April 11, 2011

To: Scott L. Waugh, UCLA Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost

Re: Huron Report on the UCLA Graduate Division

Dear Scott:

The Academic Senate received your request for comments on the Huron Consulting Group’s UCLA Graduate Division Assessment on February 14, 2011. The report and the process flows appendices were sent out for review to relevant Senate Committees the next day. The Senate’s Graduate Council (GC), Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), and all Faculty Executive Committees (FECs) were specifically asked to opine, and others were invited to do so if they so chose. Besides input from the above-named bodies, we received additional comments on the report from the Undergraduate Council (UgC), Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO), and Committee on International Education (CIE). The comments from all of these Senate bodies are attached to this memo. I should note that because a meeting of the Council of Faculty Chairs had been scheduled for March 4, well before the deadline for inputs on the Huron Report, we used that opportunity to discuss the report briefly with the FEC chairs. We specifically discussed the role of the Senate in graduate education and on the formal delegation of authority that takes place each year from the Senate, via Graduate Council, to Graduate Division. The role of Graduate Division in approving student programs, exceptions to policies, and the like were all discussed at this meeting, and as a consequence, a few FEC chairs mentioned comments at this meeting in their memos. The Executive Board of the Senate considered all comments at its March 31, 2011 meeting, in addition to the “corrections” document issued by Graduate Division on March 22, 2011.

There were a number of areas in which Senate Committee responses were in agreement with one another and were consistent with many of the comments by Executive Board members. There is clear agreement with the Huron Group that there are many ways in which Graduate Division can improve processes in admissions, student support, record-keeping, financial services, and the greater use of electronic media and improved information technology services for the aforementioned areas. Elimination of unnecessary administrative redundancies and reducing bureaucratic barriers by streamlining approval processes is also endorsed by a large number of Senate bodies, including the Executive Board. Reducing the number of Associate Deans and combining leadership responsibilities likely would have a positive effect on operations, although care should be exerted in making such changes and not having responsibilities “fall through the cracks”

It is clear to most Senate bodies that Graduate Division fulfills three primary functions: academic operations (e.g., administration of summer research programs for promising undergraduates in STEM areas), administrative/regulatory operations (e.g., Ph.D. committee approvals or
exceptions to policies), and student support and services (e.g., distribution of fellowship funds to departments). Many of these functions result from specific delegation of authority from the Senate (Graduate Council) to the Dean of Graduate Division, per UCLA Senate Bylaw 65.2 B(6), indicated below:

“As allowed in Senate Bylaw 20 and Senate Bylaw 330(C), the Graduate Council reserves the right to delegate to the Dean of the Graduate Division routine administrative decisions related to the regulations and policies of the Graduate Council as described in its delegation guidelines (see Appendix III, Bylaws of the Graduate Council). The Graduate Council will monitor and review these delegated decisions on an annual basis, and revise its delegation guidelines accordingly. [En 28 May 98]”

Hence while the “routine administrative decisions” are the responsibility of Graduate Division and its leadership, the actual authority to make these decisions is delegated to Graduate Division by the Senate, specifically by the Graduate Council. Under this delegation Graduate Division has the authority to redelegate duties that concern the establishment of administrative procedures for implementing student-related Senate regulations and Council policy to departmental, school, or college faculty or faculty administrators. This authority cannot be removed by popular demand or by the recommendations of an outside consulting group. In order to facilitate the smoother functioning of the Graduate Division, Graduate Council has indicated that they will continue to review carefully and clarify the annual delegation of authority made to the Division.

