I. Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes of the April 3 meeting.  
Action Taken: The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.

II. Chair’s Report - Chair Onyebuchi Arah  
The Chair talked about the proposed merger between UCSF and Dignity Health, which is a Catholic hospital corporation. The members were very strongly opposed to the merger, and the Chair will be drafting a letter to go to Council about this matter. The ACLU has said that it will sue if UC goes ahead with the partnership.  

The Chair brought up an issue regarding PhD degrees which are granting “en route” (non-terminal) MAs without coming to CCGA to have that degree approved. It is believed that this is practiced widely on the campus level and it is concerning. Director Todd Greenspan shared with the committee Handbook (page 2) and Senate Regulation language (page 728) related to this issue.

The committee discussed it at length, specifically with regard to a proposal that had been approved at the last meeting. It was decided that the proposal should take out the MA language and that CCGA would approve PhD. The committee will develop a process for “blessing” en-route degrees and will share that with the campus once it is accomplished.

III. Vice Chair’s Report – Vice Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam  
The Vice Chair was not present. However, he sent an update via email. Members of CoGD asked that since campuses have already sought external reviews as part of their review process, could CCGA choose to expedite the process by reducing their number of external reviews. There were also suggestions regarding letting the campus GCs know about proposal changes that were implemented during the CCGA review process. Finally, there was discussion about providing better guidelines to campus GCs for a more thorough review, so proposals are successful when they come to CCGA.

IV. 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  

Updates were minimal given the discussion that had already taken place in the meeting.

V. New Program Proposals (1)  
A. Proposal to establish a MFA in Environmental Art and Social Practice at the Santa Cruz Campus – Lead Reviewer Dyche Mullins  
The proposal is still under review.  
B. Proposal to establish a Master of Presentation Design at the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP] – Lead Reviewer Hyle Park
The lead reviewer is still waiting to hear back from the campus. The lead reviewer has sent emails every few weeks looking for a response and has received none.

C. Proposal for a Master of Legal Studies on the Los Angeles campus. [SSGPDP]
   -- Lead Reviewer Mark Wilson
   The lead reviewer has three reviews in hand and expects a fourth by the end of the month.

D. Proposal for a Master of Science in Genetic Counseling on the San Francisco campus. [SSGPDP]
   -- Lead Reviewer Amr El Abbadi
   The UCPB report quite negative, and the lead reviewer is waiting for the campus to address how it will handle the problems raised by that committee. Academically, the program is fine, but financially it is struggling. Also, there was no real mention of diversity. The campus is having a hard time resolving the issue.

E. Proposal for a Master of Design (MDes) Program on the Berkeley campus [SSGPDP]
   -- Lead Reviewer Beth Phoenix
   **Action Taken: The proposal was approved 8-0-1.**

F. 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 was not present.

G. Proposal for a School of Public Health on the San Diego campus
   -- Lead Reviewer Ramesh Balasubramaniam
   The review is progressing.

VI. **Incarcerated Students Policy**
    Consultation with UCADDE, UCRJ, and UCEP
    Lok Siu, UCADDE Chair
    Jonathan Glater, UCRJ Chair
    Anne Zanucchi, UCEP Chair
    • 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 three chairs shared their perspective on various approaches and what would need to be considered in the creation of a new policy. There are many special needs for people who are incarcerated, and a lot of variability from prison to prison about the approach of the staff and the climate and the culture in each prison. There is a need to get buy-in from the warden. There is also a significant difference between women and men in prison; staff do not take education for the women as seriously. Furthermore, there is so much disruption in the prison system that it is hard for students to participate (individual and group lock down, etc.). Tuition, waivers, fellowships and NRST are also important issues to consider. How would changes to policy regarding access affect the enrollment of traditional students.

With a lot of peer counselling and support, students can be able to be admitted but funding is a huge issue. These students don’t have access to Pell Grants. Coordination through community colleges could provide some bridge for these students. Access to materials is another consideration.
Computing resources and internet connectivity vary from prison to prison. Some do have tablets and internet capability, but it is unclear if there is regular access.

UCI is possibly developing connections with prisons and something may formalize in the next few years at the undergraduate level. The community colleges have done very extensive work in this area with CSUs – there is a lot UC can learn from an intersegmental viewpoint. It may be useful to have a set a principles regarding UCs engagement with incarcerated students – language around access and mission.

The Chair brought forward the issue of faculty and student safety and whether it made sense to think of a broad policy that would allow anyone to have access to education. Adverse effects need to be considered regarding many facets of such a policy.

The topic was discussed by the committee at length.

VII. Consultation with Julie Posselt re Graduate Admissions
Julie Posselt is an associate professor of higher education in the USC Rossier School of Education. Rooted in sociological and organizational theory, her research program examines institutionalized inequalities in higher education and organizational efforts aimed at reducing inequities and encouraging diversity. She is also the director of C-CIDE, the California Consortium for Inclusive Doctoral Education.

Dr. Posselt showed a Power Point entitled Creating Equity in Graduate Education. The slide show featured what does and does not work in graduate education and some approaches that have been proven to be effective in reducing bias and creating opportunity.

The presentation was designed to help the committee respond to queries about holistic review, dropping the GRE and redacting information in graduate applications. It was then followed up with a period for questions and answers from the committee members.

VIII. New Program Proposals (2)

H. Proposal for a Graduate Academic Certificate in Future Undergraduate Science Educators on the Davis campus.
   - Lead Reviewer Beth Phoenix
   The proposal is still under review.

I. Proposal for an MS in Human Computer Interaction on the Santa Cruz campus.
   - Lead Reviewer Caroline Streeter
   Letters are out to prospective reviewers; no reviews as of yet.

J. Proposal to Convert the Existing MA in English to a Master of English on the Irvine campus [SSGPDP]
   - Lead Reviewer Gina Dent
   The committee has to know how the last campus program review went for the MA and then can perhaps conduct an internal review.

K. Proposal for a PhD in Global Studies in the School of Social Sciences on the Irvine campus.
   **Action Taken:** Lynn Russell was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

IX. Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishments, and Discontinuances
A. Proposal for a “Simple” Name Change for 1) the Computer Science M.S./Ph.D. program to Computer Science and Engineering M.S./Ph.D., and 2) the Electrical Engineering M.S./Ph.D. program to Electrical and Computer Engineering M.S./Ph.D. on the Santa Cruz Campus.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 6-0-1.

X. Campus Updates
- UCSB has a program coming.
- UCLA has an SSGPDP working group and will hopefully have a report soon.
- UCB has a certificate coming and a new concurrent degree coming.
- Riverside has been doing reviews of SSGPDPs and looking at how to force more return to aid to happen.
- The Graduate Deans are looking to broaden APM 010; the Graduate Councils have not weighed on this.

The meeting was adjourned 3:08.

Attest: Onyebuchi Arah, Committee Chair
Minutes taken by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst