Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
Annual Report 2023-24

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Per Senate Bylaw 180, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) advises the University President and all agencies of the Senate on matters regarding research and learning related to graduate education. One of CCGA's chief responsibilities, as delegated by the Regents, is the authority to review and evaluate campus proposals for new graduate programs and schools that require approval of the President. In addition, CCGA establishes basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various graduate councils and divisions, recommends to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students, reviews policies applied by graduate councils, reviews policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies, and approves UC graduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in divisional catalogs.

Review of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs

During the 2023-24 academic year, CCGA approved 15 program proposals and declined three. Eight of the approved proposals were Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), and one proposal had PDST (Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition). Two of the declined proposals were for *en route* Master's programs and one was for an SSGPDP. Two proposals will carry over to the 2024-25 year. One of these was received in April and has been in the process of review. The other was received on May 31, and no reviewers were available to take it on that late in the year. It will be assigned in the fall.

Programs Decided Upon During the 2023-24 Year

Campus	Program	Date Received	Date Approved	SSGPDP
UCB	Addition of an MA in Logic and the Methodology of Science	4/19/24	7/3/24 (returned to campus)	No
UCB	Addition of an MS in Computational Biology	4/19/24	6/11/24	No
UCD	(Resubmission) Master of Engineering in Medical Device Development	12/4/23	4/10/24	Yes
UCD	DNP – Nursing Anesthesia	1/23/24	6/5/24	Yes
UCI	School of Population and Public Health	1/10/24	4/10/24	No
UCI	Master in Management	2/28/24	6/5/24	Yes
UCI	Part-Time MS in Business Analytics	2/28/24	5/1/24	Yes
UCI	Addition of an MA en route to the PhD in Psychological Science	2/14/24	3/6/24	No
UCLA	Master of Real Estate Development	6/16/23	12/6/23	Yes

UCLA	MS in Medical Physiology	10/20/23	6/5/24 (rejected)	Yes
UCR	Master of Public Health	3/1/23	10/4/23	No
UCSB	Addition of an en route MS to the PhD in Environmental Science and Management	3/4/24	6/14/24 (returned to campus)	No
UCSD	MAS in Physician Assistant Studies	10/11/23	2/7/24	Yes
UCSD	School of Computing, Information, and Data Sciences	10/17/23	2/7/24	No
UCSD	Rady School of Management - Unit Reduction	7/26/23	11/1/23	No
UCSD	Rady School of Management – Modality Change	7/26/23	11/1/23	No
UCSD	PhD in Public Health with a Concentration in Health Services Research and Implementation Science	12/22/23	4/3/24	No
UCSF	MS in Artificial Intelligence and Computational Drug Discovery and Development	10/13/23	12/6/23	Yes

The committee worked diligently with campuses and faculty throughout the year to help them craft and improve proposals that would meet the University's expectations of excellence.

Proposals Under Review to be Carried Over to 2024-25

Campus	Program	Date Received	Status	SSGPDP
UCI	Master of Education Sciences with a Concentration in Learning Analytics	4/3/24	On Hold Until October	Yes
UCSF	Part-Time MS in Global Health Sciences	5/31/24	On Hold Until October	No

Topics of Note During the 2023-24 Year

Future of Graduate Education Task Force

The Future of Graduate Education Workgroup met throughout the year and debated existential questions. The bottom line is that more funding is needed for graduate education. There was discussion about seeking funds from industry because nothing of note will be coming from UC or the state. Many of the solutions seemed to suggest reducing the number of graduate students as TAs and using undergraduate students. The Workgroup has divided into three subcommittees; Chair Tantillo is in charge of one on graduate student mentoring issues. The other two subcommittees are studying graduate student career preparation and the redesign of graduate curriculum.

Mid-year, the Workgroup released its interim report with a broad request for feedback; CCGA was considered one of the key constituents which should respond and it gave a thorough report

back to the Workgroup. CCGA was gratified that the Senate Chair told the Provost that the work of the group and the report should be acted upon and not simply "filed." Despite the efforts of the Workgroup, reports from the campuses indicated that few faculty actually received the report.

The workgroup on the future of graduate education appreciated the letter CCGA submitted on their interim report. They were pleased with the committee's candor and its push for the workgroup to be more radical in its recommendations. The Chair reported on his subgroup's findings on the topic of incentivizing mentoring. He said that the administrative members of the group were not in favor of options such as teaching relief to encourage and reward mentoring. He added that the APM is being revised to make the mentoring requirement more explicit.

Congress on Graduate Education

In early October, the Provost held a systemwide congress on graduate education. Several members attended, but the overall consensus was that the congress was not a resounding success. It was felt that the speakers/topics did not adequately address the concerns of a large public institution of higher education, particularly in the wake of the fallout from the graduate student negotiations, and in the light of the continued budget shortfalls from the state.

APM 210

In the early 2000s, CCGA worked with UCAP to develop language for APM 210 that would bring attention to faculty mentoring activities. This year, the revisions to APM 210 were approved by the Provost and are now finalized.

Labor Negotiations and Graduate Student Work/Employment

Much of the discussion at CCGA this year revolved around the consequences of graduate student unionization for the faculty and for the University as a whole. These conversations at times included confidential consultations with representatives from APP and Labor Relations. At the heart of the issue was the challenge of differentiating academic work from paid labor and possible strikes related to that area of potential or perceived overlap. In the spring, APP assembled a group of 20 faculty to consult regularly with regard to the next round of negotiations. The CCGA Chair and one CCGA member are members of this group.

CCGA members were particularly frustrated by the lack of faculty involvement in the last round of labor negotiations. It was felt strongly that inclusion of faculty would have prevented the contract from being constructed in such a way that academic work and paid labor were conflated. The Provost said that she has been engaging in confidential interviews with hopes of improving the collective bargaining next time around. Chair Tantillo attended one of those meetings and said that the Provost seemed willing to listen to feedback.

Labor relations is aware that there needs to be better communication and better coordination regarding bargaining going forward. It was reported that the CoGD is unhappy with many things that the negotiators agreed to in the bargaining process. Those items will be difficult to remove now that they have been incorporated. Vice Chair Bisley noted that some campuses are "pushing back" on issues that already have been negotiated which is problematic. If these issues were to come before PERB, the decision would not be in favor of the campuses, because the issue has been bargained and settled. In addition, such campus-based actions fracture the system, which needs to be operating as a unit in this arena. It was noted that OP

needs to take some deliberate action to let the campuses know what is – and is not – settled.

The Provost mentioned that she is working with a labor consultant who will be producing a report for the President. In the spring, the consultant presented her report to the President, and it was then distributed to the campus administrators, and (finally) to the Senate leadership. The Senate Chair expressed his belief that the Senate should have received the report at the same time as the campus administrators. He observed that the report was somewhat modular, so it is an open question as to which options will be taken.

In the spring, the committee developed a succinct [statement](#) on faculty responsibility in guiding graduate students and assessing their academic progress. After review UC Legal and APP, it was endorsed by Council and sent to the Provost and the campus senate executive directors. It has also been posted on the CCGA website.

AB 656

AB 656 is a bill – approved by the governor in late 2023 – that allows CSU to offer professional and applied doctoral degrees if they do not conflict/overlap with degrees already offered by UC. The committee consultants brought forward the context of the bill to the committee and explained that UC needed to establish a set of criteria by which CSU could develop and submit their applications to UC for review. Director of Academic Planning and Policy Carmen Corona and Academic Planning and Research Analyst Chris Procello developed a set of draft criteria that they presented to the committee. Members expressed discomfort with the process and shared the belief that it will be difficult to determine overlap between CSU's proposals and existing UC programs. A suggestion was made that a template be developed for CSU to complete as part of their submission process. Director Corona stated that her office would develop a resource page for CSU so they can look for program duplication before they submit a proposal. The resource page will be very comprehensive and have links to all the campuses and all the programs on the campuses. Questions were raised as to whether CCGA would be responsible for vetting these proposals and grave concern expressed regarding the addition of such an undertaking to the committee's already-heavy workload. The Director explained that CSU has limit of 10 proposals it can submit each year, and that any proposals would have to be submitted by September 15. UC would then have 90 days to evaluate the proposals and let CSU know if they can move forward. CCGA, through consultants Corona and Procello, conveyed more exacting requirements for CSU doctoral proposals. These requirements were largely accepted by CSU. At this time, it is likely that CCGA will be reviewing any proposals that come from CSU, however, that assignment may need to be re-evaluated if the workload proves to be too onerous. CCGA already has a very heavy and complicated charge. Relatedly, there is legislation being proposed that would allow CSU to set up doctoral programs without UC approval if they partner with an international institution. This did not come out with CSU; at this time, it is unclear where it originated. Director Corona added that the bill passed out of the Assembly floor and has passed out of the Senate, but there is no interest at CSU.

Awarding Degrees Posthumously

In cooperation with members from UCEP, a subgroup of CCGA members worked to develop a [policy](#) on awarding degrees posthumously. The group intended to create a policy that ensure that the University as a whole extended its sympathy in the event of the death of a student. The group also specified that the diploma should be a "standard" one and should not be marked or identified as being posthumous in any way. Both committees reviewed and approved the document, whereupon it was forwarded to Council. The proposed policy was endorsed by

Council and will go out for systemwide review in the fall of 2024.

Visit with the Provost

In January, Provost Newman met with CCGA to discuss issues related to graduate education. Chair Tantillo told the Provost that he was concerned that UC is considering removing graduate students from being TAs, which is going to increase the burden on faculty. The Provost acknowledged that there is a real financial stress being placed on the University which will probably result in a smaller number of TAs (as traditionally configured). However, the role of TAs may need to be adjusted to accommodate the advent of the contract. She underscored that the financial needs of UC graduate students are legitimate, however. The cost of living is high at many of the campuses and the students are suffering. Furthermore, the governor has just announced that the next few years are going to be tough financially. The University needs to determine how it can effectively manage the teaching responsibilities of faculty without "drowning" them.

Acknowledgements

CCGA is grateful to have had valuable input from - and exchange with - these UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Theresa Maldonado, Vice President of Research and Innovation; Scott Brandt, AVP of Research and Innovation; 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; and Council of Graduate Deans representative Jean-Pierre Delplanque (UCD). Thanks, too, to Academic Council Chair James Steintrager and Vice Chair Steven Cheung, and Senate Executive Director Monica Lin.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean Tantillo, Chair (UCD)	Michael Scheibner (UCM)
James Bisley, Vice Chair (UCLA)	Sarita See (UCR)
Edmund Campion (UCB)	David Barner (UCSD)
Jeffrey Schank (UCD)	David Booth (UCSF)
Tonya Williams Bradford (UCI)	Chandra Krintz (UCSB)
Brooke Scelza (UCLA)	Andrew Fisher (UCSC)