Some of the responses of Senate Committees to the Report, however, identify erroneous assumptions on the part of the Huron Group with respect to this authority, per the following concerns:

- The consultants have blurred the distinction among academic governance, student support, and academic administration in their pursuit of administrative efficiencies. Efficiencies cannot be implemented unilaterally by Graduate Division in a way that would undermine shared governance or the academic mission of the Division.
- The Graduate Division does not just have responsibility for graduate students, but also for graduate programs, and as such is a highly valued partner with the Senate’s Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. The accelerated development of self-supporting graduate programs and the attendant implications for teaching loads and advising and teaching of state-supported graduate students suggest the necessity of maintaining the strong presence of the Graduate Division in academic affairs.
- The vocabulary in the Huron Report underscored the sense that the consultants had a relatively limited knowledge of the academic mission of the university. “One stop shop,” for example, is an unfortunate phrase that misses the necessary distinction between student affairs and graduate academic affairs.
- The fact that relatively few graduate students were interviewed by the Huron Group, and that the Graduate Student Resource Center (part of Student Affairs) is suggested to be co-located with Graduate Division, further suggests a lack of understanding on the part of the
consultants. While there are clearly useful connections between GSRC and GD, the level of comfort by students seeking advice in the GSRC within Student Affairs, vs. advice in the academically-oriented Grad Division, should be recognized.

- Although the Ethnic Studies Centers were deemed by UCLA to be outside the purview of the consultants, they nevertheless saw fit to recommend the Centers’ removal from the Division. Some Board members were skeptical of this suggestion, but others were intrigued by it, and agree that the time is right to formally address this question. Some Senate bodies were supportive of naming a separate committee tasked with developing a strategic plan for the Ethnic Studies Centers.

- Many Senate bodies and Exec Board members raised concerns regarding the decentralization of graduate student funding. Although there was great support for making the process both more transparent and efficient, members were skeptical that delegating those funds to the various academic deans would be an improvement; this could lead to much greater conflict and unnecessary competition.

Overall, it is clear to Senate bodies that this Report should be delivered to the new Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Division as a guide, not a mandate. The new Dean and Vice Provost should have latitude to implement organizational efficiencies, again, within the context of shared governance and the delegation of authority from the Senate.

I hope that you and Chancellor Block will consider our Senate input on the Huron Report as a constructive evaluation of a proposed framework that could have benefits and applicability at UCLA. The Senate stands ready to work with the UCLA Administration in exploring alternatives within Graduate Division that could have a positive impact on our future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ann Karagozian
UCLA Academic Senate Chair
March 14, 2011

Ann Karagozian, Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Dear Ann,

At its meeting on February 25, 2011, the Graduate Council discussed the *Huron Report on the UCLA Graduate Division*, as commissioned by Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh. EVC Waugh presented an overview of the Report at the meeting, and Council members had the opportunity to address questions and concerns directly to him.

The Council discussed the report in detail, including its recommendation to improve operational efficiencies and customer service in both the admissions and student support units, as well as the recommendations that fall under the authority of the Graduate Council, including its delegation of authority that currently permits the Graduate Division to act on its behalf with course actions, minor program requirement changes, and the appointment of IDP chairs and administering committees. I present this response to provide a general account of the Council’s views on a number of key points made in the report.

Members were sympathetic to the proposed shift of the Graduate Division from being an administrative unit that monitors graduate policies and programs to a more student-centered organization, but they questioned the effects such a move would have on the functioning of graduate programs. They also questioned the effects such a move would have on the close relationship that the Division currently has with the Council. Members expressed concerns that such a shift could set the stage for the Graduate Division’s eventual decline in academic affairs, a decline that would dramatically affect the operations of graduate programs and the Graduate Council. Concerning programs, this proposed shift could remove the Graduate Division’s role as a “one-stop shop” for the administration and departments that require guidance and support on graduate issues. This shift also threatens to remove Graduate Division’s important oversight of UCLA’s graduate programs and affairs, an issue that, particularly with the advent of a world that will likely be filled with new graduate self-supporting programs, the report inadequately addresses. Concerning the Graduate Council, there exist concerns that the shifts suggested by the Huron Report will deeply alter the close working relationship enjoyed by both Division and Council. The Graduate Council deeply appreciates the Graduate Division deans’ contributions to Graduate Council discussions in their roles as *ex officio* member (Dean) and invited guests (Associate and Assistant Deans). Finally, some members felt that the decline in Graduate Division’s role in academic affairs presaged by the report is in direct conflict with the very recent change to the Division’s leadership position – from Vice Chancellor to Vice Provost, the latter having the academic oversight that the Division currently maintains. (It bears noting that the Academic Senate by-and-large did not support this change in title.)

Council members were generally in agreement that the Graduate Division could improve its operational efficiencies in both the admissions and student support units. However, concerns were raised about the potential for decentralizing the admissions operations for schools with “mature admissions functions.” No definition was provided for such functions and greater detail – if not identification of those departments/schools – must be given before the Council supports such a significant change. There also must be in place an adequate plan for oversight.

Members did support moving towards a more electronic environment and reducing bureaucratic barriers that may delay standard, pro forma processes. They also acknowledged that improvements could certainly be made with respect to the Division’s culture of service.

With respect to the Council’s delegation of authority, members acknowledged that much of it could be revisited and that revisions were indeed possible, if not advisable. In fact both the Graduate and Undergraduate Council Chairs have discussed the delegated role with the appointment of IDP chairs and administering committees and have already questioned the most logical administrative home for such authorities (note, the Vice Provost for
Undergraduate Studies currently serves in a similar capacity, by delegation of the Undergraduate Council. The Council plans to revisit the issue in the Spring Quarter and to discuss whether these actions should be delegated to respective divisional and school deans. As for other delegated actions, including approval of course actions and minor program requirement changes, members acknowledged that the current Graduate Council Delegation could be more precise with respect to identifying the specific actions that it releases to the Graduate Division, which would certainly help address the report’s concern about the lack of clarity between the Division and Council’s authorities. The Council intends to review its current delegation with a critical eye and update it to reflect a clearer division between Council and Division responsibilities.

Concerning the Graduate Division’s role in the Academic Senate’s 8-year review process, members noted that the recommendation to minimize the Division’s role comes at a time when the the College is assuming a more pronounced role in the process with its almost zealous incorporation of learning assessment plans. Aside from the possible marginalization of graduate concerns in the review process that such a recommendation suggests, it also shows on the part of the Huron Group a serious lack of understanding of the process more generally. Moreover, last year WASC universally praised UCLA’s review processes. As such, the report seeks to fix another problem that doesn’t exist. Note the Graduate Division has played an integral role in the program review process with its provision of critical graduate student data. The Council feels that the Division’s issues statement serves as an important perspective that typically proves helpful to the very comprehensive process of program review. The criticism in the report about the statements consistently addressing diversity is close to bizarre. Diversity is one of the Chancellor’s most important issues, and to criticize the Division for paying attention to it on a consistent basis is simply inappropriate, particularly given that in the majority of UCLA’s graduate programs and unit faculties, the lack of diversity remains a serious issue.

The Council also expressed concerns about the lack of student input in the creation of the report and the implementation of changes before full campus input is received. Given that the report calls for a more student-centered focus, it struck members as ironic that the report was not disseminated to the Graduate Students Association or to graduate students in general. Waugh assured the members that student input would be collected, yet given that the wheels are already in motion, one must question how valued their input will actually be. Along the same lines, members found the timing of the report – i.e., before the appointment of a new Dean/Vice Provost – to be both prudent and problematic, seeing as the position and organization may be significantly changed by the time this appointment is made this summer.

Last, the Council noted that some of the recommendations could not be implemented in the short term and that it was premature to comment on them since they were not very well developed. These include the recommendation to move the ethnic studies research centers out of the Graduate Division’s purview, and the shifting of an operation currently housed under the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (i.e., the Graduate Student Resource Center). Members acknowledged that the campus will need many more discussions on these topics before final decisions about appropriate administrative accommodations are made and that the report made recommendations for which the consulting group seemingly conducted little to no research or analysis.

On behalf of the Graduate Council, we appreciate the opportunity to opine on the Huron Report and stand prepared to review more proposals as the report’s recommendations become more formalized and prepared for implementation.

Regards,

Steven Nelson, Chair
UCLA Graduate Council

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Sr. Policy Analyst, Graduate Council
March 22, 2011

Professor Ann Karagozian
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Huron Report on the Graduate Division

Dear Professor Karagozian,

The UCLA Council on Planning and Budget discussed the Huron Report on the Graduate Division at its March 14, 2011 meeting. Vice Chancellor/Provost Waugh joined us for part of our discussion to answer questions regarding the Report and his plans for implementation. Overall, members of CPB welcome the Report and most support its basic recommendations that would decentralize many of the current functions of the Division to Departments and Schools, and improve the Division’s services to Departments, faculty and graduate students themselves. Indeed, several members felt that the recommendations did not go far enough towards decentralization and reducing the size of the Graduate Division staff. VP/Provost Waugh emphasized that his primary goal was to improve administrative support for graduate education, but that savings would be realized over time.

CPB understands that the lead Senate committee for graduate affairs and programs is the Graduate Council. However, because the Huron’s suggestions relate to the intersection of budgetary and academic matters, CPB will monitor implementation of the changes in these areas:

1. The distribution of fellowship funds. The Huron Report arrives at a time of substantial change in funding patterns generally in the University, and also in a time of great uncertainty with respect to state support for the University. CPB is the lead Senate committee overseeing and participating in the implementation of the Funding Streams Model and it is also the lead committee with respect to the campus budget. CPB needs to be an active participant in the coming campus-wide faculty discussion regarding the distribution and management of all forms of graduate support.

2. The Ethnic Studies centers. Apparently these ORUs are housed in the Graduate Division for purely historical reasons that have little or nothing to do with the support of graduate education at UCLA. CPB believes that now is the opportune time to move the centers to a more appropriate unit, such as the School of Public Affairs or other unit involved in organized research and community outreach.

3. Resource Savings. We understand that the primary goal of the Graduate Division reorganization is to improve administrative support for graduate programs and students. But in current circumstances, even understaffed and well-run units are facing substantial cuts. As the Graduate Division’s functions are rationalized, automated and decentralized to schools and departments, its operating budget should be reduced accordingly. We believe that the “Ideal State Organizational Structure” (p.28) is a step in the right direction, but even it does not seem to go far enough.
4. Program Oversight. Most CPB members support the general idea of moving from “over the shoulder” to less costly and less intrusive audits as the preferred way to enforce essential Academic Senate policies related to graduate education. But a few units may continue to require more central support and oversight than others and CPB believes that either the Graduate Division or some other appropriate authority should maintain closer support and scrutiny of those few units. Some members are particularly concerned about maintaining admissions standards in self-supporting degree programs. But most members agree that there is no reason to maintain elaborate oversight procedures for all units if problems are limited to just a few.

5. Maintaining and increasing faculty authority over graduate education. We recognize that there are legitimate reasons for Academic Senate/Graduate Council oversight of graduate programs, and that there may well be reasons to continue to have the Graduate Division or some other central body carry out Senate policy. Still, CPB strongly endorses the principle that primary authority over graduate education rests with departmental faculties, and that to the maximal degree possible all decisions regarding graduate programs and students, including decisions about financial support, should be taken at the department level. Above all, the reform of administrative support for graduate education needs to be based on this principle.

Once again, our reaction to the Huron Report and to Vice Chancellor/Provost Waugh’s plans to implement its key suggestions is generally positive, and we endorse these important improvements in the administrative support for UCLA’s graduate and professional programs. CPB looks forward to working with the Graduate Council and the Chancellor’s Office in the implementation of these reforms.

Respectfully,

David Lopez
Chair, UCLA Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Andy Leuchter, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Robin Garrell, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
March 23, 2011

To: Ann Karagozian  
Academic Senate, Chair

From: Rebecca Jean Emigh  
Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity, Chair

Re: Senate Item for Review: Huron Report on the Graduate Division

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity reviewed the Senate Item for Review: Huron Report on the Graduate Division. After thorough review, the Committee was concerned that the Huron report suggests that the Ethnic Studies Centers, the Institute of the American Cultures, and IDPs should be moved out of Graduate Division. We do not have enough substantive information at this time to judge whether this proposal would be appropriate, but we urge the administration to conduct a thorough study of this particular proposal, with ample opportunity for faculty input, before implementing it. We are concerned that the Huron study did not have enough information at hand to recommend this proposal, as they obtained relatively little information from faculty and students in these units and because they were officially outside the scope of the study. In recruiting the input of a broader diversity of stakeholders, we hope that these additional viewpoints can create a review of the graduate division that better represents the whole of the UCLA community.

We applaud the Huron recommendation for a central diversity office to coordinate diversity efforts and to assure that efforts for graduate diversity are well coordinated.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Dottie Ayer, Assistant to Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Brandie Henderson, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
March 22, 2011

Mr. Jaime Balboa  
Chief Administrative Officer, 
Academic Senate Executive Office  
University of California, Los Angeles  
3125 Murphy Hall  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1408

Dear Mr. Balboa:

On behalf of our FEC Chair, Joe Olivieri, I would like to inform you that the TFT FEC Committee Members were not able to meet in person to review the proposal paper “Huron Report on the Graduate Division.”

However, Joe did receive responses on the report via email from four of the FEC members. These four members support the findings. Three members did not respond.

Therefore, Joe would like to say that the official response from the TFT FEC Committee is that four of the members support the report as written, with three abstentions.

If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact Joe Olivieri at olivieri@tft.ucla.edu. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michele Medina  
Dean’s Office Manager/FEC Coordinator
MEMO

Date: March 16, 2011

From: Andrea Fraser
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
School of the Arts and Architecture

To: UCLA Academic Senate
Jaime Balboa, CAO

Re: SOAA FEC review of Huron Report on the Graduate Division

The FEC of the School of the Arts and Architecture reviewed the Huron Report on the Graduate Division, as requested by the Chair of the Academic Senate. At our March 11, 2011 meeting, we voted that we cannot endorse the report’s recommendations until a number of concerns are addressed. These concerns are detailed below.

The SOAA FEC welcomes some of the changes proposed in the Huron Report, particularly those pertaining to streamlining and updating admissions and grant application processes. The suggestion to create databases and allow for online form submission is a feasible and timely one. However, the committee expressed the following concerns regarding the report and its recommendations:

- The Huron research was not representative: Huron interviews did not include anyone from the arts (SOAA or TFT) and only seven graduate student advisors; Huron interviewed insufficient numbers of those who interact with Graduate Division regularly, such as administrators and faculty graduate advisors.

- The report recommends changes that impinge on the Graduate Council and, as such, imply a fundamental restructuring of the university’s delegation of responsibilities and roles. We echo Academic Senate concerns that the implementation of changes to the Graduate Division does not supersede the authority of the senate in delegating responsibility.

- The decentralization of Graduate Division responsibilities, as recommended by Huron, would result in increased workload in departments, especially with regard to admissions, course review, and the administration of IDPs. This is particularly troubling in the current budgetary climate when staff and faculty workloads are already increasing dramatically.

- The report’s recommendation that Graduate Division functions be decentralized to departments and schools corresponds to a broader trend toward decentralization at UC. Our committee has expressed concern that this trend will lead to the fragmentation of campus programs and an every-unit-for-itself ethos. In the context of a number of recent proposals to expand self-supporting and professional graduate programs, we anticipate
the need for more oversight of graduate programs in the future, not less. In the context of financial pressures on academic standards, there is a greater need than ever for a “campus-wide advocate for the advancement of graduate education [that] strives for standards of excellence, fairness and equity in all graduate programs” (Graduate Division Mission Statement).

- The Huron Report recommends that departments with “mature admissions functions” be able to opt-out of Graduate Division review, but does not indicate how such “mature admissions functions” would be defined; nor does it indicate how quality in admissions would be assured and how accountability would be maintained. Furthermore, this shift would increase the workloads of departments, schools, and of the Registrar’s Office, none of which are prepared for this. Shifting primary responsibility to departments would require a high level of specialization of the individual faculty members who take on the role of Vice Chair/Graduate Advisor. Expecting individuals to perform this demanding service role for a usual term of three years is unfair and unfeasible.

- Shifting responsibility for IDPs to individual departments contradicts the identity of IDPs as inter-departmental programs. In addition, the SOAA FEC has concerns about the financial implications of such a shift: how would faculty time spent on IDPs be accounted for? What funds will individual departments use to support IDPs?

- The SOAA FEC acknowledges that there are problems with the current system for the distribution of fellowship funds, especially the different weighting given to MA, professional MA, MFA, and PhD students. However, the committee does not believe that shifting 50% or more of fellowship funds to deans for “strategic allocation,” as recommended by Huron, would improve on the current situation. Specifically, the committee is concerned that such an approach would be open to subjective preferences, based on an individual’s perception of a particular department’s performance or of the importance of particular fields of study.

- The SOAA FEC supports the relocation of the Friends of Jazz program, and echoes Dean Waterman’s proposal to move it to the Herb Alpert School of Music.

- The SOAA FEC echoes Graduate Council Chair Nelson’s comment that the criticism of Graduate Division’s diversity statements is troubling. Diversity comes up repeatedly as an issue because it continues to be a problem. Furthermore, diversity is not a single problem with a single solution: it is a concern that needs ongoing attention to ensure equal representation across the lines of race, gender, ability, and economic background. FEC members pointed out that simply adding diversity as a standing item to agendas runs the risk of turning it into empty sloganeering and desensitizing the very individuals who need to be attuned to equal representation.

- SOAA FEC members concurred that their dealings with Graduate Division have, overall, been helpful and, in some cases, indispensable. Graduate Division’s assistance in admissions, in managing student progress, and in departmental reviews has been welcome.
Jaime -

The HSSEAS FEC met on Feb 23, 2011 and discussed the Huron Report on the Graduate Division. The committee endorses the policy revisions as written.

There was strong support for the idea of allowing schools such as HSSEAS to "opt out" of the graduate division altogether. There was a perceived lack of value added by the graduate division to this school. At the same time, the recognition of bureaucratic growth and cost causes us to recommend that there be no replacement for the position of Claudia Mitchell-Kerman and thereby remove another Vice-Chancellor from the large list.

The functions that require the existence of a graduate division should be delegated/absorbed across other already established entities and at the very least, and the division be downsized if not eliminated completely.

Yours,

Oscar Stafsudd, Chair
HSSEAS FEC
Hello Ann,

Please consider this message as my official response to the requested feedback concerning the Huron Report in my capacity as the GSE&IS Faculty Chair.

In our School's FEC meeting on Feb 24, we briefly discussed the Huron Report. Although not everyone had a chance to carefully review the report, there was support for many of the recommendations. At this point, I can safely say that our FEC supports the recommendations in its entirety concerning Admissions, Financial Services, Division Administration, and Student Services. Concerns were raised regarding some of the recommendations in the other areas—Academic Services and Communication. Given the preliminary nature of the discussion at that meeting, however, I cannot be more specific about those concerns at this time.

Generally, our FEC found most of the recommendations in those limited areas to be quite sensible, especially given the current budget climate. If there are savings to be had, I would fully support Jaime's recommendation to earmark those savings for graduate student support.

Unfortunately, our FEC will not meet again before the March deadline to further discuss this report. Per your request, I will offer my own thoughts on some of the recommendations that were not fully supported by our FEC. Although these thoughts do not reflect our FEC's position or discussion, I have served on Graduate Council and also currently serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Asian American Studies Center, so do feel qualified to respond.

In particular, I want to respond to recommendations #3 & #4 under Academic Services. I'm especially troubled by these recommendations because the ethnic studies research centers were identified as "not in scope for this evaluation," and yet the report draws conclusions (minus any evidence) regarding their operations, organizational location, and the "ideal infrastructure" for institutional support. I understand that those who wrote the report never met with the center directors nor with any faculty or staff members associated with the ethnic studies degree programs.

One thing that certainly does not make sense is to have those units report to an academic dean or even two. One major problem here is that the ethnic studies centers draw faculty from a wide range of academic fields that go far beyond the academic oversight and expertise of any one dean on our campus. While the recommendations might improve administrative efficiency—even this is questionable—it certainly does not make any sense from a scholarly or intellectual standpoint and therefore, is not academically sound.

Given the problems associated with these two recommendations and with any others that concern ethnic studies research centers, they should be rejected and a more authentic set of recommendations should be developed in consultation with the leadership of those centers.

Thanks again for the opportunity to respond,

__________________
Mitchell J. Chang
Professor
Higher Education and Organizational Change
University of California, Los Angeles
Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
3127 Moore Hall, Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521
March 24, 2011

To: Ann Karagozian, Chair
    UCLA Academic Senate

From: Raymond Knapp, Chair
    UCLA College Faculty Executive Committee

Re: College FEC response to the “Huron Report on the Graduate Division”

Thank you on behalf of the College Faculty Executive Committee for the opportunity to review and opine on the report prepared by the Huron Consulting Group at the request of Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh. The FEC discussed the report at our March 4, 2011, meeting after Professor Michael Goldstein, Interim Vice Provost and Dean, introduced the report and offered background. On March 22, 2011, a formal vote to endorse the comments of this letter was conducted electronically (10 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain). The following summarizes the FEC’s concerns and attempts to capture the tone of our discussion.

1. Many members of the FEC were encouraged by the report’s suggestions of ways to make Graduate Division’s relationship with departments and students more productive; however, this emphasis was undermined by the report’s near-total lack of understanding of issues concerning shared governance and campus academic culture. In particular, the report seems not to have understood the important relationship between Graduate Division and Graduate Council. The FEC recommends that the new Dean use the report as a starting point in a much larger discussion about how to shape the mission, structure, and future of the division. Given the lack of understanding of shared governance in the report, the FEC strongly urges that the new Dean use the report as a recommendation and not as a mandate.

2. Many FEC members were also concerned by the report’s recommendation that the Graduate Division revisit the process of how financial aid is dispersed across units. Given that many financial aid packages are based on multi-year commitments, the FEC pointed out that commitments to current students must be honored, and that these commitments would run four to five years into the future. The FEC agreed with the Huron Report’s call for greater transparency in the allocation process. But devolving control over Graduate financial aid to local deans would introduce new levels of uncertainty into the process. Since the funds coming to the campus will no longer be earmarked specifically for graduate student support, it is important that the new Dean of the Graduate Division be actively involved in determining how graduate students support will be allocated.

3. The Graduate Division should play a central role in ensuring that graduate education is protected and promoted during these changes to the university. The FEC was very concerned that the Huron Report seemed to see Graduate Division only as a service organization rather than an important part of academic planning. We urge the administration to reconsider the report in light of Graduate Division’s mission, as the group whose mandate it is to ensure academic quality, fairness, and equity across campus. This
would include the very important work of carrying out the academic policies set by the Graduate Council. Any reorganization of the Graduate Division should keep this primary function in mind. The FEC believes this recognition to be particularly important given the fact that the undergraduate population is slated to grow while the faculty shrinks, which will put added pressures on the graduate programs and on TAs.

4. Some members of the FEC found it curious that the same people who suggested resource-centered management—and the distribution of tasks and costs to all the units—is now suggesting centralization of many of Graduate Division's functions. While the FEC believes that efficiency should certainly be sought, devolving tasks to central offices that are already overburdened seems likely to dilute the attention paid to graduate education. The new Dean should be able to determine which tasks should be outsourced and which are crucial to the promotion of excellence in graduate education.

Our membership appreciates the consultative process and understands this report is still in the draft stage. We welcome an opportunity to opine on future versions or responses to the issues raised in this letter. In the meantime, you are welcome to contact me at knapp@humnet.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

cc:  Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
     Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives
     Kyle Cunningham, Senior Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
     Jisoo Kim, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
     Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
     Steven Nelson, Chair, Graduate Council
     Joseph Watson, Chair, Undergraduate Council
March 24, 2011

To: Professor Ann Karagozian, Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

From: Professor Joseph B. Watson, Chair
UCLA Undergraduate Council

Re: Undergraduate Council Response to the Huron Report on the Graduate Division

On behalf of the Undergraduate Council, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on the report by the Huron Consulting Group, UCLA Graduate Division Assessment: A Report for the Restructuring Steering Committee. The Council discussed the report at its March 4, 2011 meeting and agreed that the concerns included in this letter should be conveyed before any implementation attempts are made.

- The Council recognizes that the Graduate Division is not immune to criticism and that there are many areas in which the Graduate Division can improve. However, the Council felt that the negative depiction of the Graduate Division’s failure to provide adequate “customer service” distorts and undermines the academic mission of the Graduate Division, its integral role in academic life at UCLA, and its impact on the rest of the campus.

- Furthermore, the report exhibits poor understanding of UCLA’s academic missions, shared governance and internal structure as evidenced by some of the recommendations such as the creation of a Committee on International Student and Scholar Affairs to include perspectives of international stakeholders including the International Education Office; there already exists a Senate Committee on International Education whose charges are to represent UCLA in matters concerned with international education, to provide consultation and make recommendations to UCLA with respect to international education, international exchange, and international internships, to provide consultation to the International Education Office and the Vice Provost, International Institute, and to serve as liaison between the IEO and Academic Senate leadership, helping to ensure that policies and procedures are appropriately vetted by the Senate. Given the ample evidence of lack of familiarity with UCLA as an educational institution, the Graduate Division’s academic links to the campus, and their significance, the Council questions why the report was commissioned to an external agency.

- As it impacts the Council, the members specifically commented on the report’s recommendation with regard to issues statements the Graduate Dean provides. The Council, which conducts the Senate program reviews jointly with its Graduate counterpart, finds the information contained in each issues statement valuable, for it often provides a helpful insight or alerts the Review Team to an issue otherwise
unknown. Therefore, the Council prefers the current practice to what is recommended in the report.

- The Council suggests that Immediate Past Dean Claudia Mitchell-Kernan be given an opportunity to provide a through response to the report before any implementation is contemplated.

- Given the current budgetary situation, the Council was rather puzzled to find no mention of the anticipated cost associated with restructuring the Graduate Division, especially considering that the report recommends that the Graduate Division take a larger role in some aspects and absorb certain functions, e.g., “create a one stop shop for students by bringing the Graduate Student Resources Center into Graduate Division.”

The Council does not wish to discredit the report in its entirety as the report does contain some recommendations that are promising and constructive. However, the Council strongly believes that implementation should not be imminent until the recommendations of the report are comprehensively vetted and all responses are adequately considered.

If you have any questions regarding the concerns raised in this letter, please feel free to contact me (x57587; jwatson@mednet.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Principal Policy Analyst Jisoo Kim (x51194; jkim@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant to the Senate Leadership, Academic Senate
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Kyle Cunningham, Senior Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Jisoo Kim, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Steven Nelson, Chair, Graduate Council
March 27, 2011

To: Professor Ann Karagozian, Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

From: Professor A. Carlos Quicoli, Chair
UCLA Committee on International Education

Re: Committee on International Education Response to the Senate Item for Review: Huron Report on the Graduate Division

On behalf of the Committee on International Education, I am writing with regard to the report by the Huron Consulting Group, UCLA Graduate Division Assessment: A Report for the Restructuring Steering Committee. The Committee discussed the report at its March 15, 2011 meeting and conducted an electronic vote on March 24-27, 2011 unanimously to endorse the comments of this letter.

Although the Committee found many of the recommendations constructive and forward-thinking, it was concerned about the potential redundancy that may result from the report’s recommendation to create a Committee on International Student and Scholar Affairs. As stipulated in our bylaws, the duties of the Committee on International Education include representing UCLA in matters concerned with international education, providing consultation and making recommendations to UCLA with respect to international education, international exchange, and international internships, providing consultation to the International Education Office and the Vice Provost, International Institute, and serving as liaison between the International Education Office and Academic Senate leadership in order to ensure that policies and procedures are appropriately vetted by the Senate. Given our charge, this Committee may serve the need to have various international stakeholders integrated in relevant decision-making processes in order to include their perspectives; therefore, it is unclear what benefits would accrue to the creation of yet another committee when there is an existing committee in place, which is open to suggestions and recommendations to improve coordination among the stakeholders identified in the report. The Committee regrets that it was not consulted during the assessment process; had such an opportunity been afforded, consideration could have been given instead to making most efficient use of the existing resources including this Committee.

The Committee thanks you for the opportunity to opine on the proposal and welcomes an invitation to review future drafts that respond to the concern voiced in this letter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (x68584; quicoli@humnet.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Principal Policy Analyst Jisoo Kim (x51194; jkim@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant to the Senate Leadership, Academic Senate
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate