

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

**Minutes of Meeting**

Wednesday, March 4, 2020

**I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes**

***Action Taken:*** *The minutes and agenda were approved as noticed.*

**II. Chair's Report - Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam**

The Chair told the committee that the SSGPDP sub-committee will be meeting on Friday.

The GRE issue has been moved to the back burner, but will hopefully be picked back up in April. The APM 210/mentoring discussion has gained some momentum.

Preparedness for the corona virus means that the next committee meeting may be held exclusively via Zoom. That will be determined in the weeks ahead. Most of what will be discussed today will be in relation to the wildcat strike.

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

The Vice Chair reported that he attended CoGD. Most of the meeting was spent in preparation for a meeting with Provost Brown. The main issue was the graduate student strike, but they also talked about Title IX and the mentoring issue. Graduate student appreciation week is coming the week of April 6-10.

The Vice Chair also attended Academic Council in place of the Chair who could not attend. They discussed openness in research policy and the Working Group on Comprehensive Access. Provost Brown came to the meeting and there was a long discussion about the graduate student strike. There was a letter that came from Council and the President was not happy with it. There was a feeling that there was not enough communication. Afterward, there was a presentation from the Regents' Vice Chair. She stated that the University should increase the number of students it enrolls and go to the legislature to ask for additional funding.

**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*

*Michael Brown, Provost*

Provost Brown spoke at great length about the graduate student strike and the pain it was causing both the students and the University. He explained that when the state funds UC, it funds it based on enrollment, and that enrollment is primarily undergraduate. The graduate enterprise is funded by two main sources: external grants that faculty bring in and the redirection of core dollars to the graduate education enterprise. However, UC's budget has been in steady decline since the 1980s. The core dollars have not been keeping up with needs of the institution itself. Graduate education is more expensive than undergraduate education. In past years, there was a "bump" in the University's budget allocation specifically for graduate education. However, that funding no longer exists, and newer campuses are suffering because of it.

The Provost explained that grant sources for graduate students have dried up. The areas that are funded are more narrow and more specific. Money for the broader research enterprise hasn't been what it once was. The University has been underfunded for a long time.

The Provost posed the question: What is the solution for an underfunded enterprise? UC's support packages are far less competitive than its comparitors and they do not match what it takes to live there. However, he said, it is unconscionable to hurt undergraduate students (by withholding their grades) to help graduate students. The University needs to find ways to support graduate and undergraduate students. He said that the policy makers and the people who control the money in Sacramento are not talking about graduate education.

The student representatives asked about the perceived disconnect between raised tuition and increases in administrative salaries. Graduate students are living in their cars and eating at food pantries. The Provost explained that the chancellors are good at bringing resources to the institution that help graduate and undergraduate students. Most of the chancellors are at about 20-25% of what their market salary would be. Graduate education was underfunded before the students joined the union and after. But the graduate students now have a union-negotiated contract, and the University is held to that. He said he would like to find a way to help both the graduate and undergraduate students.

The student representatives asked about limiting the hours that grad students are asked to work that are unpaid. They also said that they are not allowed to get jobs outside of their University work or their funding might be jeopardized. The Provost answered that these terms and condition of work and he could not discuss them since they are centrally negotiated. He agreed about the legitimacy of the issue. When the next contract comes up for discussion, those kinds of issues should be discussed. In the interim, the faculty ought to know what demands are reasonable and what demands are unreasonable. The department should be able to define reasonable and unreasonable expectations.

The Chair observed that the students feel that there is a lack of empathy on the part of the administration. He said that their concern for the students' needs to be communicated. The fact that there is empathy on both sides needs to come through clearly. He added that there are a lot of faculty who are not fully aware of the parameters and what the union negotiated contract means.

Senate Vice Chair Mary Gauvain talked about how the students come and talk about tuition increases at the Regents' meetings. No faculty ever come and the Regents don't know about graduate education. Faculty might need to become actors to initiate change.

#### V. Graduate Student Issues in Light of the UCSC Wildcat Strike

The Chair reported that Council wrote a letter to President Napolitano encouraging her to take up this issue of the strike more directly, and the President wrote back sternly. This is a union-negotiated contract that does not expire until 2022 and reopening it would be out of alignment with the agreement with the union. The UAW has filed a claim saying that there are unfair legal practices, and then the University filed a claim saying the that the union hasn't intervened and told the wildcat strikers that they are out of line.

Since then, things have taken a downward turn and the strike has moved to other campuses. Essentially there is a solidarity strike that is beginning and has picked up steam on more than one campus. UCSB and UCD are striking. In Santa Cruz, some of the striking students' contracts have been annulled or not renewed. This is a dismissal of TAs only, not of student status. However, it could affect international student visas. The provost at Santa Cruz offered a \$2500 housing supplement and the students have rejected the offer. A good number of students who are not striking have taken pledges not to fill the voids left by the students who are striking.

The Chair asked members to report on how the strike was being handled on their campuses. Many reported sympathy for the students paired with concern about undergraduate grades. There was a sense of uncertainty and powerlessness. The student representatives also reported on their housing and food insecurity. Ms. Nevarez Martinez stated that the University says it wants diverse students but is not paying enough for first generation and students of color to persist. She remarked that the money that had been spent on having campus police at the strikes could have instead been spent on the graduate students. Ms. O added that the waiting time for family housing has forced her to move into her in-laws' home.

As part of the campus reporting, some members explained the actions that are taking place to prepare for the corona virus outbreak. Faculty are being asked to prepare for remote learning and the probable disruption of in-person classes.

The committee discussed the strike at length.

## **VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership**

*Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Chair*

*Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Vice Chair*

Vice Chair Gauvin said she wanted to pull back and give a larger context to the discussion. No committees can send a letter directly to the President. The committee would need to write the Chair of the Senate, who would bring it to Council, and then Council would send it to the President. Faculty can write letters on their own behalf, but not on behalf of their unit or department. She said that the University was in a “perfect storm” of circumstances right now, not least of which was the corona virus.

There is a funding policy about openness in research. This will be circulated to all the committees. The policy is in place, but there are amendments to align with new federal policies. This will mainly effect people involved with funding from DOE and DOD.

The GO Bond has probably failed. It was supposed to fund renovations for buildings that are falling apart. This is a setback. Another item of difficulty for the campuses is that six or more of them are located where there is the most expensive real estate in the country and perhaps in the world.

For the past two decades UC has been on lifeline from the state – it has tried to backfill every way it can. The state does not do its part in supporting public education. The legislators and Regents don't understand graduate student funding. The Regents are very concerned about diversifying the faculty and they need to understand that graduate education helps diversify the pipeline.

The University is also in negotiations with Unit 18 Lecturers, which is going to take a long time and will have consequences for the faculty and the Academic Senate.

The University has to consider what Governor Newsom looks at for discretionary funding and be realistic. The corona virus is going to place a huge financial burden on the state. UC is being reshaped and it needs to be clearheaded about where it wants to go.

## **VII. New Program Proposals**

- A. Proposal to establish 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 – *Lead Reviewer LeRoy Westerling*

Over a month ago, the Lead Reviewer requested reviews from a dozen faculty. Three agreed to provide reviews. Only one review (from a UC faculty member) has been received. The review was quite positive, but somewhat superficial. UCM Senate staff have been following up with the other two reviewers to encourage them to provide their reviews.

The Lead Reviewer reached out to the lead proposer a month ago to explain that the proposal needed to have a diversity plan. He received an addendum to the proposal with a fairly thoughtful diversity plan, although the assessment portion was weak and the language about increased resources being budgeted for student support (above the initial three percent) was vague.

The Lead Reviewer sent some questions back to the proposers and is awaiting their response.

- B. Proposal to establish a Graduate Academic Certificate in Family Caregiving on the Davis campus  
*Lead Reviewer Andrea Kasko*

CCGA's interpretation is that this was a campus issue. If the campus has further questions, they can contact CCGA for clarification.

- C. Proposal to establish a BA Political Science – Master of International Affairs on the San Diego Campus

*Lead Reviewer Carlee Arnett –*

The UCSD School of Global Policy and Department of Political Science propose a new five-year program that allows the completion of a BA in Political Science-International Affairs and a Master of International Affairs. Students first declare as Political Science majors and follow the already established curriculum requirements. In the spring of their junior year, they may apply to the 5-year program and upon admission change to the Political Science-International Affairs major. Students will take master's level courses in their senior year and upon graduation will be nominated to the graduate year to earn the MA. Only students admitted to the BA/MIA will be allowed to declare the Political Science-International Affairs major. The proposal does not create any new courses or graduate degrees. All that is required in an undergraduate major code in the new major. Therefore, CCGA does not need to do a full review of these already established programs.

- D. Proposal to establish a Masters in Development Engineering on the Berkeley campus [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Linda Cohen was assigned as Lead Reviewer.**

- E. Proposal to establish a Master of Urban and Regional Planning (MURP) dual degree with the Paris Institute of Political Studies (Sciences Po) on the Los Angeles campus  
**Action Taken: Erith Jaffe Berg was assigned as Lead Reviewer.**

- F. Proposal to establish a Master of Healthcare Administration (MHA) on the Los Angeles campus [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Donald Smith was assigned as Lead Reviewer.**

- G. Proposal to establish a Master of Engineering (MEng) on the Los Angeles campus [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Amr El Abbadi was assigned as Lead Reviewer.**

- H. Proposal to establish a Master of Science in Business Analytics on the Riverside campus [SSGPDP]

**Action Taken: Andrea Kasko was assigned as Lead Reviewer.**

- I. Proposal to establish a School of Pharmacy and Doctorate of Pharmaceutical Sciences on the Irvine campus

**Action Taken: Ramesh Balasubramaniam was assigned as Lead Reviewer.**

The Compendium allows for a simultaneous review of a program locally and systemwide. The Provost has written asking that CCGA provide a timeline for the review for the School and the Pharm D. proposal. The Irvine campus has been putting a lot of pressure on because it wants the review to go in a faster manner than CCGA is typically able to do. The Chair said – as lead reviewer – he would do his best to accommodate the request but was doubtful that processes would move quickly enough to make it to July Regents.

The Chair will draft a letter with a timeline and send it to the Irvine chair with a copy to the Provost.

### **VIII. For Systemwide Review**

- A. Proposed Presidential Policy on Gender Recognition and Lived Name

The committee supports the proposal.

- B. Report of the Academic Council's Standardized Testing Task Force AND Additional Statement

The committee largely supports the proposal but would like to see an alternative testing method sooner than nine years (as proposed).

- C. BOARS Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT Writing and SAT Essay Requirement

The committee concurred with the findings.

### **IX. Campus Updates**

The campuses updates were largely provided during the strike discussion.

The committee adjourned at 2:44.