



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, November 6, 2024

In attendance: James Bisley, Chair, Partho Ghosh, Vice Chair, Ilan Adler (UCB), Eleonora Grandi (UCD), Tonya Williams Bradford (UCI), April Thames (UCLA), John Abatzoglou (UCM), Hyle Park (Alternate, UCR) Wayne Steward (UCSF), Frank Biess (UCSD), Alex Simms (UCSB), Chad Saltikov (UCSC), Ryan Manriquez (student, UCB), Rebecca Ruiz (student, UCI), Steven Cheung, Todd Greenspan, Pamela Jennings, Chris Procello, Rolin Moe (UC Online), and Fredye Harms (analyst)

I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

Action Requested: *The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed.*

The Chair welcomed the committee's new student representatives, Ryan Manriquez (UCB) and Rebecca Ruiz (UCI). The students briefly introduced themselves.

II. Language Acquisition Needs and How They Are Being Addressed Through Online Education

Rolin Moe, Executive Director, UC Online

Executive Director Moe described UC Online and explained that most its work had been in the undergraduate arena. He shared his screen showing how UC Online helps students take courses that are not offered on their campus. He remarked that this also improves student time-to-degree. Two campuses, Berkeley and UCSD, do not allow for students to take courses through the intersegmental agreement. In response to questions, Executive Director Moe said that UC Online provides funding from the system to the campuses through block awards, however tuition dollars do not follow the student. Chair Bisley asked what was expected from CCGA; the Executive Director asked for support and advocacy. AVP Jennings remarked that it might be helpful to invite former CCGA Chair Erith Jaffe-Berg to talk to the committee about this topic since she had been working on it and is a strong advocate. Analyst Harms will reach out to Professor Jaffe-Berg to see if she can come to the next meeting.

III. Chair's Report

Chair James Bisley

Chair Bisley stated that he had attended three meetings since the committee last met. The first was Council, which was held in-person in Oakland. The meeting featured an introduction to labor relations, which was detailed and very helpful. Representatives from labor and APP reviewed the key statutes and regulations for PERB and the process for

negotiations and charges, and how they have grown because the composition of the academic workforce that is unionized has grown to 74 percent. He explained that setting expectations and boundaries is part of a normal employer/employee relationship and does not require the union. However, he also mentioned Weingarten Rights, which state that employees have the right to have representation in meetings that could lead to employment discipline. In these meetings, the union representative has certain rights. However, for meetings about academic progress, there are no Weingarten rights, however some departments allow for a moral support person to be present, and this may be a union representative, although they don't have the same rights as in a meeting about employment. Chair Bisley underscored that faculty should always set expectations for these sorts of meetings. He noted that it is sometimes nearly impossible to distinguish between what is academic work and what is employment. He is going to ask if he can get the labor relations slide deck from Council to share with others. President Drake came to Council and spoke primarily about campus climate and was asked about the increasing healthcare/insurance costs. He gave a detailed answer: during the pandemic, fewer people went to the doctor, so premiums were lower. After the pandemic, there was rebound. UCOP is doing its best to mitigate the problem, but it is not something it can control. Board Chair Janet Riley visited and talked about her priorities, which include campus climate, the health enterprise, and advocacy and outreach. Quite a few Council members asked about her views on graduate education. Chair Riley acknowledged that the Regents did not know about it and would be interested in hearing more.

A second meeting the Chair attended was with ICAS (the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates) featuring discussion on how doctoral program proposals from the CSU will be reviewed by UC. He was asked how CCGA conducts program reviews, and the CSU representatives said they should do something similar in their system.

Finally, Chair Bisley discussed the APC workgroup on developing a single systemwide academic calendar. The President, Provost, and chancellors are thinking of moving all the campuses to the semester system and that was obvious in the original charge. There was considerable pushback from the faculty, and now the charge has been reconfigured. However, it is still written that it is predetermined that UC will go to common calendar. The workgroup is jointly chaired by an administrative and Senate member. The administrative co-chair remarked that the change likely would not be happening in the near future. The UCPB chair asked repeatedly if this change is the best use of University resources. This was not met with a positive response. The undergraduate student representative felt strongly about staying on the quarter system; there is no graduate representative at this time. The Chair said that the Provost soon will be sending a letter updating the faculty on what is happening with the workgroup.

