I. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

*Action Requested: The agenda and minutes were approved as noticed 10-0-0.*

II. Chair’s Report

*Chair Dean Tantillo*

The Chair reported that he went to a budget meeting and learned that some bills had been vetoed with regard to “sympathy strikes,” where one union strikes in solidarity with another union. In other news, the governor seems committed to the five percent increase for the University; this will likely be accompanied by more pressure on faculty hiring.

At Academic Council, the Provost said that she has enlisted a consultant who has been engaging in confidential interviews with hopes of improving the collective bargaining next time around. Chair Tantillo attended one of those meetings and said that the consultant seemed willing to listen to feedback. President Drake made considerable comments on the situation in the Middle East, campus safety, and mental health services.

The Future of Graduate Education Workgroup has been meeting and is debating existential questions. The bottom line is that more funding is needed. There was discussion about seeking funds from industry because nothing of note will be coming from UC or the state. Many of the solutions seemed to suggest reducing the number of graduate students as TAs and using undergraduate students. The Workgroup has divided into three subcommittees; Chair Tantillo is in charge of one on graduate student mentoring issues. The other two subcommittees are studying graduate student career preparation and the redesign of graduate curriculum.

Members had some questions for the Chair.

III. Vice Chair’s Report

*Vice Chair James Bisley*

The Vice Chair reported that he had attended an all-day meeting of the CoGD in Oakland where the group was able to talk with the labor relations team at OP. Labor relations is aware that there needs to be better communication and better coordination regarding bargaining going forward. They (labor relations) said that they are going to push to ensure negotiations are handled better than they were last year. CoGD is unhappy with many things that the negotiators agreed to in the bargaining process. Those will be difficult to remove now that they have been incorporated. The “top up” issue remains ambiguous, and therefore can be renegotiated fairly easily. Vice Chair
Bisley noted that some campuses are “pushing back” on issues that have been negotiated which is problematic. If these issues were to come before PERB, the decision would not be in favor of the campus, because the issue has been bargained and settled. In addition, such campus-based actions fracture the system, which needs to be operating as a unit in this arena. OP needs to take some deliberate action to let the campuses know what is – and is not – settled.

Enrollment numbers were discussed and there was acknowledgement that the University needs to have some flexibility with regard to graduate student enrollment over the next few years. The governor’s compact states that UC will grow 2,500 graduate students over the next four years, but enrollment numbers have declined. The campus multi-year plans will be out in March, and at that time, the University can determine if it will need to re-negotiate with the governor.

Representatives from Academic Affairs weighed in with some comments and members had questions.

IV. CoGD Report
Dean Jean-Pierre Delplanque

Dean Delplanque was not at the meeting due to a conflict.

V. Proposed Policy on Awarding Degrees Posthumously
James Bisley (Vice Chair) and Tonya Williams Bradford (UCI)

Professor Williams Bradford explained that the group wanted to ensure that it articulated the purpose of the policy to make sure that the university as a whole extended its sympathy in the event of the death of a student. UCEP looked at the proposed language and suggested three small changes. The group also specified that the diploma should be a “standard” one and should not be marked or identified as being posthumous in any way.

Action Taken: The committee voted to approve the proposed language 10-0-0.

VI. 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

Executive Advisor Greenspan remarked that his office has received the fall enrollment figures. Graduate student numbers declined on a year-over-year basis by about 1500, of which 500-600 were academic PhDs. About two-thirds of the doctoral decline was new doctoral students; last year there was also a new doctoral student decline, so the second- and third-year classes will be smaller. Undergraduate students grew by close to 6500, but the legislature’s target was 8000. There is a question if the nine
undergraduate campuses will each be asked to take 150 more students to make up this deficit. Undergraduate applications just closed, and California applicants are up, particularly from community college students. However, Merced and Riverside were really hurt, and they ended up being under-enrolled.

Analyst Procello told the group that the Five-Year Planning Perspectives for 2024-29 are being kicked off in January. The majority of the material is graduate-related; this will be the first planning cycle following the collective bargaining process. He also informed the committee about the Provost’s upcoming congress (What the Future Holds) on AI in February at UCLA. Finally, he remarked that Academic Affairs is working on a multifaceted strategic plan that will be focused on equity, efficiency and affordability. Most of this plan will be directed at undergraduate students, but there was a mention of creating more 4+1 and 3+2 programs to expand participation in innovation and entrepreneurship. The plan will also look at increasing graduate degree attainment in high-demand workforce fields. This effort will would be related to the compact goals and also to increasing HBCU and HSI enrollment.

AVP Brandt reminded the committee that California has been selected for a hydrogen hub. This is a $1.2B project that UC helped the state win. Most of the impact for the University will be indirect rather than direct. Initially the DOE said that 10 percent of the funding could be used for research, but it later stipulated that no funds could be used for research or proof-of-concept. However at that point, UC was already committed to the project. He remarked that this is in keeping with the University’s values and its service mission, and that there will be a small amount of funding going to Scrips and the Berkeley Laboratory. The University will be doing a tremendous amount of work on this project, that there will be “spin off” research opportunities. Negotiations are underway and funding will probably come through in the summer. In the meantime, UC has been talking with the California Council of Science and Technology about co-sponsoring a seminar on hydrogen research and funding opportunities.

Vice President Maldonado said that the Provost is in the midst of a strategic planning process for Academic Affairs; there is a division-wide town hall next week and the real research goal is around multi-campus efforts. Also laced into that conversation is the role of graduate students. Her office met with the graduate deans for an hour and explained that there are many discussions taking place with regard to graduate students, such as within the CCGA, the CoGD, the VCRs, the National Laboratories, and Academic Personnel. She encouraged CCGA to engage in a two-way dialog with her during her visits.

Members had questions for the Vice President and for other Academic Affairs staff.

The student representatives introduced themselves.

VII. Presentation from the Presidential Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program

Director Mark Lawson, PPFP

Director Lawson explained that the Presidential Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program was established in 1984 to encourage outstanding women and minority PhD recipients to
pursue academic careers at UC. However, in the wake of Proposition 209, the University had to adapt the program to embrace a broader definition of diversity in different disciplines. He shared a slide deck which provided an overview of the program and how it works.

Members had questions for Mr. Lawson, and he shared his contact information for further discussion, questions, and feedback.

VIII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

James Steintrager, Academic Senate Chair
Steven Cheung, Academic Senate Vice Chair

Academic Senate Chair Steintrager started his discussion with the interim report form the APC Workgroup on the Future of Doctoral Education. He said that the group is anxious for feedback on the interim report, and noted that CCGA is an important voice that should be included in that feedback. He had emphasized to the Provost that the work of the group and the report should be acted upon and not simply “filed.”

The Regents met two weeks ago, and the meeting featured considerable public comment on the situation in the Middle East and on related campus climate issues. Chair Steintrager, the President, and the Chair of the Board addressed it. The President’s remarks made reference to a “viewpoint neutral” history of the Middle East, which raised considerable questions regarding academic freedom. These questions were elaborated upon in a letter signed by 150 UC professors. The President then issued a clarification on his remarks; however, some lingering concerns remain. The Senate Chair’s remarks to the Regents initially focused on competitive remuneration, inflationary pressures and employee contributions to the retirement plan. However, they also dealt with freedom of expression in an academic context while stressing the importance of safety for students and faculty.

Senate Vice Chair Cheung reviewed the meeting of the Regent’s Committee on Investments and Finance. He said that the Regents want to increase the employee contribution to UCRP, but those efforts have been staved off by Chair Steintrager and CFO Nathan Brostrom. He observed that there have been large spikes in healthcare premiums, which were partly offset by the recent increase to the base salary level. The Vice Chair said that investment returns have been flat and there has been high volatility in the markets, which will have to be watched closely. On the capital projects front, UCM will be constructing a new medical education building, which was approved with considerable enthusiasm. UCLA will be demolishing and rebuilding a residence hall to accommodate more students.

Chair Steintrager told the committee that the President approved the formation of a joint task force on instructional modalities and UC quality with an eye on online undergraduate degrees. That group hopefully will be starting its work prior to winter
break and will report out at the Provost’s congress in May. A final report is expected by the end of the academic year.
The Academic Council met recently and discussed the creation of a faculty survey on academic labor issues and labor relations. The Provost has brought in a consultant to talk about academic labor relations. The divisional chairs and chairs of systemwide committees met with her online, and more meetings likely will be forthcoming. Council has also formed a working group on AI. Chair Steintrager will be reaching out to committees and divisional chairs to see what they would like to cover in this arena. Obvious concerns about academic integrity and admissions will be addressed.

The Senate Chair closed with comments on political statements on departmental websites. He noted that some Regents are very unhappy about what they are seeing on departmental websites, and they are forming an ad hoc Regents workgroup to look at it; Chair Steintrager will be a part of that group.

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

IX. 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 summarized the program and the four reviews that were received. He explained that the original proposal had several issues with respect to competition within the UC system, curriculum, and the level of support offered by the program. The reviewers responded adequately to these concerns. The committee discussed the proposal at length and decided to approve.
   **Action Taken:** The proposal was approved 8-0-2.

B. Proposal for a Master of Advanced Studies in Physician Assistant Studies on the San Diego Campus [SSGPDP]
   Lead Reviewer: Andrew Fisher

   CCGA is awaiting the report from UCPB before discussing this proposal.

C. Proposal for an MS in Artificial Intelligence and Computational Drug Discovery and Development on the San Francisco Campus [SSGPDP]
   Lead Reviewer: Edmund Campion

   CCGA is awaiting the report from UCPB before voting on this proposal.

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

   The Lead Reviewer was not present.
E. Proposal for a School of Computing, Information, and Data Science on the San Diego Campus
   Lead Reviewer: Chandra Krintz

   The Lead Reviewer remarked that this is a full proposal which follows a pre-proposal that was submitted and approved last year. She has secured three reviewers, two of whom had reviewed the pre-proposal. She hopes to be able to present and vote at the January meeting.

F. Proposal for a Master of Engineering in Medical Device Development from the Davis Campus
   Action Taken: Tonya Williams Bradford was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

X. Campus Reports

   Members reported on campus issues related to graduate student affairs.

XI. New Business
   • Analyst Harms will continue working to get sample 299 syllabi posted on the CCGA website.
   • Members should come prepared in January with comments on the Interim Report on the Future of Graduate Education. Analyst Harms will resend the document.
   • Analyst Harms will circulate a poll regarding a possible in-person meeting in the second half of the year.

XII. Executive Session

   No minutes are taken during Executive Session.

The committee adjourned at 2:34 p.m.