



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

March 23, 2005

The Honorable Jack Scott
Member of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 2082
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Scott:

Re: *SB 724 (Scott), As Introduced*
Awaiting Consideration by the Senate Education Committee
Position: Oppose

I am writing to express the University of California's opposition to your bill, SB 724. This measure would alter the Master Plan for Higher Education to authorize the California State University (CSU) to independently award "professional/clinical" doctoral degrees. The bill defines such a degree as one awarded by a "post-master's degree program that prepares students for entry to professional practice other than university faculty research and teaching." This definition would apply to a very broad range of doctoral and Ph.D. degree programs currently offered by the University of California (UC). Thus, it would mostly eliminate one of the fundamental tenets of the Master Plan—the differentiation in function in graduate education between UC and CSU that was established to conserve state resources and promote quality programs.

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, and optometry. We have now convened a group to address issues of state need in the allied health profession; discussions of how to meet needs in Audiology and Physical Therapy are already underway.

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 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 will be 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 formed an audiology task force and it is examining options to expand this kind cooperation to other CSU and UC campuses and UC medical schools. This is clearly an opportunity where a joint program will be much more than the sum of its parts—each partner has a unique contribution to the quality of the overall program.
- 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. We believe these and future CSU/UC joint Ed.D. programs will grow to fully meet the state's needs for future educational leaders.

New 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. The joint Ed.D. programs are about to enroll large numbers of future K-12 and community college leaders over the next few years. 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

The Honorable Jack Scott

Page 3

March 23, 2005

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 fund CSU graduate programs at UC levels would cost the state tens of millions of dollars annually.

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. Each segment must do its part to address pressing state issues, joining together when it makes sense, such as in joint doctoral degree programs.

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.

For the above reasons, we would respectfully urge you to reconsider this effort to eliminate one of the most important features of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the differentiation of function between UC and CSU. As an alternative, we would urge you to convert this bill into one calling for an objective

The Honorable Jack Scott

Page 4

March 23, 2005

study that assesses and prioritizes the state's needs for additional doctoral education, either in the specific fields you believe are of concern or more generally.

We appreciate your longstanding support for higher education and thank you for considering our point of view on this important issue. If you or your staff have questions regarding our position on this issue, please call me or Brian Rivas of my staff.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen A. Arditti". The signature is written in a cursive style with some loops and flourishes.

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

cc: Members of the Senate Education Committee
President Robert C. Dynes
Senior Vice President Bruce B. Darling