



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

Action Taken: *The minutes and agenda were approved as noticed, 8-0-0.*

II. Chair's Report

Chair Partho Ghosh

The Chair reported that he had attended three UCAD meetings and one Council meeting. There was a settlement with the union regarding rotations and external fellowships. UCAD Plus is getting online soon, and Chair Ghosh is on the subgroup studying the future of graduate education. The group is trying to draw attention to the [Future of Doctoral Programs Report](#) that was conducted last year, but seems to have not been viewed widely. Council discussed the release of personally-identifiable information by UCOP regarding the Berkeley campus. There will be a special Assembly meeting in response to a petition for censure of UCOP. Separately, the Chair noted that the state compact is ending and there will be a new governor. While Governor Newsom has been a supporter of graduate growth, the legislature is not. There is discussion of a \$23B bond, but it is not clear that it will get on the ballot or if it will pass. There are strong headwinds with the legislature right now in terms of funding.

Members discussed the Future of Doctoral Education Report distribution.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Senate Chair

Susannah Scott, Academic Senate Vice Chair

Academic Senate Chair Palazoglu informed the group that President Milliken and Board Chair Reilly had joined the last Council meeting, which was held in person. He noted that there was a "good exchange" between Council, the President, and the Board Chair. Chair Reilly praised the Council's statement about the demands being made of the University. Chair Riley and President Milliken also discussed the compact agreement put forward from Washington, DC. It has been reviewed by several universities and rejected by many. The President gave updates about the Berkeley incident reporting at Assembly. At Council, CFO Brostrom talked about the 2026-27 budget which remains uncertain. UC is expecting deferred funds to be available next year, but the state is still in dire straits financially. The University's budget depends heavily on capital gains, and the stock market has been doing well, but there is still a deficit. There is a proposed bond measure

for \$23B that will establish a California Science Foundation structure, but it is uncertain if it will come to fruition. The Regents will be voting on the budget in November. Other Council news included a report on employee benefits. While the average premium increase was only one percent, some subscribers saw a significant jump in premium costs. There was a settlement with UAW that went through arbitration. The UCAD interim report has been reviewed, and the group's work will continue through the fall. The feedback will also inform UCAD Plus. Twenty-six people will participate in five workgroups, derived from the interim report. Chair Palazoglu updated the committee on the faculty discipline review process currently underway. There are interim guidelines while faculty review the changes. UCPT, UCRJ, and UCAF are reviewing it closely. There are questions as to how to align the Senate Bylaws with the proposed changes to APM 015-016 and concerns regarding Attachment B, which pertains to extramural speech. The Senate Leadership hopes to align faculty thoughts with the Regents' wishes before the January Regents' meeting.

Senate Vice Chair Susannah Scott discussed the UCAD Plus workgroup on the future of graduate education. This group will be taking into account feedback on the Future of Doctoral Programs report. There was not an official feedback mechanism for the report when it was released; she asked that CCGA look at it and make recommendations.

Members had questions and there was discussion.

IV. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Ele Grandi

Vice Chair Grandi said that CoGD held a lively discussion on UCAD Plus and the Future of Doctoral Education report. She shared good news that pool-and-match approach to identity-conscious financial aid will continue, which was very well-received.

There is some talk about federal advocacy and tentative organization about possibly going to DC as well as launching some local advocacy. She noted that her work on the Faculty Advisory Committee is confidential, but pointed members to the letter from Provost Newman about the settlement. She said that the group has intensified its meetings with an eye on implementation.

Members had questions and there was discussion.

V. Council of Graduate Deans' Report

Peter Biehl, UCSC

Dean Biehl expressed that the graduate deans have been feeling tension and concerns about sunseting the PPFP, which has been particularly helpful for women and minority faculty and for hiring outstanding faculty in non-STEM disciplines. The CoGD is also extremely concerned about possibly suspending doctoral admissions. Graduate education is the backbone of UC's Research Enterprise. He stated that graduate deans and graduate councils need to be consulted from the very beginning of strategic planning regarding doctoral programs. Dean Biehl discussed the attacks on international students

and scholars and on OPT by the federal government. He encouraged members to make their voices heard and to communicate with the CoGD.

VI. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Pamela Jennings, AVP for Graduate Studies

Todd Greenspan, Exec. Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy

Carmen Corona, Dir. of Academic Planning and Policy

Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

Academic Affairs surrendered its time to the CSU Proposal discussion.

VII. Campus Reports

Members reported on issues related to graduate education from their divisions.

VIII. CSU Proposal Reviews

A. DTI in Translation and Interpreting from CSU Long Beach

Lead Reviewer: Dorota Dabrowska

The Lead Reviewer stated that the proposers do not clearly state what they want to study. Nowhere is there anything about interpreting. When they compare to the UC offerings, they omit some programs. The Chair noted that the proposal seemed to need UC departmental review.

Action Taken: The proposal was rejected 11-0-0.

B. DSc in Applied Science of Human Experience from CSU San Diego

Lead Reviewer: Baolin Wu

The Lead Reviewer felt that the proposal had extensive duplication with UC. He noted that they are trying to focus on the applied aspect, but he found that argument to be very weak. The CoGD has similar concerns.

Action Taken: The proposal was rejected 11-0-0.

C. DSc in Chemical Biotechnology and Biopharmaceutical Sciences from CSU San Diego

Lead Reviewer: Hyle Park

The Lead Reviewer said that there was considerable duplication, and they missed quite a few departments.

Action Taken: The proposal was rejected 11-0-0.

- D. PsyD in Counseling Psychology and School Psychology from CSU San Diego
Lead Reviewer: Wayne Steward

The Lead Reviewer remarked that there is significant overlap with UC programs. While the titles are not duplicative, it is a distinction without a difference. The proposed program graduates would be going into the same market as UC graduates. The degrees will need the same licensure.

Action Taken: The proposal was rejected 12-0-0.

- E. EdD in Educational Technology from CSU Fullerton
Lead Reviewer: Irene Beattie

The Lead Reviewer explained that this program is geared toward professionals trying to help educators with technology. She did not see significant overlap; none of the UCs have this focus. This is a practical degree.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 12-0-0.

- F. PsyD in Counseling Psychology from CSU Long Beach
Lead Reviewer: Neil Gilbert

The Lead Reviewer reported that this proposal has considerable overlap and they even indicate that there is a similar program at UCSD. In the proposal, they argue that they are not doing research, but on their website that they say they are doing research. There are not enough academic jobs for CSU and UC graduates.

Action Taken: The proposal was rejected 12-0-0.

- G. DEng in Engineering (DEng) in Human Factors from CSU San Jose
Lead Reviewer: Joe McFadden

The Lead Reviewer stated that CoGD had no objection to this program and that it does not seem to have a great deal of overlap with UC programs.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 12-0-0.

IX. New Program Proposals

- A. Proposal for a Dual Degree Program Leading to a BS and MD from the Merced and San Francisco Divisions
Lead Reviewer: Chad Saltikov

The Lead Reviewer explained that the proposal looks to formalize an existing pathway between UCM and UCSF. There is no double counting – the degrees are offered separately. Students would undergo a rigorous application process, and then would be guaranteed eight years in the program. It is geared toward students in the San

Joaquin Valley area. There is some ambiguity about how the funds would flow and the Lead Reviewer indicated he would request a course planner from the proposers.

Action Taken: The proposal was approved 10-0-2.

- B. Proposal for an Online Master of Business Administration (OMBA) from the Riverside Division [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Wayne Steward

The Lead Reviewer said he has one review in hand and is working on getting the other three.

- C. Proposal for a 4+1 BS/MS in Biological Sciences from the Irvine Division
Lead Reviewer: Chad Saltikov

The Lead Reviewer explained that the proposers want to reduce the master's program to one year. There was no information about how an undergraduate student gets admitted. There are questions as to how they can reduce the time-to-degree without changing the program. He will reach out to the proposers with these questions.

- D. Proposal for an En Route MA in Criminology, Law and Society from the Irvine Division
Lead Reviewer: Irene Beattie

The Lead Reviewer said that the proposal does not mesh with Irvine's master's degree requirements, and that there are several other issues that need to be addressed. She will continue working with the proposers to refine the proposal.

- E. Proposal for an Online Master of Engineering in Water Resources Engineering from the Davis Division [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Neil Gilbert

The Lead Reviewer reported that he has two reviewers secured, and is waiting on two more.

- F. Proposal for an Online Master of Engineering in Sustainable Transportation from the Davis Division [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Dorota Dabrowska

The Lead Reviewer has three reviewers secured and is waiting on the fourth.

- G. Proposal for an MS in Global Regulatory Science and Innovation (GRSI) from the San Francisco Division [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Baolin Wu

The Lead Reviewer reported that he is working on getting reviewers. UCPB had concerns.

- H. Proposal for Online Masters of Engineering (M.Eng.) in Biomedical Engineering for Healthcare Technologies from the Davis Division [SSGPDP]

Lead Reviewer: Hyle Park

The Lead Reviewer said that the proposal seems straightforward. He has sent out requests for reviewers, but has not heard back.

- I. Proposal for an MS and PhD in Life and Environmental Sciences from the Merced Division

Lead Reviewer: Joe McFadden

The Lead Reviewer stated that there has been an existing undergraduate program for eight years. Merced is building up its' programs, and this proposal has strong campus support. He has received two reviews, which have been positive. He hopes to be able to bring it to a vote in December.

X. Variance Requirement for SR 900 and 902

Irene Beattie and Chad Saltikov

CCGA discussed the February 3 letter from UCRJ regarding the question of whether the Los Angeles Division requires a variance to Senate Regulations 900 and 902 to use a term other than "academic notice" for graduate students who fail to meet minimum academic progress standards.

The committee decided that SR 904 be amended to read, "Academic notice and disqualification of graduate students is at the discretion of the Dean of the Graduate Division concerned." A letter to that effect will be sent to Council.

XI. UCLA Variance Requests

Members discussed the October 3 letter from the UCLA Senate regarding variances to several regulations. The committee saw no problems with the requested variances, and will send a letter to Council.

XII. 4+1s and Double Counting of Units

Sutanu Sarkar and Hyle Park

Professor Sarkar shared his screen and explained that this issue was being raised in response to a COGD request. Last year, CCGA tried to clarify the language about double counting. A subgroup did a survey of campuses practices and found for the most part double counting is not allowed. However, 4+1 programs were not taken into account. Professor Park noted that they had looked at existing double counting thresholds, and ~30 percent seemed to be a common number. The double counting was there to allow students to complete their studies in one year.

Dean Biehl stated that this is an equity and access issue. Some double counting would help all UC students. Members weighed in and generally felt that some double counting was valid and "made sense."

Analyst Harms will draft some new language regarding double counting and will circulate it for committee review.

XIII. New Business

Professor Saltikov asked a question about master's programs.

XIV. Executive Session

Minutes are not taken during Executive Session.

The meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.