

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, November 1, 2023

- I. **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes**
Action Taken: *The minutes were approved as noticed 9-0-0. The agenda was approved with a slight change to accommodate the schedule of the Chair 9-0-0.*

- II. **Chair's Report**
Chair Dean Tantillo

Chair Tantillo told the group that he went to his first meeting of the APC workgroup on the future of graduate education. He said that agenda for this year is to address specific questions and generate solutions.

The Chair said that he went to an in-person meeting of the Academic Council, which was attended by the Provost. Most of the discussion was about the congress. The Provost is thinking about how post-degree placement of students should relate to cohort size. President Drake was there, and he spent considerable time discussing online education and how the Regents might set a policy that would undo the undergraduate residency requirement. The Chair of the Regents also came to the meeting and did not seem overly concerned that would happen. There may be a need for a new group that would weigh in about online programs.

The Chair raised a question about TAs who are enrolled in a class and also TAing a class. What happens if they are told they have to proctor an exam that conflicts with the class they are taking? One of these is work, and one of these is education. When there is a direct conflict between a work activity and a student activity, should there be a statement or practice that graduate students are students first and that their educational work takes precedence over employment?

- III. **Vice Chair's Report**
Vice Chair James Bisley

The Vice Chair attended a meeting of UCACC; most of the discussion was about campus issues. There was an update from CIO Van Williams. Some campuses are talking about cutting off email for alumni because Microsoft is now charging. There was also discussion about pushing online undergraduate degrees. Finally, the group discussed the progression of the Oracle procurement system across all the campuses.

Vice Chair Bisley remarked that considerable time at CoGD was spent about talking about block grants; campuses seem to handle them differently. A lot of discussion was about what works and what doesn't, and increasing transparency. There was also some talk about the Provost's congress. The group was warned that some individuals are insisting that students on training grants are not employees, which will probably

lead to some interesting exchanges. The CoGD also met with the VCRs to discuss graduate education and research. The VCRs asked the graduate deans what the next steps should be in the wake of the congress. Some graduate deans expressed that they felt left out of the planning for the congress. The Vice Chair said that sentiment was shared by many groups, including the VCRs and the Senate (as well as CCGA).

The committee held a lengthy discussion on mentorship.

IV. CoGD Report

Dean Jean-Pierre Delplanque

Dean Delplanque mentioned that the interaction with the VCRs included discussions about mentoring. He said that it is in the interest of the Senate and its members to determine how mentoring is taken into account. The VCRs were also concerned about the impact the collective bargaining agreement would have on recruitment. There is a worry that UC will no longer be competitive with programs outside of the University that are not subject to such an agreement. He added that there are questions about training grants and their perceived value/required effort. Finally, the Dean raised the issue of the next round of bargaining which starts on May 2025. There is a sense that there needs to be more conversation with the faculty next time, and not just a one-way flow of information.

Members had questions for Dean Delplanque, and there was discussion.

V. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Theresa Maldonado, VP of 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

Executive Director Jennings reminded members that she had recently emailed them regarding the UC-HBCU program and encouraged them to contact her if they had any questions or needed additional information. She remarked that she also shared some information on the UC HSI Doctoral Diversity Initiative, which was launched in 2019. The Executive Director explained that the programs provide faculty grants, and encouraged members to apply. She added that each year, her office provides the graduate divisions with names of individuals who have been interns in the UC-HBCU program; these individuals come with funding. This year, the program is offering \$5000 in professional development funds and \$3000 of “transition” funding. The PFPF is another mentoring and support opportunity. UC-HBCU students are funded to attend it at least twice: for mid-career and once for later in their career. Her office has also partnered with Academy Noire for wellness support for these students. She remarked that this past weekend her office held a fellows luncheon in Oakland and the President made an appearance.

Executive Advisor Greenspan introduced the topics for the next three subgroups of the APC Workgroup on Future of Doctoral Education;

- Ensuring that PhD students (and alumni) are well-prepared for a variety of careers, in academia but also in the public and private sectors.
- Enhancing and incentivizing the mentoring of graduate students.
- Redesigning programs and degree requirements for graduate student success at the highest levels of scholarship

The Executive Advisor remarked that there are two Regents' items in November that will be of interest to CCGA. The annual budget for 2024-25 is being presented; \$60M of the \$90M personnel budget is a result of the new contract. The Regents also asked for an item on the governor's enrollment goal for graduate students. The state wants 2500 more graduate students, and the timing is not auspicious for that level of growth.

