

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, December 1, 2021

I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

Action Taken: *The agenda and minutes were approved with some adjustments to the agenda 10-0-0.*

II. Chair's Report

Chair Andrea Kasko

The Chair reported that UCOP has proposed an employer contribution reduction to the retirement plan from 15 percent to 14 percent. This frees up some money for the campuses. The Senate introduced a two-year sunset clause and that was very well received. The Council discussed some issues related to Title IX and the revised policy on SVSH; there was a part of the revised policy that allowed for contact that was one-sided. An agreement was reached with the Unit 18 lecturers, but there has been no resolution for the GSRs. There are significant questions regarding students who are paid by external fellowship.

The Regents approved the 2022-23 budget for continued operations. There was a long discussion about the Senate and who should be members; there is some political background to this issue. There is proposed legislation that would allow people who are members of a union who transfer to keep that union membership once they join the Academic Senate, potentially unionizing the Academic Senate. The last major issue about teaching assistants who are teaching remotely for non –medical reasons. Academic Council Chair Horwitz asked for a letter from CCGA to the Council about this issue.

III. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Erith Jaffe-Berg

The Vice Chair remarked that there were two CoGD meetings. In early November, Provost Brown came to the CoGD and talked about his proposal for an “optimal review” for Master’s degree proposals. He is not looking at the review of MFA or PhD programs. There was a divergence in response from the graduate deans: some were supportive about the proposed delegation to the campuses and others said they saw the value of systemwide review and were not concerned about the timeline. There is a prevailing perception that the review takes two years and “nothing of value” comes of it. Chair Kasko informed the committee that she would be co-chair of the APC task force that looks at the Master’s degree review process. Separately, The Vice Chair told the committee that the Provost had disregarded the idea of a graduate advisory board. However, Provost Brown did make an interesting suggestion that CCGA invite Regent Estolano to a committee meeting.

Vice Chair Jaffe-Berg noted that she had attended a second CoGD meeting in November and it featured Dr. Damon Tull, who spoke about Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and innovation/ entrepreneurship. He got a very favorable response. Another issue that came up at that meeting was the concept of biweekly pay for graduate students. It is the understanding of the Vice Chair

that the graduate deans are going to push for this. The Vice Chair told the committee that labor issues continue to arise. There is some pressure on some of the students to join the movement to bring about unionization, and some students feel uncomfortable and harassed. The graduate deans expressed concern about this harassment.

Finally, Vice Chair Jaffe-Berg said that the two MRU reviews seem to be progressing well and easily.

Announcements from Academic Affairs

Theresa Maldonado, VP of Research and Innovation

Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies

Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning

Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

Vice President Maldonado told the committee that her office has been consumed with climate change. It has managed to pull together all the vice presidents of OP, the 10 campuses, the three national labs, and UC Health and to develop an encompassing University strategy for climate change that UC is using in conversations with the governor's office. The proposal is currently sitting with State Government Relations. The Vice President shared that she recently had visited UCSC and the campus is very interested in getting students engaged across disciplinary lines. While she was there, Vice President Maldonado was able to see their genomics institute facility. UCSC pivoted a large footprint of that space to PCR testing for the COVID virus. The Santa Cruz campus is serving the entire county of Santa Cruz in testing; it tests migrant workers as well as the campus community. The campus has undergraduate students trained to work in this testing facility as well.

The Vice President mentioned that the Regents have a Special Committee on Innovation Transfer. The next meeting will be December 16, and her office will be looking at the non-STEM fields for innovation. The NSF funded a large university consortium to look at promotion and tenure criteria and how they involve innovation; five UC campuses are engaged in that effort.

The Vice President's office is nearing the end of its search for the UC Observatories Director. There is a very strong pool. Also the UC Humanities Research Institute Director search will be launched shortly. The committee had questions for the Vice President.

Executive Director Jennings said that there isn't an objection from UC on unionization of GSRs; the issue is excluding and protecting individuals who are on external fellowships. This has caused negotiations to break down. UC now needs to prepare for a PERB (Public Employee Relations Board) hearing. Academic Personnel has taken the lead on this.

