

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, April 3, 2024

I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes
Action Requested: Approve the agenda and minutes as noticed. 9-0-0**II. Chair's Report**
Chair Dean Tantillo

The Chair reported that he had just received word that the revisions to APM 210 have been approved by the Provost and are now finalized. Vice Provost Haynes and AVP Lee came to Council and said that they are looking for a faculty consultation group to discuss the next round of bargaining. President Drake expressed skepticism about the budget, and there was more discussion about free speech and protests. The Provost said that the AI congress was a success. The next one will be on online education, followed by congresses on research, academic freedom, and HSIs. The Provost also has received the report of the labor relations consultant. She said she will share some aspect of it as soon as she has clearance from the President. Chair Tantillo said that he had not yet heard how much money was spent on the consultant.

III. Vice Chair's Report
Vice Chair James Bisley

The Vice Chair reported that there had been no UCACC meeting and that he had missed the recent CoGD meeting.

IV. AB 656 (Allowing CSU to Offer Doctorate Degrees)
Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy

Executive Advisor Greenspan explained that AB 656 passed last year and allows CSU to offer some doctorate degrees. In the past, CSU had to get an individual bill for each doctorate degree it wanted to award. Some amendments were made to the bill, including the exclusion of the PhD. CSU has to take a set of administrative regulations to their Board of Trustees. The legislation says that the criteria for duplication needs to be developed in conjunction with the academic senates. CSU has said it does not want to do a full proposal if UC is going to object, so they want to present a synopsis of what they propose. However, UC responded that it could not assess duplication if it did not know the courses for the degree. Mr. Greenspan said that he felt some progress had been made. CSU has a January deadline to get a new program to their Board.

The Executive Advisor answered questions from the committee and there was discussion.

V. **Announcements from Academic Affairs**

Pamela Jennings, Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Studies
Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy
Carmen Corona, Director of Academic Planning and Policy
Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

Executive Advisor Greenspan said his office was waiting for the multi-year enrollment plans.

Director Corona reminded the group about the online education congress on May 1.

AVP Jennings said she did not have anything new to report.

Analyst Procello also did not have anything to report.

VI. **CoGD Report**

Dean Jean-Pierre Delplanque

Dean Delplanque reported that the CoGD met a couple of weeks ago, and has an in-person meeting coming up in May. There was a guest from FGR, and the group asked what was on his radar for graduate education. The group discussed the impact of the rollout of the FASFA form and about immigration in terms of international student access to the country. The deans asked how they can partner with FGR and SGR to help advocate for the University. They were particularly interested in work around the limits placed by federal funding agencies in light of the new graduate student contracts. IRAP had a presentation on projections, and one of the take-aways is that, as a system, UC is very short on the master's side of graduate students. The University has more PhD students than master's students and it might not be serving the state as it should. Relatedly, UC is not going to get the compact money this year. Multiple campuses have some form of a future of doctoral education group that is looking at these issues. One topic of the meeting was responsible research and whether the issue should be mandated for all students. The CoGD also discussed a fellowship that OP is offering for students who are a part of UC LEADS.

VII. **Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations, and Discontinuances**

- A. Proposal to Change the Name of the Master of Data Science (Online) to the Master of Data Science on the San Diego Campus
- *San Diego has requested that this change be applied retroactively to winter 2024.*

Members expressed some confusion as to whether this was an “apples to apples” change.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 6-2-1.

- B. Proposal to Change the Name of the Flex Weekend MBA to Executive MBA on the San Diego Campus

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 8-0-1.

- C. Proposal to Change the Name of the Master of Finance to the Master of Quantitative Finance on the San Diego Campus

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 8-0-1.

- D. Proposal to Change the Name of the Master of Science in Engineering Physics to the Master of Science in Energy and Climate on the San Diego Campus

Members expressed serious doubt regarding this proposal and whether it was – in fact – a “simple” name change. The committee felt that the documentation was not sufficient to enable it to make a decision. Analyst Harms will contact the campus Senate office to get a list of the curriculum for the program(s) for further review.

- E. Proposal to Transfer the Astronomy Graduate Program (MS/PhD) from the Department of Physics to the New Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics on the San Diego Campus.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 8-0-1.

VIII. New Program Proposals

- A. Proposal for an MS in Medical Physiology on the Los Angeles Campus [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: David Booth

The Lead Reviewer was not present, but reported via email that he was waiting on the reviewers.

- B. Proposal for a Master of Engineering in Medical Device Development on the Davis Campus [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Tonya Williams Bradford

The Lead Reviewer reported that she is still waiting on the report from UCPB, which should be in hand before the next meeting and will hopefully allow for an email vote. The reviewers thought the program was on target and the program responded to the questions that were posed last year.

- C. Proposal for a PhD in Public Health with a Concentration in Health Services Research and Implementation Science on the San Diego Campus
Lead Reviewer - Sarita See

The Lead Reviewer reported that this program has a really interesting history related to a joint program which had been offered with UCSD. The proposal was very solid, and she received four reports with different perspectives. Three of the four reports

were very meticulous, and the proposer response was very thorough. One reviewer did not see much attention paid to wellbeing and social justice, which will be noted as a point to keep in mind in the feedback to the proposers. She added that the proposers presented a very compelling and substantial revision.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 8-0-1.

- D. Proposal for a School of Population and Public Health on the Irvine Campus
Lead Reviewer - David Barner

The Lead Reviewer said that this proposal combines four existing units. He received four reviews, two of which were quite extensive. They were all positive, but there was a question of whether or not the proposal is in line with accreditation standards, (which were updated in 2019). The proposers do not deny this is a problem, but say that they are in the process of revising their curriculum. Professor Barner noted that there are three degree levels (undergraduate, MS, and PhD) and the only difference between the MS and PhD is the thesis. This seems like a fatal flaw that will not pass accreditation standards. The Lead Reviewer will ask the proposers to take the proposal back to their graduate council.

- E. Proposal for a DNP – Nurse Anesthesia on the Davis Campus
Lead Reviewer – Brooke Scelza

The Lead Reviewer reported that she had four reviewers secured, has received two reviews, and expects a third review soon. The issues that have arisen thus far are related to accreditations. Another one was about the number of clinical hours that are required.

- F. Proposal for a Master in Management on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer - Jeffrey Schank

The Lead Reviewer said that the proposal is an SSGPDP for non-business majors. It is proposing both an in-person and online option, with the decision regarding the online option coming later. He has two reviewers and working on getting two more.

- G. Proposal for a Part-Time Master of Science in Business Analytics on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer – James Bisley

The Lead Reviewer reported that this part-time proposal will be primarily online. He has three reviewers secured and one report in. The program is supposed to be completed over two years, and the capstone will be done in groups. The divisional senate graduate council had some comments and one of them has to do with international students taking the course.

- H. Proposal to add an *en route* MS to the Existing PhD in Environmental Science and Management on the Santa Barbara Campus.

Lead Reviewer – Michael Scheibner

The Lead Reviewer said he had a few concerns about the proposal. He will have more to discuss at the May meeting.

IX. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Steven Cheung, Academic Senate Vice Chair

The Vice Chair explained that he and Chair Steintrager had been in Sacramento in February working with ICAS. He said that Regents Nancy Lee and John Pérez had been reappointed for 12-year terms. President Drake talked about the difficulties with campus climate. He did have a positive note regarding the implementation of the experiential learning opportunities for undocumented students. Vice Chair Cheung said that Chair Steintrager had expressed dissatisfaction with Regental action related to SR 630E (campus experience for undergraduate students). He said that it reflected a degraded position on shared governance and raised the specter of faculty unionization. The language regarding the placing of opinions on departmental websites has received yet another revision. Vice Chair Cheung talked about the history and status of the proposed policy for some time. The deadline for review of the current iteration is April 22, which gives the Senate limited time to negotiate before the May Regents' meeting. Senate leadership believes that the Regents will vote to accept some form of this policy. High school math (Area C) was discussed at the March Regents' meeting. The conversation centered on whether the three most popular data science courses - in their current form - could validate Algebra 2. BOARS, after a thorough review, determined they would not. SR 630 E was disapproved, and Senate requested clarification on the meaning of campus autonomy, with an eye on the possibility of the Regents are creating new policy.

There has been a constant stream of amendments from the Assembly or the Senate to change the constitutional rights of the University. ACA 14 would extend state labor standards to UC operations; this does not work well for higher education and for the medical enterprise. The Senate leadership has been working with SGR and hopes to push back on this piece of legislation, which seems to come up annually.

Vice Chair Chueng shared that Ahmet Palazoglu's nomination for incoming Senate vice chair had been supported by the Council; his candidacy will go to the April Assembly for confirmation. The proposed revisions to APM 285 (LSOE to Professor of Teaching) were generally endorsed, with some divisions expressing a preference for the title of Teaching Professor. The Oliver Johnson awardees were announced, and the proposed policy on awarding degrees posthumously was moved forward and will be sent out for systemwide review. It is hoped that this will become Regental policy. Council also featured a spirited discussion about Senate membership for health sciences clinical faculty. APP would like to set up regular hour-long meetings through the end of August to consult and brainstorm with faculty on potential changes to the bargaining agreements. STEM and non-STEM reps are being recruited. The Provost stated that the labor consultant report should be available soon, and it will be released

- possibly in redacted form – shortly. Finally, Vice Chair Cheung announced that the California state budget is under pressure, and the University is waiting for the May Revise for final numbers. However, there have been strong investment gains across all assets of the investment portfolio, and this puts much less pressure in terms of contributions to UCRP, thereby releasing some monies for operations.

Members had some questions for the Vice Chair.

X. Campus Reports

Members reported on issues related to graduate education from their divisions.

XI. Student Report

Sonya Brooks, UCLA

The student was not present.

XII. Items Under Systemwide Review

A. Second Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area H)

Members determined that this was an undergraduate issue.

B. Final report of the University of California Systemwide Advisory Workgroup on Students with Disabilities

The committee analyst will circulate this for comment.

C. Proposed Academic Senate Statement on UC Quality

Members remarked that this statement was “vague to the point of not being useful,” and only applied to undergraduates. The committee analyst will circulate it for further comment.

XIII. New Business

There was no new business.

XIV. Executive Session

No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

The committee adjourned at 2:15 p.m.