

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, February 1, 2017

Item

NB: This meeting was slightly affected by a couple of unusual circumstances. The Chair's flight was cancelled twice due to inclement weather. He and several other members joined via the University's new videoconference platform. The newness and unfamiliarity with the system resulted in some technical – and, accordingly, communicational - glitches and mishaps throughout the meeting. Due to the unusual circumstances, the Chair and Vice Chair (who was present in-person) collaboratively chaired the meeting.

I. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda and Approval of the Minutes of January 2017.

Action Taken: *The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.*

II. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Todd Greenspan, Academic Planning Director

Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director

Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

Due to scheduling conflicts, there were no reports from Academic Affairs.

III. Faculty-Student Mentorship

UCB Graduate Division Dean Fiona Doyle informed the committee about a UCSA letter reflecting student concerns about faculty mentoring. She discussed what has been put in place on the Berkeley campus in terms of “best practices” for faculty mentors. These include awards for excellence in faculty mentorship. Overall, she is convinced that the vast majority of faculty is committed to good mentoring and doing what is needed. Unfortunately, there will always be the risk one or two “bad apples” in the mentor pool. The success of the faculty-student mentoring relationship relies heavily up on personal chemistry and amicability; students sometimes may not be matched with the ideal mentor. From the student perspective, a major obstacle is the lack of anonymity if s/he raises a complaint; the student complainer is too easily identifiable. Ms. Doyle put forward that perhaps some explicit mention of mentorship expectations could be included in the Faculty Code of Conduct (CoC), which would have to come from the Senate, not the graduate deans.

Academic Senate Chair Chalfant agreed that there is a gap between the CoC and what would be considered “bad behavior,” and that the University needs to separate the egregious from the unideal. He said that he would like to see CCGA take the lead in determining how the campus grad councils are implementing best practices. The Council vice chair cautioned against conflating the separate issues of “bad apples” and best practices. Ms. Doyle remarked that it would be good to interview the campuses to develop a suite of best practices; something on the systemwide level could be very effective. Egregious misconduct will be handled through the P&T processes. Students need to know that they will be heard and that there are practices for dealing with inappropriate behavior.

IV. Program Proposals (part 1)

- A. Proposal to establish a new Masters of Business Analytics on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP] –
Lead Reviewer Phil Kaminsky

This program is designed with a track structure and intends to seek STEM certifications. In general, all four reviewers were impressed with the faculty; the rigor of the program and the budget and facilities were adequate. The only substantive criticism was addressed by the school. UCPB focused on more specific details, all of which were addressed thoroughly. Return-to-aid was raised to 10 percent.

Action Taken: *The proposal was approved 10-0-1.*

V. Chair's Report - Chair Kwai Ng

Chair Ng remarked upon the recent statement released by President Napolitano about the Regents' approval of a 2.5 percent tuition increase, the first in six years. He also discussed the "2:1 ratio" goal: to enroll one transfer student for every two freshmen enrolled. Davis, San Diego, and Los Angeles have reached it, and Berkeley is close. There has been some dramatic change since last meeting and now and some of the Regents are willing to consider allowing certain campuses to stay above the 20 percent non-resident cap. While this is encouraging, it allows a two-tier policy in terms of campus non-resident admission.

Academic Council had a discussion about how UC Health can coordinate with the teaching and research mission of the campuses. EVP Jack Stobo talked about the current status and the possibility of a separate committee to be involved in the future of student healthcare. Council also discussed the long term planning, also known as framework for UC growth and support, that the Provost wanted to conduct for all campuses as well as the PDST policy. In regards to PFPF, Council was generally positive but some people were concerned about the lack of Academic Senate involvement in the program's oversight.

VI. Vice Chair's Report – Vice Chair Karen Duderstadt

The Vice Chair noted that the primary issue raised at CoGD is faculty mentorship and challenges that have taken place on some of the campuses. At the November meeting there was a group of students who came and gave a compelling story about how issues they had with mentoring. They expressed concern that there is not enough action being taken on individual campuses to handle problematic mentoring practices. She commented that it was a very passionate presentation.

The committee discussed the issue at considerable length. "Poor mentoring" was contrasted with behavior that is against the faculty code of conduct. In a mentoring relationship, personalities and workstyles may not mesh, but that does not necessarily mean there is inappropriate behavior on the part of the faculty member. If it is a concern, is it pervasive, or a rare occurrence? Should the University set standards or guidelines for the quality of its mentors? Would this be a violation of academic freedom? If a student does come forward with a valid complaint, s/he can be easily identified by the mentor in question and possibly suffer consequences.

Ana Peluffo will forward the UCD mentoring guidelines to all the members.

VII. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair

Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair

The proposed changes to Bylaw 182 (International Education) have again been turned down by the Council. Work will have to be done by UCIE members at the campus level to garner the support

needed for approval of the changes.

Discussion around PDST is focusing on the gathering of comments and the determination of which of them would serve better as implementation tips and which should actually be policy. The hope is to have a resolution by May, possibly as early as March. One of the things it says in the policy is that PDST is not supposed to be charged because state funds have been withdrawn from the program. However, while the principle deserves to be supported, it is in practice difficult to ascertain or disprove any correlation between the two.

VIII. Program Proposals (part 2)

- B. Proposal to establish a new Masters of Conservation and Restoration Science on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer Donald Smith*
Reviewers expressed grave concern that they program had no faculty with sufficient expertise in restoration. The Lead Reviewer will forward these concerns to the campus for their response.
- C. Proposal to establish a new MS/PhD in Public Health on the Merced Campus – *Lead Reviewer Onyi Arah*
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 10-0-1.
- D. Proposal to establish a graduate program for the MFA degree in Social Documentation on the Santa Cruz campus. – *Lead Reviewer Ana Peluffo*
The Lead Reviewer reported that she had received some comments from reviewers and forwarded them to the campus. She has not had a response from the campus, however.
- E. Proposal for a Program of Professional Graduate Studies with PDST for a Master of Management offered by a new Graduate Group in Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology on the Merced Campus – *Lead Reviewer Dick Arneson*
Reviews for this proposal are still underway.
- F. Proposal for a Self-Supporting Program of Graduate Studies in Drug Development and Product Management for the Master of Science Degree at the San Diego campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer Ramesh Balasubramaniam*
Reviews for this proposal are still underway.
- G. Proposal for a 4+1 BA/MA in European Thought and Culture on the Irvine campus.
Action Taken: Dar Roberts was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- H. Proposal for a JDP with SDSU in Computational Science on the Irvine campus.
Action Taken: Michael Coffey was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- I. Proposal for an MS in Geotechnical Engineering on the San Diego campus.
Action Taken: David Min was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- J. Proposal for an MPH on the San Diego campus.
Action Taken: Jason Rock was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

VII. Disclosure of Sexual Orientation on Student Applications

The Chair asked the members to report on how information related to student sexual orientation was handled on each of the campuses. Concern had been expressed that the circulation of information through the application process might infringe on the privacy of students.

VIII. Proposed Revisions: APM Sections 278 and 210-6

The committee determined that this was not an issue related to CCGA and that it would not comment.

IX. Proposed Revisions: Presidential Policy Business and Finance Bulletin G-28

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

X. Management Review: Presidential BUS-50 (Controlled Substances)

The Chair asked any members with concerns or comments to forward them to the Committee Analyst.

XI. Items of Interest from the Campuses

No items were brought forward.

The meeting adjourned 3:40.