

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, March 1, 2017

I. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda and Approval of the Minutes of February 2017.

Action Taken: *The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.***II. Chair's Report - Chair Kwai Ng**

- Academic Council Meeting
- Academic Planning Council
- CoGD

Budget call on February 17: There is a certain absence of attention to the increase in graduate enrollment the president proposed to the state (900 more graduate students). According to David Alcocer, this is normal, but UCOP will keep pushing. The percentage of graduate students in the UC population is at a historical low, and we have more professional students than before. This situation might dilute the character of UC as a research university. There will not be enough people to teach, to TA, and to create an environment for research and teaching and learning. Documents from the Department of Finance, etc., sometimes conflate the graduate and non-graduate population. This is especially true with respect to the discussion on non-residency cap. This is worrying because we have so many non-resident graduate students.

The Regents agreed to a 2.5 percent tuition increase (equaling \$282 per student per year). There are going to be 2500 more undergraduate students enrolled next year, which will add more burden to individual campuses. Many campuses are already above capacity for classrooms and housing. The systemwide UCOP budget will have an increase of seven percent; some of the campus representatives have expressed concern about this. One of the major drivers of this cost is the establishment of the cybersecurity program which is managed by UCOP: training, software protection, technical support, etc. Last year, the CSA audit put forward that non-resident students were being accepted to UC over California students, regardless of academic standing as a way to bring dollars into the University.

Academic Council meeting: February 22: OP is going to propose a cap on non-nonresident enrollment, and it is believed that it will be adopted by the Regents. UCB, UCLA, and UCSD would be allowed to stay at their current levels (slightly over 20 percent), while the other campuses would need to honor a cap at 20 percent. UC will evaluate the policy in five years; if any changes were to be made at that time, it would be more likely to lower the cap than to raise it.

At Council, the President talked about the DACA students and was critical of new administration's policy. There is some uncertainty about what will happen with DACA in the future: will it be "killed" or just allow to "die" due to lack of renewal. The Provost discussed the long term planning framework. Some divisional representatives are skeptical about the benefits of this kind of exercise. The Provost explained that the new PDST policy will be discussed at the Regents' meeting and will hopefully be approved by them.

The Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE)/Teaching policy is interpreted differently from campus to campus. Generally speaking, the southern campuses use LSOE more frequently along with “teaching professor;” the northern campuses are more careful about its use. The policy is intended to specify the review criteria for those positions, the voting rights (if any) of LSOE faculty, their ability to chair a dissertation committee or teach a graduate seminar, etc. An additional component is the creation of a revised pay scale.

The Council of Graduate Deans met on February 15 featured a discussion on a new program called Imagine PhD. It is intended for humanities and social science graduate students. It is similar to the career planning tool for STEM PhD students (myIDP.sciencecareers.org) which is considered a success.

UCSA has expressed some concerns about faculty mentorship expectations; while most mentorship partnerships are productive and positive, students feel that faculty behavior in this arena is not always monitored sufficiently. The Deans have heard their concerns and will be responding to them shortly.

Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair

NB: Both the Senate Chair and Vice Chair were attending a CUCSA in Irvine at the time of the meeting. The Vice Chair was able to call in for a brief consultation.

On behalf of the Council, the Vice Chair thanked the committee for its rapid and efficient proposal review process.

The Vice Chair noted that there had been a public records act release to the media sexual violence and sexual harassment on all 10 campuses. The information has been getting significant news coverage, however most of the public responses have been reasonably balanced. The data lists 113 instances of sexual violence or harassment over the past three years; about two-thirds of the perpetrators no longer work for the University, and about one-quarter were faculty. Roughly half the victims were students and half were staff. Approximately four faculty continue to serve as actively serve as faculty and this will probably get student attention. This is data from 3 years. It is for all 10 campuses. The University has the difficult job of balancing the individual’s right to privacy with the public’s right to know. The Vice Chair explained that UC has been experiencing a rapid increase in public record act requests. It is possible that more requests will come forward.

The PDST policy proposal is going to the Regents. The old policy tied it to comparator institutions and what they were charging; the current proposal asks the Regents for multi-year plan approvals if there is a budget provided that shows incremental growth. This process is intended to allow for more focus on proposals and less on adjustments. The cap has been eliminated; instead PDST proposals must show the need for a budget increase and what the money is being spent on. It provides more transparency and accountability for the University. Chair Ng asked if the Regents were aware of the close relationship between PDSTs and SSGPDPs and about the influx of self-supporting program proposals CCGA has received in recent years.

III. Conversion Process: State-Supported Program to SSGPDP

To date, conversions have been very rare. However because the PDST is in flux, CCGA is likely to get more conversion requests. There is not only a difference in return to aid and diversity stipulations, but there is also the issue of taking a program that has been built by state money and turning it private. The committee discussed the current PDST policy and requirements and what criteria are going to dictate if a campus request to convert a program can move forward. What “clear

and overwhelming” evidence will be required? How confident can the committee be in approving conversions when it does not have data on how current SSGPDP courses are faring financially? It was decided that the committee will not put forward any guidelines for proposals, but will review campus requests/justifications on a case-by-case basis. Campuses can tailor their submissions to meet their particular motivations for suggesting the conversion. CCGA will come up with a short list of questions that will allow campuses to determine what is needed /wanted for CCGA to review a conversion request.

IV. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Todd Greenspan, Academic Planning Director

Pamela Jennings, Graduate Studies Director

Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

The department is preparing for Graduate Research Advocacy Day and UC is gearing up for a whole campaign about growing together: growing students, research, partnership with the state and UC. The goal is to reinforce the advocacy messaging that UC will be putting forward.

The department has been receiving a lot of questions about the HBCU initiative and expects to have a lot of competitive applicants.

Grad Slam will be held May 4 at LinkedIn. More information will follow.

V. Program Proposals

- A. Proposal to establish a new Masters of Conservation and Restoration Science on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer Donald Smith*

This is a two year program taught by ladder rank faculty, supplemented with LSOE and featuring partnership with local experts. It plans for 25 students annually; the proposal conducted a thorough market analysis and demonstrated significant demand. UCPB concluded that the budget appeared adequate; all four reviewers praised the program’s content and quality but expressed concern about having no ladder rank faculty who was in restoration sciences that expertise will be provided by outside practitioners. The Lead Reviewer suggested that the proposers secure an agreement from the dean to get an extra FTE in that arena; he has committed for an FTE but not until the third year to make sure the program is viable.

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

- B. Proposal to establish a graduate program for the MFA degree in Social Documentation on the Santa Cruz campus – *Lead Reviewer Ana Peluffo*

Reviews are still coming in. Two that have come in so far are very positive.

- C. Proposal for a Program of Professional Graduate Studies with PDST for a Master of Management offered by a new Graduate Group in Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology on the Merced Campus – *Lead Reviewer Dick Arneson*

Progress is moving slowly, but the Lead Reviewer is hopeful to have all reviews in by April.

- D. Proposal for a Self-Supporting Program of Graduate Studies in Drug Development and Product Management for the Master of Science Degree at the San Diego campus [SSGPDP]

– *Lead Reviewer Ramesh Balasubramaniam*

Reviews have come back and all four are very positive. The Lead Reviewer communicated the feedback with the proposer last week and they responded; the concerns were minor. The

committee will vote via email once the final report from UCPB has been received.

- E. Proposal for a Master of Public Health (MPH) on the San Diego campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer Jason Rock*
Reviewers are being secured. However, Daniel Neumark will assume the role of Lead Reviewer at the April meeting.
- F. Proposal for a 4+1 BA/MA in European Thought and Culture on the Irvine campus – *Lead Reviewer Dar Roberts*
The proposal put forward no reviewers, and no CVs included. The appendices are very inadequate, untitled, and not listed in the table of contents. It is unclear why the local graduate council did not identify these problems. The Lead Reviewer has asked for a revised proposal; two weeks have passed and there has not been a response from the campus.
- G. Proposal for a JDP with SDSU in Computational Science on the Irvine campus – *Lead Reviewer Mike Coffey*
Reviewers are lined up for this proposal.
- H. Proposal for an MS in Geotechnical Engineering on the San Diego campus – *Lead Reviewer David Min*
The Lead Reviewer was not present; updates will follow at the next meeting.
- I. Proposal for an Master of Real Estate Development and Design (MRED+D) on the Berkeley campus [SSGPDP]
Action Taken: *Onye Arah was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

VI. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations, and Discontinuances

- A. Proposal for a “simple” name change from an MS in ICS with an Emphasis in Informatics to an MS in Informatics on the Irvine campus.
Action Taken: *The name change was approved 8-0-0.*

X. ETLC (Educational Technology Leadership Committee)

Jenn Stringer, Associate CIO, Academic Engagement, UCB

Mary-Ellen Kreher, ILTI Director, Course Design and Development

Ms. Stringer explained that the University of California should have a say in how suppliers collect, use, and manage its users’ data. Currently, faculty and student data are being “mined” by vendors who provide free services and then sell the resulting data as a product. Some of this information may not seem to correlate to the free service offered, and there is no way to hold the vendor accountable for the data use since the University does not have a user agreement with them. The ETLC has framed the following Learning Data Privacy Principles:

1. Ownership: The UC, faculty, and students retain ownership of the data and have the right to how their data is used;
2. Ethical Use: Learning data is governed by pedagogical and instructional concerns;
3. Transparency: Data owners have a right to understand the particulars of how their data is collected and used, including transformative outputs (such as visualizations);
4. Freedom of Expression: Faculty and students retain the right to communicate with each other without the concern that their data will be mined for unintended or unknown purposes;
5. Protection: Stewards will ensure learning data is protected in alignment with regulations regarding secure disposition; and

6. Access and Control: Data owners have the right to access their data in usable, transferable formats.

The presenters acknowledged that faculty and students both have legitimate needs and worthwhile causes to use modern instructional tools, but cautioned that the University community needs to be aware of privacy, access, and data concerns that may be present as well as cognizant of their terms of service, which are often overlooked or ignored. May have unintended consequences. Many institutions are grappling with these same issues, and the ELTC intends to create a structured set of principles to ensure the creation, ownership, computation, analysis, and outcomes of student and faculty data remain transparent, secure, and private.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst
Attest: Kwai Ng, Committee Chair