

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Videoconference

Wednesday, January 8, 2020

I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

Action Taken: The minutes were approved 7-0-0 with one minor change to the December minutes circulated.

The agenda was approved with the addition of an item related to the graduate student strike at UCSC.

II. Chair's Report - Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam

The Chair said he had updates on a few topics.

- One is proposed changes to APM 210. The Chair will be meeting with UCAP at their next meeting to discuss this.
- The subcommittee on studying SSGPDPs will be meeting within the next week to figure out the next steps.
- Beginning the discussion on the GRE. Executive Director Jennings will give an overview which will hopefully launch us into a more in-depth discussion – this is not as high-stakes as the SAT discussion that is happening. GREs are handled more locally (except at UCM).
- The Chair had a discussion with a UCI faculty member about “turn around” time for CCGA proposals. If you exclude proposal reviews that go over the summer, the average review time is 4.1 months.
- Lastly, the UCAF Chair will be joining the committee to discuss academic freedom issues.

III. Vice Chair's Report – Vice Chair Amr El Abbadi

The Vice Chair had no updates to report.

IV. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Emily Rader, Research Strategy and Portfolio Manager

Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning

Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies

Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

Research Strategy and Portfolio Manager Rader said that the timeline for having a new Vice President is narrowing and hopefully an announcement will be made soon. Also, there are ongoing discussions around issues surrounding foreign influence. It is thought that the White House will have a presentation next week about foreign influence in academia.

Director Greenspan said that the January Regents' meeting will feature an item on graduate students. It will be an item that talks about the importance of graduate education. Provost and Pamela Brown will be making the presentation. This is coming out of the 2030 framework for the University. The governor's budget will come out this week the University is waiting to see what that holds. The CSU is interested in looking at a doctorate of public health. It is unlikely that UC will support that endeavor.

Analyst Procello stated that proposals have been held up because of a failure to address the new diversity criteria. He told members that it would be a good idea to remind their campuses that this criteria is now in place. CCGA also needs to make sure that every grad council analyst is aware of these. The School of Pharmacy proposal might propose concurrent review. They want to move very quickly. Mr. Procello shared a brief on the disciplinary trends in graduate degree program proposals from 1999 to 2019.

Executive Director Jennings reminded the group that the graduate deans work with state government relations every year and that Jean-Pierre Delplanque is coordinating that. At this point, it is unclear what that will entail this year.

V. Conversation with UCAF Chair Sarah Schneewind

UCAF Chair Shneewind said that UCAF has put together a statement about threats to academic freedom and was hoping Council would issue it. She said that everyone needed to be educated about the basics of academic freedom and how it can be protected. Issues of academic freedom need to be promoted on the campuses.

Chair Balasubramaniam mentioned the discussion with Human Rights Watch and how they had made a presentation to Council. There are concerns regarding what is going on in Hong Kong and also about the “muzzling” of student voices on UC campuses. The University expects students have the right to say what they want. If that is under threat, that is a problem. There are questions as to how the University should respond and how it should move forward.

The UCAF Chair said that faculty are also getting harassed and that it is having a chilling effect on the campuses. However, she also cautioned that the University needed to be careful about sliding into racism; it should not label Chinese students as the problem. Faculty need to address this in the beginning of their classes. Every department needs to have a meeting where they read the AAUP document and discuss it. There are a lot of questions that cannot be answered in the abstract; the details matter a lot. She also suggested that there be something specific in the syllabus and that the teacher set aside some time to discuss it. The committee discussed this at length and the Chair said that it would try to devise ways for CCGA to collaborate with UCAF on this issue.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Chair

Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Vice Chair

The Council Chair said that the search for a Vice President of Research is hopefully reaching its final stages. Word will come from the Provost. The search for a new President continues. The Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) consists of 13 people: one from each campus and two at large. The search has started a little slowly. The AAC will get names and will evaluate them; all of the evaluations will go to the special committee. The AAC needs to be sure that the search will be conducted in a way so that the faculty are actively included. Faculty do not have a formal place in the search committee and do not have a vote. In the past, the chair of the AAC has sat in on the formal discussions and been able to offer comments and insights. As of now, the Special Committee (search committee) will not have the faculty in those formal meetings.

Unit 18 lecturers are in negotiations.

Area D (part of the of A-G requirements) – The Assembly passed a motion that students have to have completed three sciences to be eligible for admission. The Provost did not see this until it had passed

and he is very unhappy with it. He feels that requiring three sciences will work against schools that are badly-resourced in the state. The PPIC was asked to conduct a study about this; it comes out on Jan 15. Council meets on Jan 29 and will discuss the third part of Area D and then will bring it up at Assembly on February 12. There is a question as to whether they want to change the motion that went up to Assembly before.

Standardized testing – The Standardized Testing Taskforce met in 2019 for the first time. There was a draft report discussed in January. The STT reports to Council and they will give their report before the next Council meeting. The President has been supporting the Senate on taking its time on this but says that the final report is due in May. The policy will go to April assembly so it can then go to the President and then she can present it to the Regents in May.

VII. New Program Proposals

- A. Proposal for an M.S. in Cognitive and Information Sciences from the Merced campus *Lead Reviewer – Divyakant Agrawal*

This is a proposal from an established department which already has a PhD in and wants to expand their offering to include an MS. The Lead Reviewer did not feel that there was a need for external reviewers and the committee agreed.

The Lead Reviewer explained that this is an emerging and important part of data sciences. It has 35 PhD students and will be adding five new faculty to the program. They are increasing their offering in terms of the master programs. The proposal is well written and the faculty are well organized. The campus feels like there is a need for a masters degree. It is initially going to start with five students a year and ramp it up to 10-15. It will not exceed current PhD enrollment which is around 25. The program is not asking for any additional resources. There was no discussion about a diversity plan. The Lead Reviewer will go back to the proposers about staffing diversity planning and will come back to the committee in February.

- B. Proposal for a Dual Master of Financial Engineering (MFE) – Asia Pacific with the Guanghua School of Management at Peking University (Master of Finance) [SSGPDP] on the Los Angeles campus

Action Taken: LeRoy Westerling was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

- C. Proposal to add a Master of Science in Medical Science to an Existing MD program on the Irvine campus

Action Taken: Partho Ghosh was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

VIII. Discussion about the GRE

Executive Director Jennings summarized the discussions CCGA had in 2018-19 surrounding the GRE, including discussions with AMIGA from Davis, conversations with Francis Leslie and Robin Garrell and a presentation by Julie Posselt at USC. The research shows that the GRE is not a good indicator and it has bias. But that raises the question of how the University can deal with mass quantities of applicants. What are some examples of programs that have looked at the GRE and either decided to eliminate it or keep it. Riverside is shifting, encouraging holistic review and is going to add some statements to their website about holistic review. What can CCGA do to offer value to this discussion.

Chair Balasubramaniam noted that letters of recommendation can be biased and access to extracurricular resources are also biased. The concern is how to do admissions better, not to necessarily get rid of the GRE. Executive Director Jennings and Chair Balasubramaniam will talk offline and will determine next steps for the committee.

IX. UCSC Graduate Student Strike

Professor Smith said that the graduate students at UCSC filed some demands for COL increase, but the administration was unable to enter any negotiation because the graduate students are under contract with UAW. As a result, the students moved forward and initiated a formal strike. Some students who were working as TAs have withheld grades in response. The administration has had to design some work-arounds. The two sides are at an impasse and there is no clear path forward.

X. Campus Updates

UCB – The campus is just getting started for the year and there is nothing to report.

UCD – The campus had nothing to report.

UCI – Grad Council is working on a policy for the employment of SSP masters students as teaching assistants in undergraduate classes. The discussion at Grad Council has focused on: (1) should priority be given to PhD students, state-supported masters students, and PhD students in other programs, and if so, what kinds of procedures are appropriate so that the hiring departments would expend effort to identify and hire qualified students, especially in other programs; and (2) where should the money come from to pay the salary of SSP TAs, and to pay the remission charges.

UCLA – Nothing significant to report. An SSGPDP might be coming.

UCM – There is a new software for course approval and the roll out was kind of painful. There was also a problem with disputes between graduate students and their advisors. The campus is looking at a policy change and is going to set standards for professional communication.

UCR – The grad students came to grad council and were following the UCSC strikes very closely. The issue will probably come up at our next meeting. The former grad division dean has convened a group of faculty to create a grad student financing subcommittee.

UCSF – No major issues. The next meeting is next Thursday.

UCSD – Nothing to report.

UCSB – The member had to leave the meeting before it was over.

UCSC- The campus has the strike issue that was discussed earlier and hopes to have a couple of proposals approved soon.

The meeting adjourned at 2:04

Attest: Ramesh Balasubramaniam, CCGA Chair
Minutes Taken by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst