

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Notice of Meeting

Wednesday, April 3, 2019

I. Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes of the March 6 meetings.

Action Taken: The minutes and agenda were approved 9-0-0.

II. Chair's Report - Chair Onyebuchi Arah

Elsevier is still working with the University in spite of the negotiation deadline passing.

There is discussion about the companies that monetize UC's data – analytics on University performance. There has been a study by the librarians to see what has going on; some companies are trying to sell the University back its own data by bypassing the libraries.

Academic Analytics continue to raise questions. There is a lot of “voodoo” about how campuses are ranked. It can be used to predict outcomes and skew investments and other things. The metrics can be very suspicious.

III. Vice Chair's Report – Vice Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam

The Vice Chair discussed the possible changes to the APM related to mentoring. If CCGA is going to spearhead the change, it should perhaps be done in conjunction with UCAP. The Vice Chair will approach the chair of UCAP to see if they would be willing to be involved in a possible co-endorsement of the changes.

Several schools are looking at the GRE and graduate admissions. The CoGD is carefully studying the pros and cons.

IV. Redacting Data in Graduate Admissions

- Will redacting some information in graduate school applications increase diversity?
- If so, what information should be redacted?

The Chair said that the committee has been asked to consider this by the Senate leadership to ultimately bring forward to Council and to the Assembly. The concept would be to leave out socio-demographic information. The rationale is that the information might be used unfairly in graduate admissions. Committee members were largely opposed to this idea. The Chair asked members to bring forward any ideas they had for improving diversity in graduate admissions and also to share their concerns regarding redaction. Members said that UC is not competitive because it does not have financial rewards for diverse students. This is also true for faculty diversity.

V. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Art Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning

Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies

Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

Vice President Ellis discussed National Academy studies on sexual harassment, primarily in the STEM fields. Many women drop out due to harassment after they have invested a lot of time and energy into training. A number of members of congress are drafting legislation to address this. The

National Academies will be launching an effort that UC will be a part of, and the UCLA Title 9 office is very busy; the investigation timeline is very long.

Foreign influence, academic espionage, and intellectual property theft continue to be issues of concern. The Vice President asked members to inform him if they had any information about problems in this area. He said there is a lot of paranoia in DC right now. Scrutiny of details is extreme.

Executive Director Jennings mentioned that last month was the 10th annual Grad Research Day where students and faculty go to the capitol and make the case for graduate student funding. She said that the students are always very well-received. It was an effective day. She is also trying to get some legislators and Regents to come to Grad Slam.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Robert May, Academic Council Chair

The Council Chair brought up the topic of possibly redacting inform from graduate application in the hopes of improving diversity. He urged the committee to consider the concept and possibly facilitate pilot activity in a department. He felt strongly that there would be an immediate positive impact. He also mentioned the possibility of multi-year funding as an incentive to improve diversity. The redaction topic was discussed at length.

Chair May also discussed the national admissions cheating/bribery scandal which has taken place at many universities, including some UC campuses. He said that there will be a statement issued by the Senate on this issue.

The Senate has a taskforce looking at the SAT/ACT tests at the undergraduate level. Any decision will be front page national news.

UCSF is perhaps going to enter into an affiliation with four Dignity hospitals. These hospitals are part of a Catholic chain that is called Common Spirit. There are serious questions as to whether UCSF should be doing this. The division has serious space problems and has critical issues about how to maintain the quality of care because of this. The two Dignity facilities in SF are operating at 30-50 percent bed census. They need people in the beds, and UCSF gets the space. Financially, it is a very good deal. The problem is that the Catholic hospitals have to adhere to their own values: no abortions, no contraception, no transgender reassignment, and no end-of-life hastening. The values are incompatible with the values of UC. The Senate tried to find a way to make this would work, but could not. The President is in favor of the union, as is the administration of UCSF. They are looking to create a firewall to make it work.

Chair May stated that last year, the Senate received a very generous donation to establish an award and this is for mid-career faculty contributions, and two faculty are being awarded: Sean Malloy from UCM, and Chair Arah from UCLA.

VII. Incarcerated Students – Possible Policy Development

- Should the University have a policy or “best practices”?
- How is “going to school” determined in this context?
- What accommodations (if any) should be made?

The Chair explained that the Council was not looking just for a policy on incarcerated students, but also for other students who are not resident at the campus. This could have implications for lots of areas. He said that the policy should describe the boundaries of what the University would consider, and build in evaluations so that it does not take off in an uncontrolled manner. Should

the University determine who is “worthy” of a UC education? Would it then have admissions requirements other than academic qualifications? How does the University work with someone who cannot come to campus because they are political prisoner? This raises residency issues, accommodations, tuition payment, etc. The Chair asked members to send him any information or ideas they might have.

This topic was discussed at length.

VIII. GRE Review

This was discussed in large part earlier in the meeting. Members are asked to send any recommendations or materials they have to the Vice Chair. In particular, if there are any campus practices that are working, please share them.

IX. APM 210 Revision

The Vice Chair will write a letter inviting UCAP to participate in the review of this revision.

X. New Program Proposals

- A. Proposal to establish a joint Entomology BS/MS Five-Year Combined Degree program on the Riverside Campus
- *Lead Reviewer Caroline Streeter*
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 7-0-1.
- B. Proposal to establish a MFA in Environmental Art and Social Practice at the Santa Cruz Campus
- *Lead Reviewer Dyche Mullins*
The Lead Reviewer has reached out to the proposers due to the long turn around on this proposal. He is still getting reviewers.
- C. Proposal to establish a Master of Presentation Design at the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer Hyle Park*
The campus is still working on the revision.
- D. Proposal to establish a PhD in Language Science at the Irvine Campus – *Lead Reviewer Gina Dent*
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 7-0-1.
- E. Proposal to establish an Online MBA Program on the Davis Campus [SSGPDP]
- *Lead Reviewer Priyaranjan Jha*
Action Taken: After consultation with the OGC and UC Berkeley (which also has a 2U program), the proposal was approved 7-0-1.
- F. Proposal for a Master of Legal Studies on the Los Angeles campus. [SSGPDP]
-- *Lead Reviewer Mark Wilson*
The Lead Reviewer is seeking reviewers.
- G. Proposal for a Master of Science in Genetic Counseling on the San Francisco campus. [SSGPDP] –
-- *Lead Reviewer Amr El Abbadi*
Four reviewers and the UCPB review have been received. The Lead Reviewer is waiting on the campus response to the UCPB review. Academically it looks fine.

- H. Proposal for a Master of Design (MDes) Program on the Berkeley campus [SSGPDP]
– *Lead Reviewer Beth Phoenix*
Four reviewers have been secured and they are all quite positive. There is perhaps some attention needed to diversity and return to aid. She will have an update at the next meeting.
- I. Proposal for a Master of Data Science in the Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences on the Irvine campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer LeRoy Westerling*
The Lead Reviewer is seeking reviewers.
- J. Proposal for a School of Public Health on the San Diego campus
– *Lead Reviewer Ramesh Balasubramaniam*
The Lead Reviewer is seeking reviewers.
- K. Proposal for a Graduate Academic Certificate in Future Undergraduate Science Educators on the Davis campus.
Action Taken: Carlee Arnett was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- L. Proposal for an MS in Human Computer Interaction on the Santa Cruz campus.
Action Taken: Caroline Streeter was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- M. Proposal to Convert the Existing MA in English to a Master of English on the Irvine campus [SSGPDP]
Action Requested: Gina Dent was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- XI. Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishments, and Discontinuances**
- A. Proposal for a “Simple” Name Change from the PhD in Planning, Policy, and Design to PhD in Urban and Environmental Planning and Policy in the School of Social Ecology on the Irvine campus
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 8-0-1.

The meeting adjourned at 3:43 pm.

Attest: Onyibuchi Arah, Chair
Minutes prepared by Committee Analyst Fredye Harms