

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, January 5, 2022

I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

Action Taken: *The agenda was approved 11-0-0. The minutes were approved via email 12-0-0.*

II. Chair's Report

Chair Andrea Kasko

The Chair told the committee that there was an Academic Assembly meeting on December 8 and one issue that was discussed was electrifying the campuses. (Electrification would involve the early retirement of the methane burning infrastructure on the campuses.). In particular, it was discussed in the context of the state budget surplus. Another topic of discussion was the Regents' vote to approve the report from the Committee on Innovation Transfer. There were questions as to whether the APM needed to be modified. There was discussion on COVID and the promotion and merit review process. The Chair observed that these deliberations have not adequately addressed the long-term impact on graduate students and the ability of faculty to take on new students. She said that she approached Shaun Bowler, the chair of CoGD about possibly having a joint statement from CoGD and CCGA about the impact on graduate students.

Another topic of discussion was the budget meeting. The state wants the University to add 6000 students next year. This is different than the adding of 20K over the next several years. There is a lot of pressure from the state to continue to raise enrollment. Conversely, several campuses that have a high percentage of non-resident students need to bring those numbers down.

At Academic Council, there was a letter from UCIE about restrictions on Chinese visas from students who are affiliated with universities associated with the Chinese military civil fusion strategy. Council endorsed the letter and sent it to the President. In a similar vein, CCGA's letter about remote teaching was endorsed by the Council. The Chair thanked member Sabra for his work in finalizing the letter. The Council is also working on a memorial to the Regents about climate change. The memorial would go to Assembly, and then the campuses, and then to the Regents. Finally, students came to the Council meeting and asked for a day of asynchronous instruction on Election Day. While there was support for student participation in elections, there was not support for the student proposal, especially in view of mail-in ballots.

At APC, there was discussion about the workgroup on the review of Master's degree proposals; Chair Kasko remarked that she would be co-chairing that workgroup. The University has reached a tentative agreement about who is included in the wording about GSRs and who is not. Bargaining will start soon. The Chair added that the APC members were asked for names of a faculty representative who might be available for consultation during the bargaining process. This person would need to be familiar with the nuances of graduate students in the arts versus the sciences.

III. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Erith Jaffe-Berg

The Vice Chair told the committee that the CoGD met in December and the issue of biweekly pay came up along with continued frustration with UCPath. In October, the leadership team decided to remove the biweekly pay pilot from this year's agenda because there were already mistakes in overpayment and underpayment. Instead, they decided to create a working group to address the issues. Many graduate deans expressed concern about this decision. UCACC had a consultation with the Informatic Technology Services and was informed about the Log4J vulnerability. In response, UCOP is creating a "best practices" manual about this and is looking at the coordination of first response to issues of data breach.

As a result of these discussions and previous ones, the UCACC decided to issue two letters, currently circulated among the UCACC membership for comments. The plan is to then send these letters on to the Senate leadership. The first one is about the Accellion data breach. The second letter expresses strong concerns regarding the work of the Research Data Protection project, which was put on hold. The scope needed to be clarified.

UCRP discussed the MRUs, which are moving along smoothly and productively.

IV. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies

Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning

Executive Director Jennings remarked that the *In Absentia* policy is now formally approved. The President sent a notice to the chancellors, and it will be effective for the spring term.

Director Greenspan said that the Provost has provided the names for the APC task force on Master's degree proposal review. Chair Kasko will be the co-chair, along with EVC and Provost Elizabeth Watkins from UCR. A charge has been developed. He added that his office is working on enrollment proposals for next year. The Regents' budget proposal provides for 2000 new undergraduate students, with 500 of them being California residents. It also allows for 500 new graduate student growth. He added that UC saw a decline in California community college transfer numbers, but saw a slight increase in California freshman enrollment, perhaps because of the elimination of the SAT.

V. Council of Graduate Deans' Report

Dean Jean-Pierre Delplanque

Dean Delplanque remarked that there is some difference between the way CoGD sees GSRs and the way the President sees them. He noted that the Vice Chair had captured well the frustration with UCPath and the issue of biweekly pay. The graduate deans are very interested in students being paid on time, but they are agnostic about how this gets done. Dean Delplanque said that the CoGD is wanting to engage the President in advocacy for graduate education with the Regents and the legislature. The issue of English language proficiency requirement has carried over from last year.

VI. Campus Reports

UCB – At the GC meeting there was a lot of discussion about how to deal with the five-year funding mandate. It is a big cause for concern.

UCD – The campus had nothing to report.
UCI – The campus had nothing to report.
UCLA – The campus had nothing to report.
UCM – The campus had nothing to report.
UCR – There was some discussion about student housing costs and the impacts of student growth in enrollment
UCSD – The campus had nothing to report.
UCSF – The campus had nothing to report.
UCSB – The GC will be meeting next week.
UCSC – The campus had nothing to report.

VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Chair

Susan Cochran, Academic Council Vice Chair

Academic Council Chair Horwitz explained that labor relations around the GSRs was settled for the time being, but the issue of who is in the bargaining unit is still unclear. There will likely conflict around the issue. At the November Council meeting, there was a long discussion about who should be admitted to Senate membership. The AFT (the bargaining unit for the Unit 18 lecturers) leadership has said explicitly that it wants to be part of the Senate. The Senate dealt with the issue of clinician membership in the Senate 10 or 11 years ago and decided that clinicians do not do the same functional tasks as ladder rank faculty. The current argument is that poor clinician morale is tied to their lack of inclusion in the Senate. He said that he and the Council Vice Chair are putting together a working group to look at this issue; it will likely carry over to next year.

The APC is looking at how Master's programs are approved. There has been considerable back and forth between the Senate and Provost Brown's office on this topic. The Provost has just announced the administration's appointments to this committee. Faculty merits are being fully funded. There is a salary increase of four percent on scale and one and half percent for equity gaps. Vice Provost Carlson has asked for Senate input on the proposed one and a half percent equity increases, so that will be circulated among the committees.

The Council Chair reminded the committee about the Senate leadership's fostering of climate crisis groups on the campuses. All the campuses are forging closer ties to their campus sustainability units and the push is to reduce the carbon footprint of campus operations. The Climate Crisis Group met in November to take up the possibility of sending a climate memorial to the Regents. The language of the memorial was taken to the Academic Council in December and was endorsed unanimously. It will now go to the Assembly and then will go to a senate vote on each campus.

Chair Horwitz told the committee that he and Vice Chair Cochran have been talking to ECAS (Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services) to put together a one-page document to help faculty with compliance issues when they go abroad: what do they need to do, how to get their conflict of interest forms submitted in the most expeditious way, etc. They invited SVP and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Alex Bustamante to come to Council and he agreed to put together a whistleblower mechanism for UC staff who are working at affiliated religious hospitals.

The Council Chair discussed the activity surrounding COVID and the merit and promotion process. In response to a letter from the Council last January, President Drake authorized the creation of a Senate/administration work group on mitigating the effects of COVID on faculty.

The work group put together a preliminary report that was sent to campuses several weeks ago through Provost Brown. The most important concept of that report was the notion of achievements relative to opportunity (ARO) and the merit and promotion process. For many faculty, research stalled or slowed. Also many younger, primarily female faculty had to cope with caregiving responsibilities during COVID.

Finally, Chair Horwitz told the committee that the Council needed to start thinking about nominations for vice chair of the Senate. He asked the members to think about faculty who might be good candidates. Nominations are due by March 21. The Senate is also beginning the search process for the replacement for Hilary Baxter as Executive Director.

VIII. New Program Proposals

A. Proposal for a BS/MS 4+1 in Microbiology on the Riverside Campus

Lead Reviewer Arvind Rajaraman

The Lead Reviewer explained that he had been waiting for over three months for a response from the proposers. Finally, Chair Kasko wrote a letter asking for response by the January meeting. The proposers have not changed the proposal; they are still looking for approval for it as it stands.

Action Taken: The vote to approve the proposal was denied 0-10-2.

B. Proposal for a Master of Nutritional Sciences and Dietetics on the Berkeley Campus [SSGPDP]

Lead Reviewer Bjoern Schwer

The Lead Reviewer discussed the proposal and the reviews he had received. Overall there are no significant concerns; he intends to share the reviewer comments with the proposers. He is also waiting for the comments from UCPB.

C. Proposal for an Eighth Undergraduate College on the San Diego Campus

Lead Reviewer Lissa Caldwell

The Lead Reviewer is seeking external reviewers.

IX. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations and Discontinuances

A. Proposal to Transfer of the Cell, Molecular, and Developmental Biology (CMDDB) Graduate Program and the CMDDB Undergraduate Program to the Department of Molecular, Cell and Systems Biology (MCSB) on the Riverside Campus

The Chair explained that the proposal asks to change the administrative structure without changing the program. There was strong faculty support.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-2.

X. Discussion: Double-Counting of Units

Chair Kasko said that, according to accreditation rules, no more than 25 percent of course credits offered at the graduate level may be double counted. The question is how to interpret this rule. She showed slides with examples of different ways of double-counting units. Members agreed

that it would be valuable for campuses to have guidance in this arena. The Chair remarked that CCGA seldom sees proposals with double-counted units, and so the issue has not been resolved heretofore. There was considerable discussion about the possible ways to count units. The Chair stated that one approach would be a default interpretation of 25 percent unique units and anything that falls between unique units and total degree units needs a strong justification for the program to be considered. The committee decided to look at its past decisions regarding dual degrees and use that information to formulate an opinion as to how to move forward.

XI. New Business

There was no new business.

The committee adjourned at 2:13 p.m.

Minutes taken by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst
Attest: Andrea M. Kasko, Chair