

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, June 5, 2024

- I. **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes**
Action Taken: The agenda was approved as noticed 9-0-0. The minutes were not yet ready.

- II. **Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership**
Steve Cheung, Academic Senate Vice Chair

Senate Vice Chair Cheung reported that the Regents' meeting was held at UC Merced for the first time, and that the campus seems to be developing nicely. The meeting featured the selection of the Board Chair (Janet Reilly) and Vice Chair (Maria Anguiano) for next year. The Vice Chair noted that both of these individuals seem to be willing to engage with the Senate. The current version of the policy on public and discretionary statements has landed in a reasonable place; it looks like the UCAF statement from 2022 except that it not a recommendation. It does allow landing page links to discretionary statements. Vice Chair Cheung said that he is hopeful that the incoming Board leadership will abandon this effort. The Regents also discussed the \$10M annual payments UCLA will be sending to Berkeley because of UCLA's decision to leave the Pac 12. This payment structure will be re-evaluated after three years. The Vice Chair commented on the groundbreaking at UCM for a medical education building, which was quite a happy event. The Regents also had a good discussion in open forum with the CIO about the investment returns which have been quite good this year in supporting the pension system and the University endowments. There have also been some initial discussions about investment choices and divestment as brought to light through the protest activities that have taken place on the campuses.

Vice Chair Cheung said that much of the effort at Council surrounded the discussion about BOARS' amendment to Area H related to ethnic studies. This has a long history, and it has been under systemwide review and Council received a fair number of concerns, many of which are in the implementation realm. One of the questions if this imposes an unreasonable burden on under resourced schools. Out-of-state students would not be required to fulfill this requirement. Furthermore, UC has a category for admission by exception to accommodate students who do not have the option of taking the ethnic studies course. Senate leadership has not yet consulted with CSU and CCC regarding how it would impact them. The change will probably go before Assembly in September.

Vice Chair Cheung reported that ACSCOTI Chair Chalfant delivered seven STEM transfer pathways, and Council approved them. That set into motion a review by ICAS to move them toward transfer model curricula and then to the community colleges to create Associate Degrees for Transfer. This series of changes was mandated by legislation. At the heart of the matter is the view that UC strongly prefers major

preparation over general education fulfillment. There is also another proposal from ACSCOTI to relax Area 5. In certain majors, it may be possible to fulfill that requirement with two physical science courses. The Vice Chair expressed excitement at the changes taking place.

Council adopted the term “Academic Notification” over the term “Academic Probation” which will move to Assembly in the next couple of weeks. VP Haynes is retiring at the end of June. There will be plans to change the structure of APP; the office will soon be bifurcated into two heads: one that will be run by Amy Lee and then a new position with a new job description. The Vice Chair reported that student encampments have occurred on nearly every campus and some of the removals have been in the news and others seem to have been handled better. The UCLA chancellor was called before Congress, and he did well.

Vice Chair Cheung closed with discussion of the labor front. The strike is falling when faculty need to make decisions about final exams and grading. The University feels that this is an unfair labor practice by the UAW and has taken its case to PERB, and has failed. The case has now moved to the state courts. The Vice Chair mentioned presidential letter about cybersecurity practices, and the Senate has endorsed a letter from UCACC. He said that he had a meeting with the Chief Information Officer and hopes to come to a more agreeable resolution.

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

III. **Chair’s Report**

Chair Dean Tantillo

Chair Tantillo told the group that at Council, Provost Newman mentioned the report from the consultant and pointed out that it is not yet available. All of the chancellors were supposed to meet about it today, and then further distribution would be determined. She discussed future congresses was asked how she measured the success of her past congresses. She did not have an answer. The proposed revision to APM 016 is planned to go into effect in July. The statement on UC quality was not really intended to incorporate graduate students but was rather meant to set a standard for online undergraduate degrees. The Chair reported that he presented the committee’s statement on faculty responsibility. Council liked it, but wanted it to be reviewed by UC Legal and APP before being endorsed. Those reviews are complete and did not result in anything substantial that changed the statement, so it will be resubmitted to Council for a hoped-for rapid email endorsement and submission to the Provost. If endorsed, it will also be distributed to the campuses and posted on the CCGA website. Neither the Chair nor Vice Chair will be able to attend the June Council meeting; Analyst Harms will look into having another member of CCGA attend in their stead.

The workgroup on future of graduate education was held in person and the group is working toward producing a final report this summer. It will probably go to the Provost, though the workgroup co-chairs are pushing for broad distribution.

IV. Vice Chair's Report*Vice Chair James Bisley*

The Vice Chair reported that UCACC did not meet. CoGD met this month in person in San Diego. The meeting also included the staff of the graduate divisions. The intent is to get together and discuss issues across campuses and find out what things work better on some campuses and how they might be customized to work well on others. Some discussion focused on small departments and (separately) non-academic training. The group also discussed having the graduate deans more involved in lobbying in Sacramento and in bringing in money through development.

V. AB 656 (Allowing CSU to Offer Doctorate Degrees)*Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy**Carmen Corona, Director of Academic Planning and Policy**Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst*

Analyst Procello commented that staff from Academic Planning had met with representatives from CSU to talk about AB 656; it was a productive conversation. The legislation stipulates that CSU can propose 10 degrees a year, however they expect to submit a maximum of one to two proposals a year. Most of the campuses are not interested in developing doctorate degrees because they are too expensive. Mr. Procello shared his notes from the May CCGA discussion about this topic with the CSU staff, and they are going to develop a flowchart about the process of all the steps involved. They will refine the criteria based on what CCGA asked, and they had no objections to any of the committee's feedback. CSU is moving toward a more refined pre-proposal stage so that UC will have a more solid idea of what they intend. They are going to mock-up a pre-proposal that will be shared with CCGA. Analyst Procello also reported that there is some legislation being proposed that would allow CSU to set up doctoral programs without UC approval if they partner with an international institution. This did not come out with CSU; at this time, it is unclear where it originates. Director Corona added that the bill passed out of the Assembly floor and has passed out of the Senate, but there is no interest at CSU.

VI. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations, and Discontinuances**A. Proposal for Simple Name Changes for the Following Two Proposals on the San Diego Campus:**

1. PhD in Art History, Theory, and Criticism to PhD in Art/History/Media/Theory
2. PhD in Art History, Theory, and Criticism with a Concentration in Art Practice to PhD in Art/History/Media/Theory – Art Practice

Members felt that the unit changes and course changes indicated that this is more than a simple name change. The campus will be invited to make an argument to the contrary and, if they are unable to do so, will be encouraged to submit a full proposal in the fall.

VII. New Program Proposals

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

The Lead Reviewer told the committee that he believes this proposal should be sent back to the campus. He said that the proposal had a number of gaps and unclear explanations for the market need. UCPB rejected the proposal; they thought the program was too expensive and did not enumerate the resources needed. This would be an annual program that cost \$55K as compared to \$18K at UCR. The proposal lists incomplete facilities and incomplete resources. There is also a concern that program faculty would have an additional 20 percent teaching load and that it would rely heavily on TAs (but does not specify where those TAs would be found). The program would not meet the prerequisites to get into medical school.

Action Taken: The proposal was not approved 0-9-2.

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

The Lead Reviewer reported that she had three reviews. All were very positive with a few issues she brought back to the proposers, who addressed them well. One of the main questions was about the timeline for accreditation. They are going to have their accreditation by May 2025 with the first cohort in fall 2025. Students will matriculate into the general DNP program if that accreditation does not happen in May. A second issue was about the number of clinical hours and whether the virtual training could be counted toward clinical hours. The proposers made a good case in their response. UCD will have the second highest number of clinical hours in their program. UCPB was concerned about the start-up funding, but the proposers assert that there is no expectation that the program will have to pay back that funding.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-2.

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

The Lead Reviewer reported that this program will start out in-person and in year three will also offer an online option. He secured three reviewers, and they were all positive; there were no issues. UCPB unanimously approved the proposal, though they had three concerns that the proposers addressed adequately. The proposers also elaborated on their diversity plan.

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

- D. 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 reported that the proposers are still revising the proposal and that it will hopefully be ready for the July meeting.

- E. 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 expressed some difficulty securing reviewers this late in the academic year.

- F. 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 reported that this proposal does not meet the fourth criteria needed for an *en route* degree. She will contact the proposers to revise the proposal or develop a proposal for a stand-alone Master's degree.

- G. Proposal to add an *en route* MS to the existing PhD in Computational Biology on the Berkeley Campus
Lead Reviewer: David Barner

The Lead Reviewer reported that this proposal does not meet the fourth criteria needed for an *en route* degree. He will contact the proposers to revise the proposal or develop a proposal for a stand-alone Master's degree.

- In light of the confusion regarding *en route* proposals, Analyst Harms will create a simple checklist/explanation on *en route* degrees to share with the GC analysts over the summer.

VIII. Items Under Systemwide Review

- A. Draft CCGA Letter: Proposed Revisions to APM 016, Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline.

The committee endorsed the draft letter to be sent forward to Council.

IX. Degree Requirements Changes

Jeffrey Schank, UCD
Michael Scheibner, UCM

Professors Schank and Scheibner brought forward concerns regarding revised degree requirements and curriculum changes in some programs on their campuses. As it

stands now, there are no definitive guidelines as to what degree campuses can make such changes without triggering a requisite CCGA review.

Members discussed this topic at length. It will be brought back in 2024-25 to be reviewed thoroughly.

X. New Business

There was no new business.

XI. Executive Session

No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

The committee adjourned at 12:55 p.m.