



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BRUCE B. DARLING

Senior Vice President – University Affairs

Office of State Governmental Relations

1130 K Street, Suite 340

Sacramento, California 95814

(916) 445-9924

Stephen A. Arditti, Assistant Vice President and Director

April 29, 2005

The Honorable Carole Migden
Chair, Senate Appropriations Committee
State Capitol, Room 2059
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Migden:

Re: SB 724 (Scott), As Amended on April 5, 2005
Scheduled for Hearing in the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 2, 2005
Position: Oppose

I am writing to express the University of California's opposition to SB 724. This measure would alter the Master Plan for Higher Education to authorize the California State University (CSU) to award doctoral degrees in "selected professional fields," excluding only the Ph.D. and doctorates in law, medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine. There are about 60 doctoral degree titles in use in the US that are outside of these areas and UC has 17 approved doctoral degree titles that could be duplicated by CSU under SB 724.

High-quality doctoral programs are expensive, requiring low student-faculty ratios, library resources, equipment, and a clinical infrastructure in healthcare fields. CSU has stated that it would like to enroll 1,500 students per year in independent Ed.D. programs. Since 2001, UC and CSU have launched 6 new joint Ed.D. programs and expanded another, with start-up and planning costs of \$4.7 million. Using CSU's current marginal cost of \$6,270 per student, state costs for enrollment would be \$9.4 million per year. CSU also stated its intention to increase its current Master's degree enrollment in Audiology from 76 to 166 per year upon creation of a doctoral degree program. At CSU's current marginal cost rate, the additional state cost would be \$564,000 per year. Audiology, like Physical Therapy, is a high-cost field; actual costs are likely to be much higher.

To pay for these costs, CSU must either seek state funding, set fees at high levels to make the programs self supporting, or divert monies away from core activities, such as undergraduate enrollment and teacher preparation.

UC is committed to meeting our responsibilities under the Master Plan to meet state needs in doctoral education, including joint doctoral programs with CSU. CSU has indicated there are unmet needs in some disciplines such as Audiology and Physical Therapy, yet has not produced nor asked the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to produce any studies of supply and demand in these fields. At UC, we recently completed a study of supply and demand in the health professions—medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, nursing, pharmacy, optometry, and public health. We have now convened a group to address issues of state need for doctoral training including professional doctorates in Physical Therapy and other allied health areas; a report on how to best meet needs in Audiology is already available.

UC President Robert C. Dynes is convening a task force to map a course for the future of doctoral education at UC. Experts will be asked to identify fields in which UC should play a major role in improving California's economic competitiveness and overall social, economic, and cultural development. The Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education will recommend a plan and funding priorities for meeting the state's workforce needs, monitoring workforce trends on an ongoing basis, and maintaining California's economic competitiveness in research and graduate education. In this planning, joint doctoral degree programs with CSU will be included as an effective way to combine the strengths of both systems in meeting these challenges. We will also look at the contribution of California's strong independent doctoral-granting institutions to meeting state needs for advanced doctoral training.

UC is committed to addressing the educational needs required for the delivery of high quality healthcare in California, including in Audiology and Physical Therapy; new joint CSU/UC doctoral programs have been established in both of these disciplines. These are two disciplines where professional standards for practice are being upgraded from a Master's degree to a doctoral degree:

- Audiology. Changes in national accreditation requirements will establish the doctorate as the entry-level professional degree, beginning in 2007. In anticipation of these changes, a new joint doctoral degree program in Audiology (Au.D.) was established between UC San Diego and San Diego State University in 2003. This program is already regarded as a national model of upgraded training for future audiologists, combining the strength of San Diego State's existing Master's degree program with clinical opportunities at UC San Diego's medical school. In clinical training, audiology candidates work side by side with medical residents training in Otolaryngology (Ear, Nose, and Throat), with knowledge and experience flowing in both directions.

UC has already completed a report analyzing state needs for audiology degree production. The report concludes that: "Expanded joint Au.D. programming in California represents: 1) the highest quality training to assure the best patient care, 2) the most cost-effective approach, and 3) the speediest avenue for providing this education." Faculty at several UC medical schools are already in conversations with their CSU colleagues in audiology to extend the UCSD/SDSU program model to other CSU and UC campuses and UC medical schools. This is clearly an opportunity where a joint program would be much more than the sum of its parts—each partner has a unique contribution to the quality of the overall program. However, the audiology report goes on to state that: "Given its responsibility for excellence in health care delivery for Californians, if CSU is unwilling to support development of joint Au.D. programs, we recommend that UC stand ready to develop either independent capstone Au.D. programs or a School of Allied Health to assure that California's needs are met."

- Physical therapy. Changes in program accreditation may result in the doctorate also becoming the entry-level degree for professional practice in Physical Therapy. Two new CSU/UC joint doctoral degree programs have recently been established between UCSF and San Francisco State University, the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) for practitioners and the Doctor of Physical Therapy Science (DPTSc) for training faculty and researchers. Planning is underway for a third joint doctoral (DPT) program between CSU Fresno and the UCSF Fresno Medical Education Program. UC's task force on doctoral education will also address potential expansion of joint CSU/UC programs to other CSU and UC campuses in order to ensure that students who wish to enter the field of Physical Therapy have access to doctoral education.

CSU/UC Joint Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership are meeting state needs while developing deliberately to ensure quality—they are an excellent model of collaboration to meet other well-identified state needs. In late 2001, CSU and UC agreed to expand joint doctoral programs (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership. The Legislature passed SCR 93 in 2002 supporting these programs. Since that time, four new programs have been established and are already training educational leaders. By the end of the summer, CSU and UC will have a total of seven joint Ed.D. programs involving 14 CSU and six UC campuses. These Joint CSU/UC Ed.D. programs are on track to enroll 400-500 students annually within the next few years.

A national report recommends training most K-12 leaders at Master's degree level. A recent national report by the Education Schools Project (directed by Arthur Levine, the President of Teachers College at Columbia University) recommends training most future educational leaders in Master's degrees programs rather than through the Ed.D. CSU already has the ability under the Master Plan to create such Master's level programs. UC's Principal Leadership Institutes (PLIs) are a recent UC approach consistent with the report's recommendations. UC still supports the need for the Ed.D., as evidenced by our commitment to the new Joint CSU/UC programs and the UCLA Ed.D. program. However, we do agree with the Levine report that doctoral programs in education should be of high quality and should not be excessively proliferated when other alternatives to quality training of school and community college leaders are available.

A CSU-alone approach to doctoral-level professional degrees threatens the success of joint CSU/UC Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership. We are concerned that the current CSU effort to seek stand-alone doctoral authority is threatening the new Ed.D. programs at a critical stage in their development. More than \$4 million in public funds has been invested by both CSU and UC in their development. UC faculty are enthusiastic about working with their CSU colleagues in the joint Ed.D. programs and are contributing significantly to their success. However, some faculty at both CSU and UC are concerned about the future of these programs and are wondering if their success is seen as a hindrance to what appears to be the CSU objective to offer such programs independently.

Joint CSU/UC doctoral programs are a good model for the state because they bring together the strengths of both institutions, as the Master Plan envisioned. UC doctoral programs are internationally renowned for their quality and add to the value of the degree earned by students in joint programs. Combining UC's experience and strengths in creating quality doctoral programs with CSU's geographic reach and practitioner focus will result in better quality programs.

A joint approach also makes better use of the state's resources. SB 724 could begin to spread California's resources for graduate education too thinly and dilute quality. Differentiation of function between the segments of higher education is a good thing for the state because it makes efficient use of resources. Having CSU duplicate the doctoral-level training mission in numerous fields would leave little meaningful distinction between the missions of UC and CSU and would end up costing the state more money. The Master Plan recognized that doctoral training is costly – quality programs require low student-faculty ratios, direct supervision of graduate students, laboratory equipment, library resources, and specialized training. SB 724 would either spread public funding for doctoral education across 33 institutions (UC and CSU campuses combined) instead of 10 (UC campuses), or else put substantial additional pressures on the State General Fund.

To meet state needs and keep California competitive, UC's graduate degree programs need accelerated growth. UC's share of the state's graduate student enrollments has declined as we have accommodated the undergraduate demand of Tidal Wave II. If California is to remain competitive in the future, UC doctoral enrollments will need to grow substantially. That growth is included in our long-range planning

and UC could accommodate state needs for doctoral education within its future enrollment plans. Duplicating high-cost doctoral programs at CSU would be an inefficient and costly way of meeting future demand for this type of advanced training.

UC, CSU, and the California Community Colleges should continue to complement each other by focusing on excellence within their distinct missions. In a 1997 study, Graham and Diamond, preeminent experts on American research universities pointed to the Master Plan's differentiation of mission as a key reason for California's success in higher education. Their ranking of the top 32 public research universities includes all eight of UC's general campuses, with five ranked among the top six. UC's success in research and graduate education depends on CSU and the community colleges achieving similar success in the respective missions assigned to them under the Master Plan.

Major changes in California's Master Plan for Higher Education should not be adopted piecemeal. Rather, proposed changes to core tenets of the Master Plan should be considered during reviews like the one just completed by the Joint Master Plan Committee in 2002. Each institution's mission was evaluated, with all aspects of the state's educational needs considered collectively and with ample opportunity for input. That review facilitated the expansion of the Joint CSU/UC Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership while reaffirming the mission differentiation inherent in the Master Plan. The Master Plan is not an irrelevant, 45-year old document. Reviewed and updated regularly, it is the critical underpinning of California's current success in higher education.

UC recommends the state complete a thorough, independent needs assessment before adopting a major change to the Master Plan. If sufficient need is identified, UC believes the state should complete a careful analysis of the costs of meeting that need. Finally, there should be a discussion of what kind of program, delivered by whom, best meets the needs of the students and the state.

As always, we appreciate your consideration of our views. If you or your staff have questions regarding our position on this issue, please do not hesitate to call me or Brian Rivas of my staff.

Sincerely,



Stephen A. Arditti
Assistant Vice President and Director
State Governmental Relations

cc: Senator Jack Scott
Members of the Senate Appropriations Committee
President Robert C. Dynes
Senior Vice President Bruce B. Darling