I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

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

II. Chair’s Report

Chair Erith Jaffe-Berg

The Chair told the committee that the budget meeting included a discussion about Cal-GETC ramifications. There are a lot of questions about the budget and commitments to the governor in terms of growing enrollment. The target numbers will probably not be met next year. Academic Senate Chair Cochran voiced the post-pandemic and post-strike reality about the higher cost of TAs, GSIs, and GSRs. The UCB CDSS proposal was discussed at Council; the three Compendium committees were in disagreement regarding approval of the proposal. Chair Cochran convened the committee chairs to discuss it. It was agreed that Council could grant a conditional approval based on the campus meeting a series of stipulations. The campus has been given a date by which it needs to respond. There was also a discussion about an expansion of the retirement savings plan, especially the self-directed investment option with a somewhat controversial proposal to include a real estate-oriented investment fund; that did not pass.

III. New Program Proposals

A. Proposal for a MA in Geographic Information Systems, Spatial Technologies, Applications, and Research on the Santa Cruz Campus

Lead Reviewer: Jennifer Smith

The Lead Reviewer reported that she had finally heard back from the lead PI. The main concerns that reviewers had were regarding the sufficiency of resources to run the program. The campus justified that they had adequate technical support – in addition to space and resources. They had a good five-year plan for DEI, but did not have anything beyond that time. There were some questions about the teaching modality and why this is being proposed as an MA instead of an MS. The campus responded that the program is geographic in nature, and it is common to have MAs for geography.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-1.

B. Master of Advanced Study in Engineering on the Berkeley Campus [SSGPDP]

Lead Reviewer: Michelle O’Malley

The Lead Reviewer said that this program is being billed as a maintenance degree for those who are already in the industry. This proposal steps into new territory and has been through many revisions on the campus. There are some concerns, such as an over-reliance on graduate student involvement, especially because of the recent UAW negotiations. UCPB’s report was favorable, and the campus response was robust.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-1.
C. Proposal for a Master of Management Program on the Davis Campus [SSGPDP]
   Lead Reviewer: Tanya Nieri

   The Lead Reviewer told the committee the Davis already has other MBA programs, but this is for students with BA degrees who do not have any business experience. There is an in-person track and an online track; courses will be offered every quarter. Both reviewers recommended approval, but they raised four points and the proposers addressed them. One outstanding issue, also flagged by UCPB, remains: students in the in-person option will be taught by tenure track faculty, while the online sections would be taught by lecturers. The Lead Reviewer will reach out for the campus and the committee will vote via email after they respond if they respond in time.

D. Proposal for a Master of Climate Solutions Program on the Berkeley campus. [SSGPDP]
   Lead Reviewer: Michael Scheibner

   The Lead Reviewer is still seeking reviewers. He has received the UCPB review; they have concerns, but they essentially approve the proposal.

E. Proposal for a Master of Engineering in Medical Device Development on the Davis Campus [SSGPDP]
   Lead Reviewer: Frithjof Kruggel

   The Lead Reviewer said that the proposal has several issues. It is three years old and there has had a bit of back and forth on the campus. He has three reviewers and is working on a fourth. UCPB is not happy with the financing of the program.

F. Proposal for a MS/PhD in Material Science on the Santa Cruz Campus
   Lead Reviewer: Jeffrey Schank

   The Lead Reviewer reported that he had received three reviews back. They were all positive and had some suggestions and considerations. The proposers have responded to them adequately, and there are no significant concerns remaining. The proposers expect the program to be more diverse than the national average.

   Action Taken: The proposal was approved 10-0-1.

G. Proposal for a Master of Public Health on the Riverside Campus [PDST]
   Lead Reviewer: Andrei Goga

   The Lead Reviewer has recruited four reviewers and should have the reviews in the next couple of weeks.