IV. Vice Chair's Report

Vice Chair Partho Ghosh

The Vice Chair said that he attended the UCACC meeting, and there was not much overlap with graduate education. It focused primarily on cyber-security and research data backup systems. He also attended CoGD, which focused considerable time on [Calbridge](#), which works to get historically underrepresented groups into PhD programs in

STEM fields with the goal of getting them into the professoriate. The program is in dire straits with regard to funding.

Vice Chair Ghosh has also been working with UCPB regarding SSGPDPs that are not self-supporting and how to determine if they are being funded with state dollars. The chancellors have to certify that the programs are self-supporting or that they are being supported by allowable funds. At this time, a specific program that may be operating with state funds is not known.

V. Council of Graduate Deans' Report

Dean Peter Biehl, UCSC

Dean Biehl discussed Calbridge and how it will soon run out of funding. He said that the graduate deans reluctantly cannot add funds to this fellowship. The program will run out of money in two years, and a decision must be made when to stop the program in order not to have cohorts running out of funds for professional development. The graduate deans asked Calbridge for placement data and time-to-degree for the past 10 years and they were not able to provide that. AVP Jennings added that it is a difficult situation. Calbridge has had significant NSF support for many years, as well as funding from the state and UCOP. Dean Biehl added that circumstances would be different if UC had continuous state support, which would give the graduate deans more ability to help. Members had many questions for Dean Biehl regarding Calbridge.

Separately, the Dean informed the group that the graduate deans are coming to UCOP to discuss how to educate the Regents, the legislature, and representatives in DC about the importance of graduate education. The first meeting is with the interim Senior VP of External Relations and Communications to learn about what outreach they are doing and how the graduate deans can partner with them to advance the mission of graduate education. The graduate deans also will be meeting the CFO to learn about the short- and long-term outlooks for graduate education. They then will be meeting with the President and labor relations and the VP for Research and Innovation. Finally, the graduate deans intend to revive the graduate student research day in Sacramento.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Steven W. Cheung, Academic Senate Chair

Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Senate Vice Chair

Senate Chair Cheung remarked that the Chair of the Board of Regents came to the last Council meeting, and she was informed that graduate students have not received the same level of attention as undergraduates by the legislature and the Board of Regents. The prior provost, Michael Brown, had initiatives to address this matter, but they did not move as far as he had hoped; the Senate leadership is working hard to push them forward. Board Chair Riley is very interested in showcasing the work of the University, and perhaps there are things from graduate education that she can share.

The MOP has been depleted much more rapidly than anticipated. MOPs do not require the usual 20 percent down payment, and they give faculty an opportunity to purchase their first home. The uptake on the MOP went from 30-70 percent over the past couple of

years when mortgage rates have been high. The allocations, which are based on prior usage, got depleted and due to the high interest rates, and the ability to sell the loans to replenish the program became stagnant. Chair Cheung had a meeting with the principals of the loan program and learned that the University should be expecting another \$100M to support the MOP and that those allocations will go out in the same formulation that they have in the past. There was an interesting thought from that meeting that perhaps the investment office could take the cash flows from the MOP and assetize them so that MOP would be self-funded. This has been raised to the task force for investments and they will take it up with the CIO.

Chair Cheung informed the group that the University currently has a number of senior leadership searches ongoing, including for the new president. He chairs the Academic Advisory Council for the presidential search, and he met with the Special Committee that is in charge of the search. The committee and Council developed a list of desirable qualities and qualifications for the new president, and those were provided those to the Regents. The Regents will use those to develop a list of criteria, which will be given to a search firm. The vice provost of APP position is open and there is already a robust pool; Provost Newman would like the new person in place by April/May. The associate vice provost of UCEAP position is also open, and two senate members from UCIE have been appointed to the search committee. The search for the new chancellor of UCSB is underway, and the search for a new chancellor for Riverside will start soon.

The congress on HSIs was last weekend; seven of the nine undergraduate campuses have been designated has HSIs. There is a lot of interest in bringing Berkeley and Los Angeles into that cohort.

Senate Vice Chair Palazoglu remarked that the workgroup on calendar alignment (transitioning all campuses to the semester system) met for the first time last week and had a thorough discussion centered around the workgroup charge which has evolved quite a bit, due in part to significant input from the Senate. The Senate wants to ensure that the study is perceived as agnostic about the costs/benefits about any calendar shift. Meetings will continue through February, whereupon a report will be issued for 90-day systemwide review. The workgroup is scheduled to continue through June. Chair Cheung noted that there is another workgroup to review the language of APM 015-016. This workgroup has two objectives and two deliverables. For the first, the consensus is that 015 and 016 do not need revision but perhaps some implementation guidelines. The second piece is to address faculty opposition revisions to APM 016 regarding the handling of simultaneous misconduct investigations and personnel actions for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The revision proposed the institution of an automatic pause to advancement. That consideration carries a presumption of guilt which is unacceptable to most faculty. That will be taken up in the spring. The AI workgroup is being chaired by former Senate chair Steintrager. It is fully empaneled, and the first meeting is scheduled for mid-November. The Provost and Professor Steintrager are interested in surveying the entire faculty to get a baseline assessment of faculty perspectives on the use of generative AI tools. They would be helped by a consultant to help protect against bias. Finally, the workgroup on doctoral education is completing the final phase of its report, which will be issued soon.

The CSU system would like to move forward with offering doctoral degree programs that would be non-duplicative of UC doctoral programs. The framework for assessing non-duplication is shaping up to be modeled after the California Community College baccalaureate degree program process.

The UC systemwide survey has closed and once the analysis has been completed, the findings will be disseminated. The total remuneration and benefit study is being handled by UCOP HR and Chair Cheung is working to help empanel a small advisory group to monitor vendor performance and methodology. This study will be compared against the study that was done 10 years ago and make sure that the comparators are suitable.

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

VII. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Pamela Jennings, Associate Vice Provost for 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

AVP Jennings discussed the congress on Hispanic Serving institutions (HSIs). She said that it was a productive use of time and thoughtful. At the congress, Davis and San Diego announced that they had met the threshold to be designated as HSIs. Also of recent note was the celebration of the fortieth anniversary for the President's Postdoctoral Doctoral Fellowship (PDFP), which is a national model. She added that the deadline for UC-HSI Doctoral Diversity Initiative faculty grants is November 22, and the graduate fellowship applications are due in February 2025. These funds are meant to support students coming from any HSI in California and facilitate their efforts to get in the professoriate. The UC-HBCU RFP will come out this month as well.

Director Corona updated the group on the recent audit of the Online Program Management companies. In June 2024, a report was issued that had some concerns with transparency, inconsistent oversight, and contractual concerns with regard to SSGPDPs. Her office is putting guidelines and policies in place and has convened a broad workgroup to have them ready by June 2025.

Executive Advisor Greenspan remarked that his office is staffing the APC workgroup on converting the system to semesters, which is an intensive undertaking. Separately, the campuses will be sending their fall enrollment figures this week, which he will share in December. His office has also asked the campuses to submit their 2025-26 enrollment plans so that OP can submit a plan to the legislature and the governor. Relatedly, a report on UC's progress on achieving the governor's compact will be coming out shortly. He noted that the legislature is somewhat familiar with the University's professional schools, but they are not well-informed about graduate education writ large. In the last decade or so, they have only funded undergraduate enrollment. They need to be encouraged to fund graduate education and research.

Analyst Procello discussed a question that had been raised by UCPB regarding SSGPDPs that may not be self-supporting. The concern is that they are not being discontinued, and may be using disallowed funds to stay afloat. He explained that the SSGPDP policy is very specific about the flow of financial information between the programs, the campuses, and UCOP. Executive Advisor Greenspan added that SSGPDPs can use campus funds as long as they are not state funds, and that some campuses have done that. However, the policy is clear that SSGPDPs are supposed to generate funds that help support state-supported programs.

VIII. New Program Proposals

- A. Proposal for a Master of Education Sciences with a Concentration in AI and Learning Analytics from the Irvine Division
Lead Reviewer: Sarita See

The Lead Reviewer commented that the proposers had changed the name of the program and the budget since it was originally submitted. It was originally fully online asynchronous; however, they have revised it slightly to have in-person elements that are required. They also strongly encourage the students to attend the capstone in person. UCPB largely endorsed the original proposal, but had some concerns, as well as suggestions for what should be focused on for the mandatory third-year review. The Lead Reviewer was able to secure five reviewers, and the proposers have responded to them. The committee decided that the proposal should go back to UCPB for re-review due to the change in budget.

- B. Proposal for a Part-Time MS in Global Health Sciences from the San Francisco Division
Lead Reviewer: Chad Saltikov

The Lead Reviewer explained that the master's degree is already in place and that it is geared toward clinicians. There are questions about clarity of the proposal, and the proposers did not provide a course plan. The proposers conducted a student survey, which was not strongly in favor of the proposal; students felt it was expensive and not very satisfying. CCGA will wait on the review from UCPB.

- C. Proposal for an MAS in Precision Medicine Therapeutics in Oncology from the San Diego Division [SSGPDP]
Lead Reviewer: Eleonora Grandi

The Lead Reviewer has secured four reviewers and received two reports back that were very positive. The Lead Reviewer hopes to have the remaining two reports within a week or so.

- D. Proposal for a Master of Urban Studies and Regional Planning from the San Diego Division [PDST]
Lead Reviewer: John Abatzoglou

The Lead Reviewer was not present.

- E. Proposal for a PhD in Urban Studies and Planning from the San Diego Division
Lead Reviewer: Alex Simms

The Lead Reviewer is working on this proposal in conjunction with the Lead Reviewer on the MURP (above). They have four reviews secured and two reports back. The two reviewers are generally positive with a few questions. Reviewers thought the quality of the faculty is high. One committee member raised the question of no language requirement despite UCSD being close to the Mexico/US border. The Lead Reviewer will follow up.

- F. Proposal for an *en Route* MS from the PhD in Astronomy from the San Diego Division
Lead Reviewer: Ilan Adler

The Lead Reviewer reported that this program seems to be already advertising online as an exit degree. Analyst Harms will check the website and follow up with the campus.

- G. Proposal for an *en Route* MA in Logic and the Methodology of Science from the Berkeley Division
Lead Reviewer: April Thames

The Lead Reviewer commented that she had contacted the proposers about language that seemed to indicate a terminal degree, and the proposers changed the language.

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

IX. Transfers, Name Changes, Consolidations, and Discontinuances

- A. Proposal for a Simple Name Change from the MAS in Clinical and Epidemiologic Research to the MS in Clinical and Epidemiological Research from the San Francisco Division

Chair Bisley stated that he had raised the concern that the MS and MAS are different degrees, and that the committee analyst had reached out to campus to make sure that the requirements are the same.

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

X. Senate MRU Reviews

- A. [UC Observatories](#)

Action Taken: Wayne Steward will serve as the liaison to UCORP for this proposal.

- B. [Bioengineering Institute of California](#)
UCORP Liaison: Partho Ghosh

XI. Statement About Graduate Education

Chair James Bisley

After some discussion, Professor Williams-Bradford agreed to edit the document based on feedback from the group.

XII. Systemwide Information and Items Under Systemwide Review

A. [Proposed SR 627 \(Posthumous Awarding of Degrees\)](#)

Professor Grandi expressed a desire for more inclusive and compassionate language to better incorporate students who may not be in good academic standing at the time of their death. Professor Williams-Bradford, who helped draft the policy, noted that a student may be involved in something harmful to others (e.g., a mass shooting or murder/suicide) and that each set of circumstances would need to be evaluated individually. Professor Steward noted that a more direct reference needs to be made to routine approvals of such degrees; the current language only mentions exceptions.

Analyst Harms will update the letter based on the discussion.

XIII. Campus and Student Reports

Members and the student representatives commented on issues related to graduate education from their divisions.

XIV. New Business

The committee discussed the presentation from UC Online and agreed to have Professor Jaffe-Berg come in December to more clearly explain the relevance to graduate education.

XV. Executive Session

No minutes are taken during executive session.

The committee adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst

Attest: James Bisley, Committee Chair