Vice President Maldonado raised the topic of the Provost's congress, and members had some feedback on their experience.

The Vice President spoke about her conversations with NSF, particularly the Research Traineeship Program. She expressed concern over the definition of graduate students as employees when it comes to grant funding. She said that the University needs to assemble a list of unintended consequences of the negotiations in preparation for the next round. She said that she has received considerable feedback regarding the change in the relationship between graduate students and faculty as a result of unionization. The committee weighed in with its thoughts.

Vice President Maldonado shared that her office is in negotiations with the DOE regarding the ARCHES hydrogen hub. She anticipates this will take at least a month. She remarked that the early stages of the hydrogen hub will focus on demonstration projects and relationships with industry, state government, and other partners. Approximately \$8B is allocated for the hubs, and DOE put aside about \$1B to support projects. <https://www.energy.gov/eere/fuelcells/hydrogen-shot>.

The Vice President added that she attended a climate action event last week in Sacramento. She said the meeting was very successful; UC's relationship with the state seems very good now, and her office is hoping to maintain and grow that relationship. Her office is working with the governor's office now on the CHIPS Act, which will benefit students. The Provost is very excited about these big initiatives.

Members had questions for the Vice President and there was considerable discussion.

VI. Provost's Congress Debrief *Vice Chair James Bisley and Committee*

The Vice Chair summarized different aspects of the congress. He showed recommendations generated as a result of the congress and highlighted the "take-aways" and questions that remain.

Members discussed the congress.

VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

James Steintrager, Academic Senate Chair

Academic Senate Chair Steintrager told the committee that Academic Council met last week and was joined by President Drake commented briefly on the Israel-Palestine conflict. Chair Steintrager said that there is increasing pressure on the Senate to make a statement regarding the situation. He has received letters from committees about problems with the administrative statements to date, and there is also Regental concern about statements made by some faculty on their websites. He added that there was a report in the *LA Times* about a letter from Regent. Chair Steintrager outlined a probable response, and observed that it likely would not make everyone happy. He reminded members that the Senate had developed guidelines on political statements on department websites which were released in 2022. These guidelines state that departments and department-like entities can have political statements. He said that he would probably address the issue in his remarks at the November Regents' meeting.

The Chair said that the President also discussed online education and the possibility of fully online undergraduate degrees. The President does not want to see SR 630 (the campus experience requirement) brought to the Board, where it would likely be overturned. President Drake would like the Senate to devise a "solution," and suggested an advisory systemwide review of proposed fully online undergraduate degree programs. (UC currently does not do systemwide reviews of undergraduate degrees.) This review would make recommendations, but they would not be binding, and the proposing campus would be allowed to move forward regardless of what was recommended by this review group. Chair Steintrager said that it is not clear how this would solve the SR 630 situation, because 630 would still be in place. He said that the President has agreed to form a joint Senate/administrative workgroup to look at instructional modalities and UC quality. He added that issues such as copyright and intercampus enrollment would need to be considered, among other things. The Chair said that Board Chair Lieb had visited Council and had expressed his support for the on-campus experience.

Chair Steintrager discussed the APC workgroup on the future of doctoral education. He said that the group had issued an interim report and that the cochairs of the group are very interested in pushing out the recommendations soon because they are time-sensitive. It is likely that CCGA will be getting the interim report and will be asked to comment on it. The Chair observed that the co-chairs presented the interim report at the Provost's congress and asked for feedback at that event.

The Senate Chair mentioned the increase in health care costs for next year. He remarked that the Regents have been asking for increase employee contributions to retirement plans and there has been work to forestall that effort. He added that it looks likely that there will be a four percent increase in faculty salaries as part of the November Regental budget request. He said that increase might go part of the way to address inflation-related costs. Finally, he said that there will be a total remuneration study that will help define where UC stands in terms of compensation.

Members had questions for the Senate Chair and there was considerable discussion about the congress.

VIII. New Program Proposals

- A. Proposal for a Master of Real Estate Development on the Los Angeles Campus [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Jeffrey Schank
The Lead Reviewer noted that he had secured four reviewers and had two reviews in hand. The second review was overall more positive than the first review. Both reviewers are concerned about the 10 percent funding for students. He expects the other two reviews this week and then will compile a list of questions for the proposers. He is still waiting on the UCPB review.
- B. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Studies in Physician Assistant Studies on the San Diego Campus [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Andrew Fisher
The Lead Reviewer has sent out five review request and has received one acceptance, two declinations, and one recommendation for another reviewer. He will solicit for more reviewers.
- C. Proposal for an MS in Artificial Intelligence and Computational Drug Discovery and Development on the San Francisco Campus [SSGPDP]
Action Taken: Edmund Campion was appointed as Lead Reviewer.
- D. Proposal for an MS in Medical Physiology on the Los Angeles Campus [SSGPDP]
Action Taken: David Booth was appointed as Lead Reviewer.
- E. Proposal for a School of Computing, Information, and Data Science on the San Diego Campus
Action Taken: Chandra Kritz was appointed as Lead Reviewer.
- F. Proposal for a Unit Reduction for the Rady FlexEvening and FlexWeekend MBA Programs on the San Diego Campus
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 11-0-1.
- G. Proposal for a Modality Change for the Rady FlexWeekend MBA Program on the San Diego Campus
Action Taken: The proposal was approved 11-0-1.

IX. Campus Reports

UCB – The GC will be meeting this week.

UCD – The GC has met once since its introductory meeting and will be meeting again this week.

UCI – All of the committees are underway. The campus is looking at SSGPDP program reviews.

UCLA – The campus is immersed in discussions about 375 classes, and how to get

those changed/off the books. The administrative committee has been focused on trying to develop some questions for labor relations.

UCM – The campus is in an ongoing discussion about impacts of the pandemic as well as coping with the Oracle system. UCM conducted surveys of graduate students and postdocs to determine what recommendations to make to the administration. The campus is looking at block grant mechanisms that the graduate students want to implement.

UCR – There is considerable concern about the administration's sudden announcement to change the graduate funding model from cohort, centralized fellowship funding to a block grant model. There are concerns about the plan itself and also about the process.

UCSD – An ad hoc group was tasked with reviewing every aspect of online education in anticipation of undergraduate majors coming in the pipeline and increased number of graduate online degrees. The GC reviewed the group's report and had concerns and comments. The campus is also discussing undergraduate instructional assistants.

UCSF – The campus is concerned about situations such as when a graduate student changes labs; who is responsible for funding at that time? Faculty would very much appreciate some guidance on 299s.

UCSB – The GC discussed the congress at length. It also has been regrouping in the wake of the collective bargaining agreement. The GC is wondering how to advise or help support faculty with their mentoring of graduate students now that this relationship involves employment. Housing is a huge issue for graduate students.

UCSC – The campus has developed a draft policy on 299s. A number of *en route* proposals are coming up at the campus, and the GC is developing some guidelines for them. Santa Cruz is looking at an exemption to the APM that would allow hiring (without a search) of someone who completed a PhD in the past year to teach a summer course.

X. Proposed Policy on Awarding Degrees Posthumously

James Bisley (Vice Chair) and Tonya Williams Bradford (UCI)

Vice Chair Bisley told the committee that he and Professor Bradford met with Antonio Rodriguez from UCEP to review draft materials and comments that were put together on this topic in 2019. The group agreed that the purpose was to extend sympathy and compassion to the families of students who die near the completion of their degree and to recognize those students' academic achievement. However, these actions must be balanced with attention to academic and institutional integrity. The group looked at campus policies and took a two-pronged approach. One approach essentially followed what was put forward in 2019, which stated that the student must be near the completion of their degree to be awarded one posthumously. The other approach took a less stringent, and more compassionate, view, stating that the student needed only to be en route to completing a degree. Professor Bradford added that this approach was intended to make the process as straightforward and simple as possible. Professors Bisley and Williams Bradford asked the committee members what option they preferred, and – after discussion - the group agreed on the more simple approach. Professors Bisley and Williams Bradford will reconvene with the UCEP member and share this feedback. They will report back at the December meeting.

XI. Items Under Systemwide Review

- A. Proposed Revisions to Academic Senate Bylaw 55 (Departmental Voting Rights)
Members were encouraged to send any comments on the draft to Analyst Harms.

XII. New Business

Professor Scheibner raised an issue regarding a program called SJV (San Joaquin Valley) Prime. It was determined that the Chair would write a letter to the UCM graduate council about relevant language in the CCGA Handbook

XIII. Executive Session

No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

The committee adjourned at 3:09 p.m.