The Executive Director reminded the committee that the pilot for UCPATH was arranged under President Napolitano, but it did not come to pass and there was no communication about it. Now her office is meeting with the executive director of UCPATH. She said there was still enough vested interest to push on this matter and her office is anxious to see how movement can be made on this issue without having to repeat previous efforts.

The Executive Director's office had a "Growing Our Own" presentation at the last Regents' meeting and it served as a good opportunity for engagement with the Regents. Several Regents asked questions and expressed interest in the program. There is a real opportunity for a broader conversation about the importance of graduate pathways and the diversity of the faculty.

Director Greenspan told the committee that the Regents' Finance Committee approved the budget for 2022-23 and Regent Chair Estolano asked if it provided enough money for the new graduate students. Director Greenspan remarked that it is rare to have a Regent express concern about graduate student growth. The Director noted that his office is getting data for the current year and there has been an increase: UC is about 2000 over on state-supported graduate students and the campuses are proposing about 900 student growth over this 2000. The Regents and the President are talking about long-term capacity; Director Greenspan's office is having talks with all the campuses about growth. These conversations will go on for the next five to six months. The Regents are saying that UC needs to ask for additional funding now while the state has money.

Academic Planning and Research Analyst Chris Procello noted that the next cycle of the Five-Year Planning Perspectives will begin in January. The majority of those plans will cover graduate programs.

IV. Council of Graduate Deans' Report

Dean Jean-Pierre Delplanque

Dean Delplanque commented on the topic of the proposed review of the approval process for Master's degree programs. He said that there is a diversity of opinions on how long things take depending on the campuses. His campus conducted a study, and the "bottleneck" in process has not been CCGA. He added that careful stewarding of the proposal will get it to CCGA at the right time of year for prompt review.

The Dean also discussed the UCPath situation and noted that the previously-established workgroup did a really thorough job; it ran pilots and simulations and it was killed for no apparent reason.

V. Campus Reports

UCB - There is a lot of discussion going about five-year support packages for PhD students.

UCD – The campus had nothing to report.

UCI – The campus had nothing to report.

UCLA – The campus will be discussing whether committees will still be allowed to meet virtually.

UCM – The Merced APO (Academic Personnel Office) is saying that a lot of international students may not go home for the holiday break. The member asked for feedback from other members regarding this stipulation.

UCR – The campus had four items: 1. Grad Council was asked to review a revised document from the office of financial planning and analysis about how to manage SSGPDPs. The proposed policy was very vague – there was no reference to the costs and an issue of faculty governance. 2. It looks like a new division of undergraduate education is being formulated at UCR; it would be primarily responsible for holding summer sessions and there were not guarantees of graduate student employment. 3. The summer session proposal continues to have remote options. 4. The ongoing case of the fraud and theft of native American identity continues to be a problem.

UCSD – The campus had nothing to report.

UCSF – The campus had nothing to report.

UCSB – In previous years, GC and other Senate committees read the data notebooks for departments under review in the fall and submitted possible questions to PRP to go to the ERCs. This year, there was a pilot process intended to expedite reviews, which have been taking too long. In the end, the GC sent memos to PRP about two programs that it was especially concerned about, and PRP has agreed to supply those to the ERCs. GC should have a discussion about this

pilot program in spring once the whole process is complete. Also, the faculty are sending a memo to the Chancellor about the Munger Hall plan and the effects it will have on students and the undue influence it grants one donor over the development of the campus.

UCSC – There is a proposal to finalize the campus proposal for a School of Engineering and have the dean be given authority for delegating degrees. It focuses primarily on undergraduate issues, but may potentially have future graduate implications.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Chair

Susan Cochran, Academic Council Vice Chair

Council Chair Horwitz told the committee that there was a settlement in the Unit 18 Lecturers' contract after two-and-a-half years. It is very good regarding pay and additional security that was negotiated. Everyone is very hopeful – it is a five-year contract. The University is still working around the GSR issue and the President is trying to maintain the distinction between a student and an employee. The Health Sciences clinical faculty are pushing to be recognized as members of the Academic Senate. There is an issue of very poor faculty morale and there is a sense that clinician morale would be improved if they were a part of the Senate. The Senate is taking this up.