H. Proposal for a Master of Legal Studies at the Los Angeles Campus (Campus Response)
   Lead Reviewer: Andrew Fisher

   The Lead Reviewer said that the campus had finally responded to the conditions stipulated by CCGA several months ago. The committee was satisfied, and the original vote of approval stands.
I. Proposal to add an MA in Psychology Science *en Route* to the Existing PhD in Psychological Science on the Irvine Campus

*Action Taken: Andrew Fisher was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

J. Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology on the Berkeley Campus [SSGPDP]

*Action Taken: Michelle O’Malley was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

IV. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations, and Discontinuances

A. Proposal to Disestablish the Master of Arts in Molecular, Cell, and Development Biology Program and Establish a Master of Science in Molecular, Cell, and Development Biology Program on the Los Angeles Campus

A vote to approve this proposal was held, but the Chair felt that it needed a more detailed review. The proposal will appear again on the May agenda.

B. Proposal to Discontinue the MS and PhD program in Information and Computer Science on the Irvine Campus

*Action Taken: The proposal was approved 7-0-1.*

C. Proposal Discontinue the MS in Engineering Management (MSEM) on the Irvine Campus

*Action Taken: The proposal was approved 7-0-1.*

V. Announcements from Academic Affairs

*Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies*

Executive Director Jennings said that there had been staff trainings on the new contract over the past couple of weeks. There are a lot of questions, and members from APP and labor relations were present to help. She emphasized that faculty should reach out to their campus academic personnel office if they need assistance. She stressed that it is important for the University to learn from the recent experience with the strike.

The Executive Director said that her office received an increase in funding for the HSI DDI program. The program now has 30 fellows: three from each campus. It also was able to award three large grants and three small grants to faculty.

Finally, she told the committee that Grad Slam invitations will be going out shortly. The event will be held at LinkedIn in San Francisco.

VI. Council of Graduate Deans’ Report

*Dean Peter Biehl*

Dean Biehl thanked Executive Director Jennings for her leadership and assistance, in particular for arranging a meeting between the graduate deans and the Provost. He said that the meeting went very well, and that communication will be key going forward.
VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership
Susan Cochran, Academic Council Chair
James Steintrager, Academic Council Vice Chair

Senate Chair Cochran talked about the recent situation with the Berkeley CDSS proposal. She said that the Compendium states that in the case of a split vote, the Chair of the Senate becomes the arbiter. The Compendium stipulates that the Chair may approve, not approve, or approve with conditions which are then forwarded to the Provost for implementation. She discussed the conditions of approval that were sent to Berkeley and the Provost.

The Chair discussed transfer. SGR is trying to push through a proposal that came from the Senate for a transfer guarantee. If it is accepted by Sacramento, it will come back to the Senate next year for approval. The legislators are pleased with the Senate and feel that the Senate is exerting genuine effort in the transfer arena.

Finally, the Chair said that there is some worry that student labor issues will arise in the spring. If they do, she cautioned, they will not be handled the way they were in the fall.

VIII. Reports from the Student Representatives
Anne Berry, UCSB
Hash Brown Taha, UCLA

Ms. Berry told the group that she had just returned from an advocacy trip to Washington, DC, and shortly would be leaving for Sacramento to lobby for the University.

Mr. Taha had nothing to report.

IX. Update from the Online Terminology Sub-Group
Paul Macey (UCLA)
Tanya Nieri (UCR)

Professor Macey reported that that the workgroup had met and gone over the definitions. A document will be circulated for review in time for the May meeting.

X. 299 Credit Workgroup Formation
Dean Tantillo, Vice Chair

The Vice Chair called for volunteers for the workgroup. Professors Schank and Kruggel agreed to work on the project.

XI. For Systemwide Review
A. Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Inventions, Patents, and Innovation Transfer

Members were asked to submit any comments or feedback to the Chair.

XII. New Business

There was no new business.
XIII. Executive Session

No minutes are taken in Executive Session.

The committee adjourned at 1:44 p.m.