA's who basically deliver the entire instruction for a course. Therefore, a conscious decision was made not to restrict this. He also explained that the wording is left intentionally vague, but it is



clarified in further language. Professor Schumm agreed to add ‘discussion sections’ to the TA description, but said that he would leave ‘recitation’ in as well.

Members also examined the UCEP edits to the memo. On page 2, regarding the recommendation that no campus utilize GTF’s for more than ten percent of the classes they offer during the year, UCEP commented that CCGA and UCEP should monitor this and request that campuses do the same. Members moved to strike this from the memo due to the fact that this is outside the standard practice and authority of CCGA. On page 3, UCEP members wanted to add the phrase that “We expect that the GTA would teach only small enrollment classes or sections such as those offered in the languages or the writing programs.” CCGA members accepted this addition. Members also did not object to the UCEP suggestion on page 3 that the qualifications of graduate students for the GTF should be set by the relevant divisional Senate committee(s). Finally, on page 4, UCEP wanted CCGA to consider whether lecturers should be paid to oversee graduate students. Ellen Switkes commented that whatever is decided, faculty workloads will increase due to increased oversight of graduate students (especially in the summer), and there will be some budgetary/compensatory impacts on UC. She added that she did not think that it is the Senate’s responsibility to think about how these impacts would be worked out, as UCEP’s suggestion seems to be trying to do. Professor Schumm suggested eliminating the sentence on page 4, “Effort expended in overseeing teaching fellows would be associated with mentorship of graduate students when considering faculty workload.” He added that a phrase should be added that oversight will entail some sort of budgetary implications. Members agreed to both suggestions.

**ACTION: Members unanimously approved the edited memo. Professor Schumm will make the suggested changes to the memo.**

#### **IX. 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 is currently recruiting external reviewers. He has also recruited two internal reviewers for the proposal. He added that the current proposal is missing bylaws, but the program proposers will provide them by the end of the summer.

**ACTION: Professor Chehab will forward UCI’s document, “Establishing Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs,” which should help the program proposers develop bylaws.**

##### **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**

**ACTION: Albert Stralka was selected as the lead reviewer.**

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

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Wu is recruiting external reviewers.

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

**ISSUE/REPORT:** Professor Heckhausen has not received anything further on this proposal and therefore she did not have anything to report.

**E. 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 proposal has been sent out to two internal and two external reviewers with a deadline of July/August.

**X. 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: Duncan Lindsey, CCGA Chair  
Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst

Distributions:

1. Karen Merritt Email: Proposed Language for Adding Master's
2. Annual Total Mandatory Fees at UCLA