At the Regents' meeting there was an adjustment to the budget in terms of the faculty salary ask. It is now four percent with an additional one-and-a-half percent devoted to equity gaps. How this works in terms of scale and off-scale is still opaque. For staff, the increase was four-and-a-half percent. In a similar vein, OP is proposing to change the employer contribution to UCRP in order to allow more money for the campuses to operate. OP proposes to reduce the employer contribution to UCRP from 15 percent to 14 percent, but to make up the loss by infusions of funds from STIP (the Short Term Investment Pool). The Senate was worried that it would be difficult to get the policy to go back up to the 15 percent in the future, and proposed a sunset clause of two years so that it would automatically go back up to 15 percent unless the Regents vote otherwise.

The Chair reported that the Regents took a much better tone about transfer at this most recent meeting. The Senate presented some data and personal stories about why transfer policy is necessarily difficult and complicated because each major at the UC reflects particular orientations to individual scholarly disciplines which make it very hard to have a singular set of courses that would satisfy transfer. The Regents seemed to understand this argument.

The Senate has been trying to push ECAS (Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services) to put together a process so that when UC medical staff are affiliated with organizations with ethical and religious directives (ERDs), there is a whistleblower process in place so that staff are protected.

Chair Horwitz said that Senate has encouraged campuses to energize their campus climate activists to organize and form standing Climate Crisis Committees. The Senate is also considering writing a memorial to the Regents about climate; it would be oriented to campus operations and would try to reduce fossil fuel emissions by some very high percentage by the year 2030. This is still in early process. From the Senate, it would need to go to the Assembly and the campuses before going to the Regents. Separately, the Provost is responding to a push from Senate to put together a UC Online advisory committee that will include three Senate members. The Senate has also sent off for Senate review the recommendations of UCAF on the issue of

political statements on department websites. It also has worked with the Provost's Office to finalize the language on the charge for the task force on Master's degree reviews.

VII. New Program Proposals

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

Lead Reviewer Arvind Rajaraman

The Lead Reviewer said that no movement has been made by the proposers. The Lead Reviewer has continued to reach out to them, and the proposers have responded that they are "very busy."

Action Taken: *The committee decided to send a letter saying that CCGA needs a response by the January meeting. The letter would also say that if the proposers respond by May 4, 2022, that CCGA will be able to continue the already-started review process. Receipt after this date would trigger a new review process. The decision was approved 10-0-2.*

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

Lead Reviewer Bjoern Schwer

The Lead Reviewer said that he is waiting for the internal reviews; he has just received the external reviews. The reviews so far are positive. He hopes to address the proposal at the January meeting.

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

Action Taken: *The Chair said she would work to secure a reviewer by the January meeting.*

VIII. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations and Discontinuances

A. Proposal to Reorganize General Academic Divisions into Schools on the San Diego Campus

Action Taken *James Bisley was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

B. Proposal for a Simple Name Change from the School of Optometry to the Herbert Wertheim School of Optometry and Vision Science on the Berkeley Campus

The Chair noted that the campus had already changed the name of the School on its webpage.

Action Taken: *The committee concurred with the proposal 10-0-1. It was agreed that the approval letter should include some language about consulting with systemwide before changing the webpage.*

IX. For Consideration: Remote TA/GSI Work –

The Chair said that she presented CCGA's concerns to Academic Council and one of the things that was brought up was the impact this had on residency. She noted that residency is defined by enrollment and not by physical attendance on a campus. It seems that there was a lot of variation between campuses, but most were interested in making sure they were concerned about the potential issue of people wanting to continue to work remotely. Some campuses do not allow for remote instruction; this should not be a local decision. The Chair was asked to provide the Senate with some guidance from CCGA. The Chair had drafted a letter and asked the committee to review it.

Action Taken: *After the committee discussed the letter and its issues for some time, it was decided that the Chair would work with Member Sabra to create a letter for Council that strikes the right balance between equity and pedagogy.*

X. New Business

For January: The committee will discuss guidance about the double-counting of units.

The committee adjourned at 1:41 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Fredye Harms, CCGA Analyst
Attest: Andrea Kasko, CCGA Chair