

## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

### Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, October 4, 2023

#### I. Approval of the Agenda

**Action Taken: The agenda was approved 11-0-0.**

#### II. Welcome and Chair's Report/Orientation

*Chair Dean Tantillo*

- A. Introductions
- B. Proposal Review Process Overview
- C. Forecast for 2023-24

The Chair had members introduce themselves and then described the proposal review process.

Chair Tantillo told the committee that CCGA was in charge of setting standards for graduate programs and – in that role – was entrusted with and protecting the authority of the Senate with regard to program approval. He remarked that there had been some efforts in the past to remove CCGA from the proposal review process and that the committee had successfully countered these attempts. The Chair remarked that faculty are still adjusting to the last round of labor relations and how the University will prepare for the next round of negotiations.

Academic Council met recently, and the Senate Chair reported on some tension about the Board of Regents' role in terms of governance and management. The Chair also discussed the Future of Graduate Education Task Force and the upcoming congress that is being held by the Provost. Chair Tantillo encouraged members to attend the congress if they are able. He informed the group that he had suggested to the Council Chair that Council committees be involved earlier in the labor negotiation process. Finally, Chair Tantillo discussed AB 656 which proposes that CSU start offering doctoral degrees. He told members that CCGA may be called upon to review CSU doctoral proposals to ensure that they are not duplicating UC degrees.

#### III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

*James Steintrager, Academic Senate Chair*

*Steven Cheung, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

Chair Steintrager remarked that the Regents do not seem interested in graduate studies. Much of their focus has been on the Special Committee on Innovation and Entrepreneurship, which has recently sunsetted. The Regents are deeply interested in a better patent tracking system and better proof-of-concept funding. Chair Steintrager shared a link to the President's Entrepreneurship Network Council:

<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/new-uc-presidents-panel-advance-uc-systems-capacity-innovation-and-entrepreneurship>. The Senate is concerned that

there is not a strong faculty voice on this council, and intends to press for more

representation. The Regents had their annual retreat three weeks ago where they discussed priorities with the chancellors and OP senior management. There was a presentation on admissions that was well-received. The retreat also featured a panel on online education, particularly undergraduate online education. The Provost believes that the University should be doing more in this area. Chair Steintrager noted that UCI and UCSC had submitted proposals last year for online undergraduate degrees. The Irvine proposal was blocked by the Senate's passage of a modified residency requirement. The Santa Cruz proposal was approved with the condition that students complete two semesters/three quarters on-campus. The Regents believe that online education will lead to revenue generation but have not given careful consideration to the need to maintain UC quality in the process. Chair Steintrager referred members to his remarks to the Regents at their recent meeting:

<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/resources/regents-remarks.html>.

In response to a question, the Chair shared some specifics regarding why the Santa Cruz proposal for an online program was approved while Irvine's was not. He explained that the Santa Cruz proposal was approved as a major, not as a degree. The Irvine proposal was aimed at transfer students, and it was felt that they would not have the requisite on-campus experience that the UCSC students who entered as freshmen would have.

Chair Steintrager discussed the ongoing workgroup on the future of UC doctoral programs (including MFAs). It has a broad charge, and the preliminary report will be presented at the Provost's congress this coming Monday. This congress is the first of many the Provost envisions. On a related front, the Chair mentioned the work that CCGA likely will be taking up with regard to the delineation of TAs from employment.

Senate Vice Chair Cheung told the committee about AB 656 and the proposals for doctorate programs that will be coming from the CSUs. President Drake will need to affirm that such programs do not overlap or duplicate UC degrees. CCGA probably will play a role in this process.

Members had questions for the Senate leadership, and there was discussion.

#### **IV. Announcements from Academic Affairs**

*Theresa Maldonado, VP of Research and Innovation*

*Scott Brandt, AVP for Research and Innovation*

*Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies*

*Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy*

*Carmen Corona, Director of Academic Planning and Policy*

*Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst*

Vice President Maldonado gave the committee an overview of her department, which includes the three national laboratories. Her office looks at large-scale research and innovation opportunities and works closely with ANR, and UC Health. R&I is a steward for the multi-campus research centers; it has seven MRUs that are guided by the Compendium, as well as other types of multi-campus research entities such as the UC

Observatories. The Natural Reserve System, which includes 31 sites, reports to her office. The Vice President described a few major initiatives on which her office has been working. Her department landed \$185M for climate action funding and is waiting to hear about \$1.2B UC is to be awarded from the DOE. R&I has developed strong relationships with the governor's office and has been asked to pull together a state-wide alliance to develop a hydrogen roadmap for the State of California. The governor's office also called her office about the CHIPS Act, which is intended to build semiconductor capacity across the United States. Vice President Maldonado said that her office has launched a working group to investigate who is participating in the innovation ecosystem of UC, the profile of the University's start-up founders, and who is engaged in formal and informal activities. Finally, the Vice President mentioned research security issues that have arisen in the federal sphere. She said it was important that graduate students understand about conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment; these issues should also be part of their research training.

Members had questions and there was discussion.

Executive Director Jennings observed that many CCGA members might be attending the Provost's upcoming congress which will highlight findings of the Workgroup on the Future of Doctoral Education. She explained that her office focuses on academic pathways such as the UCHSI and the UCBHCU efforts. Her office also works in conjunction with the graduate deans on advocacy and outreach. Together with IRAP, her office generates outcomes and analysis that it shares with the campuses. The Executive Director discussed Grad Slam and UC's work with the CSU Chancellor's Office on the California Forum for Diversity in Graduate Education. Finally, she talked about Growing Our Own, which aligns with President Drake's priorities related to trying to diversify the California professoriate and the workforce.

Executive Advisor Greenspan explained that he is the lead at UCOP for enrollment planning. He said that the Regents are going to have an item at the November meeting on graduate enrollment and the compact goal to grow 2500 graduate students. His office is also trying to remedy the overall decline in the new PhD class and the reduction in URM student numbers.

Analyst Procello shared a webpage showing the proposal review process and the status of current program proposals. He said he also recently had added information related to the approval process for new schools and colleges. He invited members to contact him with any questions.

## V. New Program Proposals (Part 1)

### A. Proposal for a Master of Public Health on the Riverside Campus (PDST) *Lead Reviewer: Andrei Goga*

The Lead Reviewer said that he was able to secure two reviewers for the program. One was quite supportive and the other was concerned about the rigor of the program, the cost, and employment opportunities for graduates. These concerns were shared with the proposers, who responded by adding two additional courses

and providing a detailed justification for the cost and potential job opportunities in the Inland Empire. They also proposed to hire two new faculty. The Lead Reviewer felt that their response was strong, and that the proposal should be approved.

**Action Taken: The proposal was approved 11-0-1.**

## VI. Campus Reports

UCB – The GC met for the first time on Monday. The campus will be bringing forward a proposal for department of Neuroscience. The Vice Chancellor wrote a letter regarding the importance of inclusion and belonging in teaching. There has been some discussion about how to help graduate students understand those issues.

UCD – The GC will be meeting on Friday. The campus is extensively updating its qualifying exam policy to specify the conditions under which remote exams can occur. Davis will also be discussing if there is a need to develop guidelines for research in the summer. Finally, UCD is considering reorganizing its program review cycle for a more even distribution.

UCI – The campus is focusing on SSGPDPs, including how to formalize and streamline the three and seven-year review processes. Irvine is having office hours for faculty regarding 299 syllabi, which are posing some difficulties in the wake of graduate student unionization.

UCLA – The campus has created a new senate committee on program reviews to shift the work away from GC. Los Angeles is also looking at SSGPDPs and has an MOU that needs to be renewed. UCLA has a task force on the future of graduate education that is running concurrently with the systemwide workgroup.

UCM – GC has met three times. The campus ran a survey of its graduate students and post-docs and has been looking to see what their concerns are. Merced has been devoting considerable time to discussions about the future of graduate education and 299 programs. UCM is also developing a policy on hybrid graduate/undergraduate programs.

UCR – GC has meet once. There is concern that the upper administration seems to want to declare a change from a cohort model for central fellowships funding into block grants without going through Senate processes. Faculty are worried about equity in terms of funding.

UCSD – The GC hasn't met yet, but the campus is experiencing many of the same concerns already mentioned at other divisions.

UCSF – The first GC meeting is next week, but there are plans to make clear and consistent graduate program bylaws. The campus is also working to re-establish a sense of community and trust with the graduate students. Finally, San Francisco is trying to find new paths of discretionary funding that can supplement graduate student stipends.

UCSB – The GC had its first meeting and is working on redefining the 299 equivalent units and providing support for departments. There has been a significant decline in offers and SIRs this year. Santa Barbara is experiencing a huge housing shortage, and the campus is working hard to come up with novel approaches to address it.

UCSC – The member discussed the campus' Implementation Task Force Report. The GC will be meeting for the first time tomorrow and will be working on guidance for 299s. The GC will be updating its SETs to distinguish between graduate and undergraduate

courses. It also intends to update the graduate handbooks to include common elements.

**VII. Vice Chair's Report**

*Vice Chair James Bisley*

The Vice Chair reported that he will be serving on UCACC, which will be meeting for the first time on Friday. He said he would also be serving on CoGD.

**VIII. Council of Graduate Deans' Report**

*Dean Jean-Pierre Delplanque*

CoGD spent a sizable amount of time discussing labor issues and what may be coming in the year ahead. The graduate deans will be meeting at UCOP with various administrators including the President. Some topics for that meeting include enrollment management and how to help programs plan their admissions process in a more intentional way. They also will be discussing the option of health insurance during the summer for new students.

**IX. New Program Proposals (Part 2)**

B. Proposal for a Master of Real Estate Development on the Los Angeles Campus [SSGPDP]

*Lead Reviewer: Jeffrey Schank*

The Lead Reviewer said it has been challenging to find reviewers because there are only a handful of programs like this in existence. However, he has been able to secure four reviewers and has one review in-hand. UCPB will also be reviewing the proposal. The Lead Reviewer described the program and some of the criticisms from the first reviewer. The UCLA CPB was also somewhat critical of the proposal.

**X. Proposed Policy on Awarding Degrees Posthumously**

***Action Taken: Tonya Williams Bradford (UCI) and James Bisley (VC) agreed to work with UCEP on this proposed policy.***

**XI. Items Under Systemwide Review**

A. Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Affiliations with Certain Health Care Organizations

B. Proposed Revisions to Academic Senate Bylaw 55 (Departmental Voting Rights)

C. Proposed Revisions to the Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

D. Proposed Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 672, Negotiated Salary Program

Members were invited to submit comments to the group via email for inclusion in a committee response.

## **XII. New Business**

Professor Scheibner raised a question about a program proposal that might need to come to CCGA for review.

The committee discussed posting sample 299 syllabi on the CCGA website for faculty reference. Members were encouraged to send sample syllabi to the committee analyst for posting.

## **XIII. Executive Session**

No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

The committee adjourned at 2:11 p.m.