

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

## Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, May 1, 2024

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

**Action Taken: The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed 6-0-0.**

II. **Chair's Report**

*Chair Dean Tantillo*

The Chair reported that the Provost put a positive “spin” on the budget at expressed cautious optimism that the governor will deliver for the University. There is currently a bill under consideration that would allow individuals who strike to continue getting paid. Chair Tantillo remarked that this would remove some of the incentive of getting to a settlement. The Provost seems very committed to reducing the number of graduate students and received some pushback from former CCGA Chair Kasko. The Provost responded by discussing a workgroup that has been established to “redesign graduate education from the ground up.”

At Academic Council, the Senate Chair mentioned that a survey on faculty engagement will be conducted. Vice Chair Cheung discussed the representation of clinical faculty in the Senate. At this time, it looks as if a special group will be created for clinicians. President Drake talked about student protests and how he is fighting legislative intrusion into the academy. CFO Brostrom came and was not optimistic about the budget. Vice Provost Haynes mentioned that APM 210 now has more language on mentoring but makes it clear that it is voluntary and not a substitution for classroom teaching. Associate Vice Provost Lee discussed some confidential matters and also discussed the group of faculty who have been convened to provide consultation regarding the next round of negotiations. Finally, the chair of UCOLASC came and was seeking support for that committee’s work with publishers. Council voted to support the work on protecting faculty rights and supporting the negotiations.

III. **Vice Chair's Report**

*Vice Chair James Bisley*

Vice Chair Bisley reviewed the CoGD meeting. One of the more lengthy discussions was about how to best help student leaders who become overwhelmed by service requests. There are a limited number of students who will commit to these positions, and they need to be given a means to pull out non-essential activities. The meeting also featured some discussion about whether campuses have backup plans for problems that might arise during graduation. Some campuses have very detailed plans.

The UCACC meeting was quite active. The President sent a letter requiring 100 percent compliance with cyber-security training. There is evidence that this training does not actually help with security, but it does help with insurance. Every device that logs onto a

secure network will need to have EDR (endpoint detection recovery software); everything is going to have dual authentication. Consequences of local non-compliance will be very expensive consequences and could affect merit increases. The campus CIOs are very distressed about this development. The decision came about with no Senate or campus consultation. The Regents are very concerned about cyber-attacks and were going to take action, but President Drake intervened. This new policy is his compromise. The 100 percent compliance deadline will come in May 2025. UCACC is going to look at ways to push back on this. Each campus needs to figure out its approach, including the health system and national labs.

Members had questions for the Vice Chair and there was discussion.

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

*James Steintrager, Academic Senate Chair*

The Senate Chair discussed the student encampments and said that Council was trying to determine the Senate's stance with regard to them. He noted that the cancellation of classes would require some Senate guidance and communication with the administration. Chair Steintrager said that Assembly met and voted on modification to Bylaw 55 which would have extended voting rights to faculty in the LSOE series. That measure required a supermajority, and it did not pass. However, it was a very close vote. This failure reflects some serious divisions across the campuses on this issue. It is unusual for a bylaw modification that is endorsed by Council to not be approved at Assembly.

The Chair told the group that the upcoming Regents' meeting at UC Merced will feature many carryover items from the last meeting, including the proposed policy on statements on department websites. The draft policy has changed significantly, and is now a blend of the Senate guidelines and a draft administrative policy coming out of UCLA. In some ways this a step in the right direction. However, the wrongness of it remains in that it turns guidelines into directives, and that is something that the Senate actively wanted to avoid. Council looked at it last week and neither endorsed nor did not endorse but will recommend that the Regents endorse the Senate guidelines. If the Regents feel that they need a policy, the Senate hopes that they aim for something minimalist in the nature of a disclaimer. The policy draft they have now looks like a presidential policy. The Senate and OP are in strong agreement that the Board needs to be reminded that governance and management are not the same thing and that their purview is governance. There seems to be a constant incursion into the managerial arena, and danger of incursion into the academic sphere.

Chair Steintrager noted that cyber-security has been handled poorly by OP. The letter from the President went out to chancellors and others but bypassed the systemwide Senate. At a minimum, it should have gone to UCACC. Part of the problem is that there is a lack of clarity about what certain parts of the letter mean. Senate feedback might have helped avoid this confusion.

In response to a question, the Senate Chair commented that the Provost seems to see the reduction of graduate students as a foregone conclusion. He noted that APC is going to provide counsel to the Provost and may have a possibility of providing valuable input.

He observed that the Provost seems to think that the APC workgroup on graduate education is going to “solve all the problems.” Chair Steintrager said that the consultant’s report had not yet been released, but that APP has established a pre-negotiation group consisting of 20 faculty that is meeting every two weeks.

**V. CoGD Report**

*Dean Jean-Pierre Delplanque*

Dean Delplanque reported that the systemwide graduate divisions will be meeting in two weeks to compare notes and learn from one another. Some of the topics that will be discussed are graduate students’ persistence and success and the support that is provided to post-doctoral scholars, particularly on the topic of work-life balance. He said that there seems to be more preparation for the upcoming negotiations than took place in the past cycle. One of the concerns that Dean Delplanque voiced was the aspect that relates to managing expectations. Effective, two-way communication, engagement, and inclusion of the faculty are all important. He discussed the limits of negotiations and the need to educate all parties about the reality of bargaining in a labor context.

**VI. AB 656 (Allowing CSU to Offer Doctorate Degrees)**

*Carmen Corona, Director of Academic Planning and Policy*

Director Corona asked the committee if they had any concerns about the criteria developed for CSU proposals to UC for doctoral degrees. She noted that Analyst Procello will be the lead with CSU in checking for duplication. Members expressed discomfort with the process and shared the belief that it will be difficult to determine overlap between CSU’s proposals and existing UC programs. A suggestion was made that a template be developed for CSU to complete as part of their submission process. Director Corona stated that her office will develop a resource page for CSU so they can look for program duplication before they submit a proposal. The resource page will be very comprehensive and have links to all the campuses and all the programs on the campuses. Questions were raised as to whether CCGA would be responsible for vetting these proposals and grave concern expressed regarding the addition of such an undertaking to the committee’s already-heavy workload. The Director explained that CSU has limit of 10 proposals it can submit each year, and that any proposals would have to be submitted by September 15. UC would then have 90 days to evaluate the proposals and let CSU know if they can move forward.

Members had many questions and there was considerable discussion.

**VII. Announcements from Academic Affairs**

*Pamela Jennings, Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Studies*

*Carmen Corona, Director of Academic Planning and Policy*

*Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst*

Director Corona remarked that the Provost’s congress will be recorded and that she would send the committee a link to the recording.

Analyst Procello noted that the School of Computing at UCSD will probably go to the Regents in July. UCI's school proposal is not quite ready.

Associate Vice Provost Jennings discussed the preparations for the upcoming labor negotiations. She shared that the VCRs and CoGD are making an effort to engage with Labor Relations and APP. Separately, she said that the Provost has acknowledged that online education is going to require a lot of time and money. Finally, she reminded the committee that Grad Slam will be on Friday at LinkedIn in San Francisco. Senate Chair Steintrager will be one of the judges. Her office just awarded the HSI grantees. There were three large awards to UCLA, UCR, and UCSC. The HBCU awards will be later this month.

Members had some questions for the consultants.

#### VIII. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations, and Discontinuances

A. Proposal for a Simple Name Change from the MPH for Health Professionals to the MPH in Community Health, Health Promotion and Education from the Los Angeles Campus

**Action Taken: The proposal was approved 8-0-1.**

B. Proposal to Establish a Major Code and Designation for a PhD and MS in Medical Informatics from the Los Angeles Campus

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

- An impromptu Executive Session was held about a question from UCSF.

#### IX. Executive Session 1

Consultation with the Co-Chairs of the APC Workgroup on the Future of Graduate Education

*Gillian Hayes, Vice Provost for Graduate Education, UCI*

*Susannah Scott, Distinguished Professor, UCSB*

No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

#### X. New Program Proposals

A. Proposal for an MS in Medical Physiology on the Los Angeles Campus [SSGPDP]  
*Lead Reviewer: David Booth*

The Lead Reviewer reported that the proposal will be ready for a vote in June.

B. Proposal for a DNP – Nurse Anesthesia on the Davis Campus [SSGPDP]  
*Lead Reviewer – Brooke Scelza*

The Lead reviewer said that the reviews are all in and there a few minor clarifications, particularly related to accreditation standards, which need to be addressed. The proposal should be ready for a vote at next meeting.

- C. Proposal for a Master in Management on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]  
*Lead Reviewer - Jeffrey Schank*

The Lead Reviewer has one review in and the UCPB review. The other two reviews should be in this week and the proposal should be ready for a vote in June. UCPB overall approves of the proposal. Their main concern was the tuition seemed a bit high and concerns about the program's diversity efforts. The one reviewer from UC was overall very favorable and thought it was well developed and justified.

- D. Proposal for a Part-Time Master of Science in Business Analytics on the Irvine Campus  
*Lead Reviewer – James Bisley*

The Lead Reviewer reported that he had three issues that he wrote to the proposers, and they had very good responses. The three reviewers and UCPB were all positive, though they were slightly concerned about tuition.

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

- E. Proposal to add an *en route* MS to the Existing PhD in Environmental Science and Management on the Santa Barbara Campus  
*Lead Reviewer – Michael Scheibner*

The Lead Reviewer remarked that this was being proposed as an exit degree, which it cannot be according to the CCGA Handbook criteria. He will be contacting them to get them to correct it to an *en route* degree.

- F. Proposal for a Master of Education Sciences with a Concentration in Learning Analytics on the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]  
*Lead Reviewer – Sarita See*

The Lead Reviewer is working to secure reviewers.

- G. Proposal to add an *en route* MA to the existing PhD in Logic and the Methodology of Science on the Berkeley Campus  
*Lead Reviewer: Tonya Williams Bradford*

The Lead Reviewer is reviewing the proposal.

- H. Proposal to add an *en route* MS to the existing PhD in Computational Biology on the Berkeley Campus

**Action Taken: David Barner was assigned as Lead Reviewer.**

## XI. Campus Reports

Members reported on issues related to graduate education on their campuses.

## **XII. Items Under Systemwide Review**

- A. Final report of the University of California Systemwide Advisory Workgroup on Students with Disabilities

Members endorsed the letter, and it will be submitted to the Senate Chair.

- B. Proposed Academic Senate Statement on UC Quality

Members felt that the statement needed to include some reference to the importance of graduate education. A letter will be drafted and circulated for comment.

- C. Proposed Revisions to APM 016, Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline.

Analyst Harms will send an email to members asking for comments.

## **XIII. New Business**

Professor Barner (UCSD) informed the committee about the revised report on the UCHRI MRU review. He remarked that the program is not well funded and that the staff has been shrinking.

## **XIV. Executive Session 2**

No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

The meeting adjourned at 3:19 p.m.