

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

**Minutes of Meeting**

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

**I. Approval of the Agenda**

**Action Taken:** *The agenda was approved as noticed.*

**II. Chair's Report - Chair Karen Duderstadt**

The Chair reviewed the CCGA Handbook with the committee and discussed the role of CCGA. She said that the committee has sent back proposals for further review; the goal is four to six months for a complete review process, depending on the time of year at which the proposal is submitted.

Academic Council Chair Shane White added that CCGA's ability to review programs could be rescinded by the Regents, so it is important that reviews are handled as quickly and efficiently as possible. In some instances, campuses feel like they do their own review and they do not need systemwide review. However, CCGA is an important step in strengthening the quality of the proposals and programs. He added that the length of the review is often the fault of the proposers and it is important that campuses do their due diligence in ensuring their proposals are ready for systemwide review.

Chair Duderstadt agreed that the job of CCGA is to "hold the line" on program quality. She then provided the committee with an overview of the proposal review process including soliciting reviewers, market studies, and questions surrounding the viability of individual SSGPDP programs. She stated that the committee would discuss these issues at the next meeting and asked members to informally determine if their campuses will be submitting any SSGPDP proposals this year and how their existing self-supporting programs are doing. Following a question regarding PDST, Graduate Studies Director Jennings stated that the new policy has set the bar very high for Regental approval in terms of diversity, accountability, and return-to-aid.

**III. Announcements from Academic Affairs**

*Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning*

*Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director*

*Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst*

Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan explained that his office is currently in the middle of undergraduate enrollment planning. The University has added approximately 11,000 resident undergraduate students; it received a \$5M allocation for these students and needs to determine how those funds will be spent. It seems likely that UC will receive funding for graduate students next year, but the amount is yet to be determined. Director Jennings added that there is an ongoing lack of understanding about graduate education, which is why the University does a Graduate Research Advocacy Day. This event is repeated every year due to the high rate of turn-over in Sacramento.

Analyst Chris Procello provided members with a handout that illustrated the proposal review process and proposals that had been reviewed to-date. At the next meeting, he will provide more information on Academic Affairs information and processes.

#### **IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

*Shane White, Academic Council Chair*

*Robert May, Academic Council Vice Chair*

Academic Council Chair Shane White thanked the committee members for their service and involvement. He explained that he and the Vice Chair would be providing an overview of things that affect the University broadly.

UC has been responding to a state audit and examining its costs, processes, and spending.

Last week the council passed a memorandum to the President about finding \$15M to fund an additional 1500 undergraduate resident students. The memo had three key points:

1. Budget decisions should prioritize the preservation of academic systemwide programs and services based on their contributions to the core teaching, research, and public service missions of the University (prioritized in that order);
2. Budget decisions should prioritize the preservation of systemwide academic programs and services that support multiple UC campuses, no matter where the programs are located;
3. Proposals for cuts to centrally-funded academic programs and services should be subject to review by the Academic Senate.

Vice Chair May discussed Retiree Health. Seven years ago, the University created a new tier of the retirement system, and part of that limited the amount of support that the Office of the President gave to retiree health. Ramping down the University contribution meant that the cost shifted onto the employee or retiree. This has become intersected with two other items: 1) UC has been committed to limiting the amount of increased contribution to health care - both for retirees and active employees - to levels lower than medical inflation; 2) both the retirement and health costs have ongoing future liabilities. There is a \$19B liability that the University is facing. Rating agencies are very concerned, and the lower the University's rating goes, the less it is able to borrow money at favorable rates. The President is convening a task force to look at the funding of long-term retiree health and the way to keep it as a sustained benefit. The goal of the Senate is to maintain the benefit at the level at which we have it without placing an undue burden on retirees. There is a letter that will be posted by Council which outlines this position.

Chair White added that another area that will be of importance in the coming year is transfer students. The Master Plan says that UC should take 60 percent transfer students to 40 percent freshmen. However it is generally agreed that the target should be 1:2. The most selective campuses have been able to achieve that. However, other campuses are doing an extraordinary job recruiting first-generation and underrepresented freshmen, but are being pressured to instead focus on transfer students. The University needs to do the right thing ethically with regard to first-generation and transfer students. He also discussed President Napolitano's leadership in protection for DACA students, staff, and faculty.

#### **V. CCGA Proposal Review Process**

This topic was covered under the Chair's Report.

#### **VI. Proposals Carried Over from 2016-17**

- A. Proposal for a PhD Program in Computational Science on the Irvine Campus - *Lead Reviewer Michael Coffey*

The Lead Reviewer is no longer on CCGA; the committee reviewed his report in his absence. One

reviewer viewed the joint degree concept as negative, while other reviewerw viewed it as largely positive. Reviewers raised questions regarding jurisdiction, staff and faculty support, and student financial support. The program is hoping to increase its diversity and access thorough the partnership with San Diego State. The committee agreed to address the issue of student funding it its letter to the proposers.

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

- B. Proposal for a Masters Degree in Molecular Science and Engineering on the Berkeley Campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer Kwai Ng*

This is a part-time two-year online program that has some funding from NSF. It is designed to teach some software engineering and also some administrative and leadership skills. The proposal specified a return-to-aid of about 10 percent from year one. All four reviewers comment the quality of faculty and the rigor of the curriculum. Reviewers raised questions about how the program will repay the start-up costs; the committee agreed to make a suggestion for the program to account for how it is going to repay the loan to their graduate council. The Lead Reviewer will follow up with proposer on this issue and then the committee will conduct an email vote.

- C. Proposal for DNP on the Irvine Campus – *Lead Reviewer Karen Duderstadt*

The DNP is a relatively new degree in the field of nursing, however it a long history within UC. Currently, there are 239 DNP programs nationally. There was an effort that went on for four years to have one program across the UC campuses, with all campus proposals coming forward at the same time. That became very challenging, and the decision was to have each campus submit an individual proposal. There have been a lot of challenges with getting internal reviewers.

## **VII. New Program Proposals**

- A. Proposal for a DNP on the Los Angeles Campus

**Action Taken:** *Chair Duderstadt will continue as Lead Reviewer.*

Chair Duderstadt has two reviewers committed and a third almost confirmed.

- B. Proposal for a MS in Coastal Science and Policy on the Santa Cruz Campus

**Action Taken:** *Teamrat Ghezzehei was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

- C. Proposal for a Masters of Software Engineering on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]

**Action Taken:** *Shahrokh Yadegari was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

- D. Proposal for a MS in Serious Games on the Santa Cruz Campus {PDST}

**Action Taken:** *Hyle Park was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

- E. Proposal for a MS/PhD in Statistical Sciences on the Santa Cruz Campus

**Action Taken:** *Jon Wilkening was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

## **VIII. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations, and Discontinuances**

- A. Proposal for a Simple Name Change from Electrical Engineering to Electrical and Computer Engineering on the Los Angeles Campus

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

## **IX. Policy on Video Security-Safety Systems**

The committee decided not to opine on this issue.

## **X. Updates from the Campuses**

- Davis is trying to encourage the development of online courses.
- Merced is very busy reviewing several proposals. One has PDST and four others are expected.
- San Diego will have two proposals coming in; neither are SSGPDPs.
- Riverside had nothing to report.
- Santa Barbara has a PDST it is putting together.
- Berkeley has new guidelines around student mentoring and the Chair asked for these to be shared with CCGA members.
- Santa Cruz is talking about post-rebenching graduate growth. There are some proposals, but they are not being distributed evenly across the campus.
- UCSF is discussing developing a Master's in Biological Engineering. UCSF Graduate Dean's Office also recently completed an exhaustive survey on graduate outcomes.

## **XI. Introduction: Provost Michael Brown**

The Provost thanked the committee for the opportunity to visit. He expressed a strong interest in graduate student life, support, and transition, and said he would like to help the rest of OP understand the importance of UC's graduate programs and graduate students. He said that the value of graduate education seems muted as of late and that he would like to help make others aware of the power and prestige of UC's graduate programs

Provost Brown talked about his background as Dean of UC Extension and as a former chair of BOARS. He noted that SSGPDPs can provide the University with a way to reach a broader audience without diverting energy from traditional programs.

**The committee adjourned at 3:56.**

Minutes prepared by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst

Attest: Karen Duderstadt, Committee Chair