

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, January 7**I. Chair's Report – Chair Jutta Heckhausen**

Chair Jutta Heckhausen reported on the December 17 Academic Council meeting. The meeting featured an in-depth discussion regarding changes in the Academic Personnel Manual that consider how diversity activities of faculty could be taken into account in their reviews. The Council felt that the language included in the current draft was controversial and too prescriptive. The Council stated that it supported the intent of the proposed changes, but not the language.

The Chair reported that President Napolitano informed the Council and that she and Governor Brown would be holding a series of one-on-one discussions regarding the cost drivers of the University ("Committee of Two").

Vice Chair Valerie Leppert informed the committee that the Graduate Deans' Meeting had been cancelled, so there was no update from CoGD.

II. Consent Calendar

Approval of the Agenda

Action Taken: *The agenda was approved as noticed.*

III. SSGPDP and "Compellingness"

Determine how to assess whether a proposed program provides a "compelling" case for an SSGPDP.

Chair Heckhausen called the committee's attention to the first page of the SSGPDP enclosure and explained that the subsequent pages detailed the initiatives on the three campuses. She asked the group if they thought that the terms "SSGPDP" and "professional degree program" could be used interchangeably. She noted that the SSGPDP criteria are written as if they were encompassing all professional programs.

The Chair explained that – typically – it is not difficult to determine an SSGPDP by virtue of its "applied" rather than "research" focus. Students in SSGPDPs are more likely to be employed full-time or looking to pursue a specific career. However, she observed, sometimes there are programs that have a more hybrid nature, and that in these cases CCGA will have to discuss in-depth if they should be state-supported or self-supported. Part of that determination is ensuring that a proposed self-supporting program will not have a negative impact on the University's state-supported programs. Conversely, SSGPDPs should sustain and strengthen UC's core mission and programs.

A committee member advised caution regarding the use of the phrase "professional degrees," as a descriptor in that JDs and MBAs are professional, but are also fundamental to the University's offerings. Other members discussed possible SSGPDP factors such as serving in an auxiliary capacity, legitimacy of access to state funds, and impact on state-supported programs.

The Chair directed discussion to the more general considerations regarding the inherent opportunities and risks associated with SSGPDPs. The administration of some campuses is putting pressure on faculty to develop self-supporting programs. The rush to develop SSGPDPs is resulting in inefficiencies that may produce programs that will not succeed due to lack of initial support. There was wide agreement that a “let thousand flowers bloom” strategy in creating SSGPDPs is not an efficient practice. Instead, it is more efficient that each campus selects a set of programs likely to be successful in terms of substantial and sustainable enrolment numbers. Those that do succeed are often allowed to retain the majority of their profits, resulting in program-to-program inequities across the campuses. This will in the long run have the effect of creating imbalances of funding across academic units and thus can severely undermine the academic strategic plans of the campuses. It is therefore better to channel a substantial amount of the beyond-cost-coverage revenue to the campus central operating funds instead of leaving most of the excess revenue in the academic units which offers it.

Committee members discussed the approaches taken on their campuses and the strengths and weaknesses of each. Fiscal accountability and responsibility were of particular concern, as well as having a systemwide context and framework for SSGPDP development, implementation, and operation. Other discussions featured the origination of proposals (should programs be developed because of administrative pressure, or through a natural outgrowth of faculty interest?), faculty quality and load conflicts, and if – ultimately – the issue of SSGPDP approval should include a broader audience than CCGA.

One member drew a parallel between the development of SSGPDPs and the advent of online education. When UCOP first became interested in online education, it requested an evaluation and that perhaps such a tactic should be employed with self-supporting programs. In addition to projecting the financial viability of the program, the study should also evaluate the impact on the students and the larger picture of what does – and does not – work. It was suggested that a systemwide moratorium should perhaps be put in place until such an evaluation could be conducted. The University needs to determine if self-supporting programs are healthy for the system and if they can help UC accomplish its goals. It was also suggested that approved SSGPDPs have a different schedule of review than regular programs – maybe every three years – that would include how many students were taught, diversity and access implications, how many faculty buy-outs, and faculty and student feedback.

