

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, June 5, 2019

I. Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes of the May 1 meeting.

Action Taken: *The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed with the addition of a Consultation with the Senate Leadership at the end of the meeting.*

II. Chair's Report - Chair Onyebuchi Arah

- UCLA has come up with their own SSGPDP guidelines and they are very strong and thorough.
- UCSD is putting the brakes on SSGPDPs. They had an online data science proposal that they were trying to do with EdX and the academic senate rejected the proposal and have put the brakes on SSGPDPs and online programs until they figure out what they want to do.
- UC Student pay gap: Typically graduate students in the UC system work or receive fellowships on an approximately nine-month calendar running from the end of September to mid-June (or August to May for campuses on semesters). Students are paid monthly in arrears (at the end of the pay period). Summer funding operates separately and is much more variable across graduate student populations than during the academic year. The nine-month academic-year pay cycle starts the day the quarter/semester officially starts. On most campuses, initial days/week(s) of employment is rolled over to the end of the pay calendar meaning that students receive their first check November 1st (October for semester campuses). This means that at the beginning of the academic year, most students go at least a month and a half without receiving a paycheck. The students have asked for the help of CCGA to get this resolved, and the committee agreed to write a letter on their behalf.
- The Graduate Education Working Group has done its final report. The Chair encouraged the committee members to read it and distribute it. If members have feedback about it, they should let the chair know.

III. Vice Chair's Report – Vice Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam

The suggestion to redact demographic information from applications has been nullified. CCGA's role in the proposal review process was discussed again. There was a suggestion that CCGA not solicit external reviews if they have already been done by the campus. However, CCGA has no way of knowing if those reviews are truly impartial. The question also arose if CCGA could give some sort of "payment" or incentive for internal reviewers. Analyst Harms will look into seeing if a payment to a faculty member's research account is an option.

The committee suggested making a proposal submission checklist for CoGD.

IV. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Art Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning

Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies

Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

The Vice President brought up the issue of funding from international corporations and the concerns that arise from that. There have been developments with Huawei; they are up against a number of federal indictments in terms of not playing fairly with intellectual property and national security concerns. A number of campuses have put a moratorium on taking foreign funding in the future in any form (grants, contracts, gifts). The Vice President been talking with the VCRs about a systemwide moratorium going forward. UC will not engage with Huawei in the future until the issues are resolved. Some agreements will not be renewed and others would be wound down as soon as possible. However, this does raise concern about bridge funding for students who are cut off from Huawei. This topic generated considerable discussion.

UCEP and the council are going to recommend against the fully online undergraduate degree at UCI.

The budget is being settled in conference committee now. The University is hopeful about the outcome. However there is concern about so much of it being line-itemed.

Analyst Procello noted that the Teaching and Learning Centers are nearly completed. They will be presenting to APC on the 13th. CP will come back with results after that presentation.

Executive Director Jennings shared that the workgroup that has been working on the HSI initiative will have something to launch in the 2019-20 year. These efforts will go beyond outreach and recruitment to support of students. Six of the nine undergraduate campuses are HSI.

V. UCLA Item

The UCLA senate asked for CCGA to weigh in on the three-part identity of a program on the campus. Does the committee think they are one department or three departments? UCRJ has asked CCGA to determine.

Action Taken: *The committee feels that they have been functioning as a single unit: 10-0-1*

VI. Proposed Changes to SR 735

The Irvine campus asked CCGA to look at SR 735 to see if it should revise it. The committee looked at the materials they submitted and found them difficult to interpret. They asked that Irvine resubmit their proposal and include a “red-line” version, bullet points, a rationale, and consequences.

VII. APM 210 Discussion

UCAP sent a response. They do understand the importance of mentoring but they are concerned about the different kinds of mentoring between humanities and STEM. They encouraged CCGA to consider that styles might be different and that the document needs to consider small programs. They want us to continue working with CCGA and the graduate deans on this. Does CCGA want to send a note to clarify its intentions so that the bodies could regroup and get on the same page? Should CCGA invite the UCAP chair to the discussion, or should a CCGA member go to UCAP and explain its position? It would be helpful if this could be sorted out before the end of summer.

VIII. New Program Proposals

All program proposals are posted to [CCGA's SharePoint site](#)

- A. Proposal to establish a MFA in Environmental Art and Social Practice at the Santa Cruz Campus
– *Lead Reviewer Dyche Mullins*

The Lead Reviewer has only received one review thus far. Other reviewers have not followed through with him. He has one more reviewer secured and hopes to be able to vote at the July meeting. He has contacted the proposers and explained the situation.

- B. Proposal to establish a Master of Presentation Design at the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]
– *Lead Reviewer Hyle Park*
The Lead Reviewer has contacted the proposers repeatedly, and they are not ready to move forward. New requirements at UCI may have contributed to this.
- C. Proposal for a Master of Legal Studies on the Los Angeles campus. [SSGPDP]
-- *Lead Reviewer Mark Wilson*
The Lead Reviewer recommended approval but noted that the proposers should make more of an effort to increase the diversity of their program. He will include that in his recommendation.
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 10-0-1.
- D. Proposal for a Master of Science in Genetic Counseling on the San Francisco campus.[SSGPDP]
– *Lead Reviewer Amr El Abbadi*
The proposers have added language about outreach and scholarship to increase diversity and there will be scholarships after the program has run four years. The school of medicine will cover any budgetary shortfalls.
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-1.
- E. Proposal for a Master of Data Science in the Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences on the Irvine campus [SSGPDP]
– *Lead Reviewer LeRoy Westerling*
There are four invitations out to review now. UCPB's report is in.
- F. Proposal for a School of Public Health on the San Diego campus
– *Lead Reviewer Ramesh Balasubramaniam*
The school submitted on a pre-proposal last year and they were given lots of feedback. The proposers say there is a vast need for a School of Public Health separate from schools of Medicine, Dentistry, etc. The proposal had high-level reviewers and they were all very positive.
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-1.
- G. Proposal for a Graduate Academic Certificate in Future Undergraduate Science Educators on the Davis campus.
- *Lead Reviewer Beth Phoenix*
The Lead Reviewer has one internal and one external reviewer secured and believes that a vote can be taken in July.
- H. Proposal for an MS in Human Computer Interaction on the Santa Cruz campus.
- *Lead Reviewer Caroline Streeter*
Two reviews are in: one external, and one internal, and another internal is coming. She anticipates voting in July
- I. Proposal to Convert the Existing MA in English to a Master of English on the Irvine campus [SSGPDP]
- *Lead Reviewer Gina Dent*
The proposers are moving the program from summer to a year-round program, which has been desired by the teachers. The tuition is somewhat lower than what the market would bear. However,

the program has had no reviews. The Lead Reviewer is going to try to get a review of the program that houses this program. UCPB was supportive.

- J. Proposal for a PhD in Global Studies in the School of Social Sciences on the Irvine campus.
- *Lead reviewer Carlee Arnett*
The Lead Reviewer is getting reviewers.

- K. Proposal for a Master of Environmental Data Science on the Santa Barbara Campus
Action Taken: Lynn Russell was assigned as Lead Reviewer

- L. Proposal to establish a Master of Applied Geospatial Information Systems and Technologies (Online) Graduate Program (MAGIST) on the Los Angeles campus [SSGPDP]
Action Taken: Amr El Abbadi was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

IX. Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishments, and Discontinuances

All program proposals are posted to [CCGA's SharePoint site](#).

- A. Proposal for a “simple” name change from the MS in Public Health to the Master of Science in Public Health (MSPH) on the Merced campus
Action Taken: *The proposal was approved 9-0-1.*
- B. Proposal for a “simple” name change from the MS and PhD in Chemical and Biochemical Engineering to MS and PhD in Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering on the Irvine campus
Action Taken: *The proposal was approved 9-0-1.*

X. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Chair May commented that the UCSF/Dignity Health proposed partnership fell apart. HE commented on the values UC has as an institution (e.g., non-discrimination) and how it is important to uphold them.

The Chair and Vice Chair met with the President recently to discuss the salary gap. President Napolitano is still committed to a five percent increase, but it depends on what the Assembly recommends. He said that they would have to wait and see.

At the last Regents Meeting, the NRST was increased (there was no increase for resident students). Of the 2.6 percent increase, some will be put into financial aid. How to get the state to commit to a greater investment for students and what is reasonable for students’ burden. Too many have food and housing insecurity. The SNAIL movement at Santa Cruz is for students are living in their cars – there are designated parking lots with security and toilets. Santa Cruz got caught off guard. Ten years ago it was very affordable for faculty and students. Then, overnight, it became one of the most expensive communities.

There is a change being envisaged with retirement health plans; this is a contentious issue. These plans are somewhat differently constructed than standard PPOs. The retirement population has the highest medical needs, and change can be difficult. Retirees are living on dwindling incomes or are not well compensated and even small changes in premiums can have a significant impact. This year there was very small medical inflation for retirement plans; next year it is supposed to be quite high: 10%. There is sense that the savings that are generated should be banked to offset payments going forward.

The Transfer Guarantee is moving forward.

Council approved the Principles of Scholarly Communication.

Elsevier has still not cut off access yet, and it is unclear when it will happen. However, the libraries have strong contingency plans.

XI. Possible Diversity Language for the Handbook

UCLA SSGPDP Guidelines have great language for this under point 9. Analyst Harms will look at that language to develop something for the Handbook.

XII. Campus Updates

There were no campus updates.

The committee adjourned at 3:23 pm.

Section 1. Introduction

A statement setting forth the following:

- 1) Aims and objectives of the program. Any distinctive features of the program should also be noted. Include a description of the expected profile of the target audience (e.g., educational background; work experience; proportion of in-state, out-of-state, and international students).
- 2) Historical development of the field and historical development of departmental strength in the field.
- 3) Timetable for development of the program, including enrollment projects. Consistency of these projections with the campus enrollment plan. If the campus has enrollment quotas for its programs, state which program(s) will have their enrollments reduced in order to accommodate the proposed program.
- 4) Relation of the proposed program to existing programs on campus and to the Campus Academic Plan. If the program is not in the Campus Academic Plan, why is it important that it be begun now? Evidence of high campus priority. Effect of the proposed program on undergraduate programs offered by the sponsoring department(s). In the case of SSGPDP, explain clearly how any possible negative effects on existing graduate and undergraduate programs will be avoided or mitigated.
- 5) Contributions to diversity: All proposals must include a plan detailing efforts to identify and recruit underrepresented minority students.
- 6) Interrelationship of the program with other University of California institutions, if applicable. The possibility of cooperation or competition with other programs within the University should be discussed. Proposers should make themselves aware of any similar proposals for new programs that may be in preparation on other campuses. Proponents are required to send copies of their proposal to the chairs (or program directors) of all departments (or programs) on other campuses offering similar degrees, with a cover letter such as the sample provided at the end of this Appendix. Any feedback received from these chairs should be included in the full submission. This solicitation is most useful if it occurs early enough to allow the proposers to take advantage of any feedback before local campus review.
- 7) Department or group which will administer the program.
- 8) Plan for evaluation of the program within the offering departments(s), by the Academic Senate and campuswide.