

Senate Education Committee

**Senator Jack Scott, Chair
Wednesday April 13, 2005 hearing
State Capitol, Room 4203**

**University of California testimony in opposition to
SB 724 (Scott) California State University: doctoral degrees**

**Dr. M.R.C. Greenwood
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of California**

Good morning, Chair Scott and members of the Committee. I am M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of California.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to present the University's position on SB 724, your bill that would alter the Master Plan for Higher Education's differentiation of function so that the California State University could award professional doctoral degrees independently, rather than in collaboration with UC or AICCU. As you have probably heard by now, the University of California is opposed to SB 724 for a number of reasons.

Let me start by stating that UC is fully committed to meeting its responsibility to provide high-quality doctoral education that meets both the existing and emerging needs of the state of California, including providing doctoral education in joint programs with CSU.

This is not just an idle statement—UC has a track record of being a reliable partner to the state. In countless fields, from engineering and computer science to pharmacy and optometry, UC has identified emerging educational needs and delivered a high-quality product to meet those needs. In fact, there is probably no other state that delivers doctoral education as efficiently as California and at such a high level. California does this through collaboration between the public and independent systems of higher education—UC awards about half of California’s doctoral degrees (including those in joint programs with CSU) and the other half are awarded by the independent (AICCU) colleges and universities.

The University is actively assessing and addressing emerging needs. We just completed a statewide needs assessment for medicine, nursing, and other health professions and we are now turning our full attention to working intensively to assess and address state needs in the allied health professions, starting with audiology and physical therapy. I have also appointed a task force to set a course for the future of all doctoral education at UC in order to meet state needs and keep California competitive. Our goal is to identify those areas where the University and the state can most effectively and productively direct their limited resources for graduate and professional education.

But even before I receive the results of these assessments, I can tell that you UC graduate programs need accelerated growth to keep California competitive. The research innovations and workforce training provided by UC graduate programs have been key contributors to California’s economic growth – but UC’s share of the state’s overall graduate enrollments has declined in the last few decades as UC has focused on access for the undergraduates of Tidal Wave II.

We need to fund additional doctoral education at the University of California or else the quality of UC graduate programs will decline at the very time that global and technological demands require that we stay at the top of the competition. If the state can maintain and increase UC's share of doctoral training, UC will have ample ability to accommodate the areas of state need, both in our own programs and in joint doctoral programs with CSU in those areas where we can leverage the strengths of the both institutions.

A perfect example of combining mutual strengths is the way we have developed the new CSU/UC Joint Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership. These collaborative doctoral degree programs are being built deliberately to ensure quality in order to train educational leaders who can make a difference in K-12 schools and community colleges. Although CSU may feel differently, these programs will be of substantial size once all cohorts and programs are operational. We are confident these programs, along with existing UC and AICCU doctoral programs in education, will meet state needs. We are committed to expanding this initiative until this goal is met.

CSU and UC agreed to this expansion of joint doctoral programs (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership in 2001 and the Legislature passed SCR 93 in 2002 supporting these programs. Since then, 4 new programs have been established and the existing UC Davis/Fresno State program has expanded. Two more programs are admitting students and beginning instruction in July and August, respectively. Thus, by this fall, CSU and UC will have 7 CSU/UC Joint Ed.D. programs involving 14 CSU and 6 UC campuses. These programs are on track to enroll

400-500 students annually within the next few years. And that does not even include the other UC programs in Ed Leadership or the many education leadership doctoral programs at the AICCU colleges and universities. Another CSU/UC Joint Ed.D. in Educational Leadership between UC Riverside and four CSU campuses (Dominguez Hills, Long Beach, Los Angeles, & San Bernardino) was approved by the UC Riverside Academic Senate in May 2004—we are awaiting approval by the partnering CSU campuses.

CSU's effort through SB 724 to seek stand-alone doctorates is threatening the new CSU/UC Joint Ed.D. programs at a critical stage in their development. The programs are about to enroll large numbers of future K-12 and community college leaders. UC and CSU faculty have invested 3½ years of dedicated work and more than \$4 million in public funds in developing these programs. UC faculty are enthusiastic about working with their CSU colleagues and contribute significantly to the success of the joint programs. However, 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 the CSU objective to offer such programs independently.

This new joint effort to seriously address leadership needs in K-12 and the community colleges needs to be given a fair chance to succeed. There has not been a needs assessment since the 2001 agreement to establish the programs. The Joint CSU/UC Ed.D. Board was tasked in SCR 93 to look at supply and demand for the Ed.D. Before such a major change is made in the Master Plan as proposed in SB 724, we would recommend that a new study of supply and demand be undertaken to see if the new programs will grow sufficiently to meet the state's needs for K-12 and community college leaders trained at the doctoral level. In the

meantime, a 5-year period should be granted so that we can evaluate the impact and the effectiveness of these hard won programs.

Another reason not to make the dramatic change proposed in SB 724 can be found in a recent national report by the Education Schools Project (directed by Arthur Levine at Columbia University and supported by several nationally prominent foundations). That report recommends training most future educational leaders in Master's degrees programs rather than through the Ed.D. The report says the Ed.D. is unnecessary for jobs in school administration. Instead it recommends the creation of an educational equivalent of an M.B.A. degrees—a Master's degree program with “courses in management (e.g. finance, human resources, organizational leadership and change, educational technology, leading in turbulent times, entrepreneurship, and negotiation) and education (e.g. school leadership, child development, instructional design, assessment, faculty development, school law and policy, school budgeting, and politics and governance).”

We believe this is exactly the approach that the University of California undertook when it created our Principals Leadership Institutes at UC Berkeley and UCLA—high quality **Master's degree** programs for school leaders that build on the expertise of our campuses in areas such as business administration.

CSU already has the ability under the Master Plan to create Master's level programs consistent with the report's recommendations. The Ed.D. should not be mass-produced when higher quality alternatives to train educational leaders are available, such as the CSU/UC Joint Ed.D. programs and programs like the Principals Leadership Institutes.

CSU/UC joint doctoral programs are a good model for the state in many areas, not just Educational Leadership. They bring together the strengths of both institutions, as the Master Plan envisioned. Combining UC's experience and strengths in creating quality doctoral programs with CSU's geographic reach and practitioner focus makes for programs that are greater than the sum of their parts. For instance, UC San Diego School of Medicine and San Diego State University now offer a joint doctorate in Audiology, and it is a model for expansion or replication elsewhere in the state.

There are 21 such joint programs, including two UCSF-SF State joint doctorates in physical therapy. Dr Eugene Washington, UC San Francisco's Executive Vice Chancellor, is here to address how quality programs in the allied health sciences can be created collaboratively between a CSU campus and a UC campus with a medical center. UCSF and San Francisco State already offer two joint doctoral degrees in Physical Therapy, another program between UCSF and CSU Fresno is in the planning stages, and there are new discussions of joint doctoral programs in Audiology between UCSF and San Francisco State and between UC Davis and CSU Sacramento.

SB 724 would eliminate much of the differentiation of function in graduate education between UC and CSU that was established both to conserve state resources and to promote quality programs. A joint approach makes efficient use of the state's resources. Doctoral training is costly – quality programs require low student-faculty ratios, close supervision of graduate students, and major laboratory and library resources. Focusing resources in targeted UC doctoral and CSU/UC

joint doctoral programs rather than spreading state resources too thinly for weaker doctoral programs at all 33 CSU and UC campuses has been a key to the quality of higher education in California, if not THE key. Having CSU duplicate doctoral-level training in numerous fields will cost the state much more money in the long run.

We estimate that this change will cost the state tens of millions of dollars in additional resources to duplicate the kind of infrastructure for doctoral education that is already in place at UC. Doctoral education is expensive. It is expensive no matter who does it. Doctoral education requires intensive faculty supervision of students working at the top of their disciplines, be it in history, computer science, medicine, education, audiology, or the professions. Good doctoral programs also require access to resources not just in their own disciplines, but access to resources in wide variety of fields.

For example, education doctoral students need access to faculty, graduate-level courses, libraries, and laboratories in fields such as sociology, psychology, and statistics, and to professional programs in fields such as public policy, business, and law. Professional students in audiology and physical therapy receive the highest quality training when they have access to the expensive clinical resources, expertise, equipment, and laboratories available in a medical school.

If CSU campuses were to offer this kind of education for their students, they would have to adopt a funding model for these programs very similar to what we use at UC. They would incur significant new start-up costs and would have to increase their on-going funding on a per-student basis. Either the state would have to

directly appropriate CSU millions more for these programs, or CSU would have to shift resources from other programs – risking the quality of what they are already assigned to do under the Master Plan: provide excellent undergraduate education, fulfill what Clark Kerr called the “polytechnic” mission to train much of the future California work force through the master's degree, and educate the largest proportion of the state's new K-12 teachers.

SB 724 would result in CSU duplicating UC and AICCU’s missions of doctoral-level education and therefore making inefficient use of the state’s resources, when the solution of joint doctorates is already available. It would result in less attention to CSU’s current mission at a time when that mission is more important than ever.

I respectfully urge that members of the committee vote “No” on SB 724. Preserve California’s excellence in higher education that has been created by the Master Plan. Efficient use of resources through differentiation of function is how California provides broad access to higher education while also providing graduate programs of the highest quality.