It was agreed that Chair Heckhausen, Vice Chair Leppert and Professor Burke would take the results of the day’s discussion, compile a short summary of proposed systemwide strategy, criteria and monitoring procedures, and would circulate it for discussion at the February meeting. The resulting document would then be submitted to Academic Council and the Academic Planning Committee. The statement is to propose an alternative strategy toward SSGPDPs. The strategy should include a priority plan for each campus that has a centralized strategy of assessing the marketability of various potential SSGPDPs for a given campus. Such priority plans could then guide investment in a select set of programs. The priority plan would also specify that a high percentage of revenue from these programs would come to the center of the campus and be redistributed according to the academic strategic plan of the campus. When the proposal is complete, CCGA will take it to APC and AC for review and discussion.

IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Academic Council Chair Mary Gilly informed the committee about recent bad news regarding the Los Alamos National Laboratory, which was levied with a \$36.6 million dollar fine. In addition, LANL lost a previously awarded contract as a part of its penalty. The result is that there is no funding available for the Lab Fee Research Program. The Lab Fee Research Program funds between 100-200 doctoral students, and its loss will have a considerable impact. Council Vice Chair Dan Hare added that ACSCOLI will be discussing how to work around this profound deficit and possible ways to retain student access to Lab equipment until the funding is restored.

Chair Gilly said that the Provost and the President are planning a faculty engagement plan regarding the University's long term stability with regard to tuition and fees. She told the members to be on the lookout for a letter in the near future regarding this plan.

Professor Gilly reported that the Regents want an actionable item regarding outcomes of the Doctoral Support Steering Committee. Chair Heckhausen stated that CCGA felt the Regents should be directly informed about the anticipated costs of creating graduate funding (multi-year funding at adequate levels, NRST management, diversity programs), which are competitive with peer institutions. She asked why the information was collected if it was not then going to be fully reported. The committee was informed that the Regents do not want to be approached regarding fundraising strategies or opportunities. They want a concrete statement about the additional funds needed for UC to be competitive with peer institutions in its graduate programs.

Chair Gilly stated that she had a conversation with ICAS about the possibility that the legislature would revoke the University's constitutional authority. Currently, the California Community Colleges are looking at the possibility of offering BA degrees and are trying to figure out what GE requirements are appropriate.

V. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

- A. **Proposal for an M.A. and Ph.D. in Sociology at UC Merced** – *Lead Reviewer John Kim (UCR)*
Professor Kim continues to receive reviews and believes that the committee will be able to vote on this proposal at the February meeting.
- B. **Proposal for a Ph.D. in Rehabilitation Science at UCSF** – *Lead Reviewer Valerie Leppert*
Professor Leppert stated that the new proposal addressed the reviewers concerns adequately and that the faculty involved in the proposal have a proven track record.
Action Taken – *The proposal was approved 9-0-1.*
- C. **Proposal for Ph.D. in Education at UC San Diego** – *Lead Reviewer Tania Israel*
Professor Israel continues to seek reviewers for this proposal.
- D. **Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (MPP) in the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IRPS) at UC San Diego** -- *Lead Reviewer Ken Kletzer*
Professor Kletzer has external reviewers and is still seeking an internal reviewer.
- E. **Proposal to establish a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Public Health Sciences at UC Davis** – *Lead Reviewer David Salmon*
Professor Salmon is following up with potential reviewers.

F. **Proposal to establish a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Global Health Sciences at UC San Francisco** – *Lead Reviewer Kathleen Hull*
Professor Hull is with the proposal and is seeking reviewers.

G. **Proposal for an MS and PhD in Mathematical, Computational, and Systems Biology at UC Irvine** – *Lead Reviewer Shauna Somerville*
Professor Somerville is receiving reviews and hopes to be able to vote on the proposal at the March meeting.

VI. Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishments, and Discontinuances

A. UCSF Disestablishments

1. Certification in Pain Management
2. Doctor of Nursing Science (DNS)
3. Ph.D. Anatomy
4. Ph.D. Microbiology
5. Ph.D. Physiology
6. Ph.D. Biochemistry

Chair Heckhausen noted that Items VI. A. 3-6 were superseded by umbrella programs, and that Items 1 and 2 have had no enrollment for some time.

***Action Taken:** Each proposal item (1-6) was voted upon independently and unanimously approved (with the abstention of the UCSF committee member).*

VII. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs

Director of Graduate Studies Pamela Jennings informed the committee that she had recently returned from the Council of Graduate Schools' 54th Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., where President Napolitano was the first plenary speaker. Director Jennings said that the President's speech was focused on current trends, challenges, and opportunities in U.S. graduate education. President Napolitano told attendees how to "build the case" for graduate education/research and remarked that she would be meeting with representatives on Capitol Hill after the conference. The President encouraged those attending the conference to become similarly engaged and involved.

Director Jennings told the committee that Graduate Research Advocacy Day would be April 28. This year, all of the campuses will hold their own Grad Slam before the end of the academic year and will participate in a systemwide competition on May 4.

VIII. Conversation with the Provost Regarding Degree Titles

Last year, said Provost Dorr, CCGA brought to the APC proposed naming protocols for SSGPDPs. This action generated considerable thoughts and discussion, which continue this year. Originally, said the Provost, SSGPDPs were to be named Masters of Advanced Studies; however, over time this has morphed.

The Provost believes that degree titles should be based on the substance of the degree, not how it is funded. Provost Dorr stated that the University has a great many professional programs that do not have supplemental support and that the proposed naming protocol would cause confusion in those instances. Furthermore, some programs start out as state-supported and then ask for a PDST or switch from PDST to SSP. She asked if the names of those programs would change each

time they changed funding streams.

Provost Dorr stated that there is one other issue that needs to be addressed. If stipulations are going to be put in place regarding degree titles, then those stipulations need to go through the University's processes for review and consultation. The majority of professional masters are not funded through SSGPDPs or PDSTs; in addition, UC has quite a few professional doctorate degrees. Work would have to be done to add "Master of" and "Doctor of" to the set of approved degree titles. In any case, the decision to enforce a "Master of X" title must be vetted by R&J, the systemwide Assembly, and the University's academic administrators. The condition cannot simply be put in place through the Compendium or the CCGA Handbook. Those documents are intended to reflect policy, not make it. If this degree title practice is to become policy, it needs to go through the full policy review process.

IX. Openness in Research

Wendy Streitz, Executive Director Research and Policy Analysis and Coordination, came before the committee to discuss possible changes to UC research policy. UC has had a longstanding policy/principle that it does not accept restrictions on publication. This practice is rooted in the UC's commitment to nondiscrimination and to its belief that researchers be selected on the basis of merit, rather than third party criteria.

However, the vice chancellors for research are exploring the option of University participation in national security research, some of which has restrictions. One argument in favor of participation is that it would allow UC faculty to address critical national and global research questions (e.g., some pandemic disease research.) Conversely, such a change could precipitate significant shift away from the University's traditional open academic environment and could require considerable resources to comply with accompanying regulations.

Executive Director Streitz stated that a proposed policy was being drafted that would establish fundamental UC principles of openness in research and would describe allowable exceptions. Some proposed guidelines for such exceptions would prohibit classified work, and would stipulate that the research must be performed in secure facilities.

Members discussed concerns regarding intellectual property, liability, and distortion of the research environment. Executive Director Streitz said that UCORP and UCAF are also beginning to discuss the proposed policy; she will take the feedback from all three committees and report back to CCGA in the spring.

X. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils

UCSB has an EDD program that is a JDP with Cal Poly. It worked well for some time, but is no longer viable; it will be coming to CCGA for discontinuation.

Davis is considering the use of the title "teaching professor." The campus feels that it would get a better pool of job applicants and also have better success with educational grants with this title. Some UCs already have this title in place, and the current Davis use of PSOE (professor with security of employment) means nothing to most people outside of UC.

UCR has an SSGPDP that is a very likely candidate for disestablishment in the eyes of everyone except the person who operates it. It has only had one enrolled student in its three year existence,

and is clearly not self-supporting.

Berkeley has as proposal coming forward from the Engineering Department for a self-supporting online Master's program. It is quite a complicated proposal and likely will take some time to come to fruition.

UCM is currently crafting two policy issues: one on concentrations and designated emphases, and another for graduate teaching by non-ladder-rank faculty. The Merced representative asked that any campuses who had experience to share with these issues please contact her by email.

XI. Executive Session

No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

The meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Attest: Jutta Heckhausen, CCGA Chair
Prepared by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst