

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, September 26, 2018

Members Attending in Person: Onyebuchi Arah (Chair), Nancy Peluso (UCB), Priya Ranjan (UCI), Caroline Streeter (UCLA), LeRoy Westerling (UCM), Lynn Russell (UCSD) Amr El Abbadi (UCSB),

Members Attending via Videoconference: Teamrat Ghezzehei (UCM), Hyle Park (UCR), Dyche Mullins (UCSF), Gina Dent (UCSC)

Also in Attendance: Fredye Harms (Analyst), Arthur Ellis (Consultant), Pamela Jennings (Consultant), Chris Procello (Consultant), Marjorie Zatz (Consultant)

- I.** Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes of the August 15, 2018 videoconference.
Action Taken: *The agenda and minutes of August 2018 were approved as noticed.*

II. Chair's Report - Chair Onyebuchi Arah

The Chair provided the Committee with an overview of CCGA's bylaw and its function. He commented that it is a foundational committee and is one of the most important for the Senate. He recommended that members become familiar with the Handbook and with the Compendium, which had been distributed (electronically) before the meeting.

The Chair noted that most CCGA business is related to the review of program proposals from the campuses. However CCGA also reviews other business related to graduate students, graduate funding, and systemwide Senate business. The committee discussed the need for multi-year funding for graduate students and for an adequate level for that funding. Grants can be very limited. The Committee agreed to look at this issue in the year ahead. Other issues the Committee would like tackle in the year ahead included self-supporting programs or SSGPDPs (in terms of impact, review process, and lessons learned so far), student mental health and well-being, and faculty mentoring of graduate students. The Committee suggested discussing the issue of SSGPDPs with the Senate leadership soon.

III. Announcements from Academic Affairs

Art Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
Pamela Jennings, Executive Director of Graduate Studies
Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst

Analyst Procello shared copies of his document showing the proposal review process and the stages proposals are in currently. He discussed the three big stages of the process: approval at campus, approval by Senate, and approval by Provost and President.

Executive Director Jennings explained that she is with Graduate Studies and that her department works closely with the Council of Graduate Deans and OGD and other bodies to advance graduate education. A main area of focus is the academic pipeline, and she discussed the UC/HBCU initiative. She also mentioned the department's similar efforts with Hispanic Serving Institutions and the CSUs. Her department also on outreach and advocacy, with efforts in Washington DC and

Sacramento. She particularly noted the success of Grad Slam and the excitement and focus it brings to the topic of graduate education.

Vice President Ellis mentioned the National Academies Report that talked about graduate STEM education in the 20th Century. Highlighted were the lack of representation of women and URMs. He also mentioned that NSF has recently issued some guidelines in response to sexual harassment cases and has stated that as soon as there is a start of an investigation, they want to know about it. The Committee discussed the issue. The Vice President also raised the issue of academic espionage and the theft of intellectual property. This can be very complicated with regard to sensitive information, international agreements and international students (VISAs, etc.). UC has been meeting with FBI representatives to talk about ways to address these concerns and not completely disrupt the University's systems or cause needless anxiety.

IV. Proposal Review Process

- Chair Onyebuchi Arah

The Chair explained that the first step in proposal review is to assign a Lead Reviewer. He explained that members do not need to review proposals exclusively from their own areas of expertise. It is possible to look at the broad contours of a program without having great information about the details. Once the proposal is assigned, time is of the essence. External and internal reviews must be sought and secured. External reviewers receive a stipend for their work; UC reviewers do not. This year, the Senate has increased the stipend with the proviso that reviewers complete their work within two weeks. It is hoped that this change will significantly reduce the amount of time reviewers take, which has been problematic in the past. Reviewers should also know that their reviews may be kept anonymous if they prefer. Once the reviews are completed, the Lead Reviewer determines if changes need to be made to (or questions asked about) the proposal. Any comments from the reviewers and the proposers are then brought to the committee by the Lead Reviewer who either recommends committee approval or other action.

The chair emphasized the need to be as expeditious as possible with proposal reviews while maintaining a thoughtful and solid review process.

V. New Program Proposals

All program proposals are posted to [CCGA's SharePoint site](#).

- A. Proposal to establish an MA in Global Health on the San Diego Campus – *Lead Reviewer Glen Mimura* –

The proposal is still under review.

- B. Proposal to establish an MS/PhD in Communication on the Los Angeles Campus – *Lead Reviewer Shahrokh Yadegari*

The proposal is still under review.

- C. Proposal to establish a Master of Bioprocess Engineering on the Berkeley Campus [SSGPDP] – *Lead Reviewer Teamrat Ghezzehei*

One internal and two external reviews have been secured; most of the comments were positive. The proposers responded to concerns, but UCPB also has some questions about funding. The proposal raised questions about SSGPDP and traditional programs- are students being comingled? The proposers have responded, but there are still questions remaining. The Lead Reviewer will contact them and seek resolution of the problematic areas. The current answers are not convincing.

- D. Proposal to establish a MS in Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology on the Santa Cruz Campus – *Lead Reviewer Dyche Mullins*
Four reviewers have been secured; all promised to get their reviews in before the next meeting. The campus has had an MA for a long time. The proposal seems pretty straightforward; a lot of the infrastructure for the program is already present.
- E. Proposal to establish a MS/PhD in Bioengineering on the Merced Campus
– *Lead Reviewer Hyle Park*
Two external reviews have been secured and one internal review. The proposal is written well, and is strong, but there has been difficulty securing a second internal reviewer. One of the primary concerns is that bioengineering is a broad field. All the coursework is very specialized. It wasn't quite spelled out how the bioengineering department would connect to other medical schools since there is not one at UCM. The committee decided to move forward without a second review.
Action taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-1.
- F. Proposal to establish a MS/PhD in Materials and Biomaterials Science and Engineering on the Merced Campus
– *Lead Reviewer Greta Hsu*
The lead reviewer's report was submitted and it recommended committee approval
Action taken: The proposal was approved 9-0-1.
- G. Proposal to establish an MS in Biostatistics on the San Diego Campus
– *Lead Reviewer Karen Duderstadt*
This proposal is still under review.
- H. Proposal to establish an Interdepartmental Program in Biophysics for the MA/PhD degrees on the Riverside Campus.
Action Taken: Carlson Arnett was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- I. Proposal to establish a Masters in Supply Chain and Logistics Management on the Riverside Campus [SSGPDP]
Action Taken: Leroy Westerling was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- J. Proposal to establish a joint Entomology BS/MS Five-Year Combined Degree program on the Riverside Campus
Action Taken: Caroline Streeter was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- K. Proposal to establish a MS/PhD in Management of Complex Systems at the Merced Campus –
Lead Reviewer Onyebuchi Arah
This proposal is under review. The Lead Reviewer hopes to be able to vote in November.
- L. Proposal to establish a MFA in Environmental Art and Social Practice at the Santa Cruz Campus
Action Taken: Nancy Peluso was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- M. Proposal to establish a Master of Engineering at the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]
Action Taken: Lynn Russell was assigned as Lead Reviewer.
- N. Proposal to establish a Master of Presentation Design at the Irvine Campus [SSGPDP]
Action Taken: Hyle Park was assigned as Lead Reviewer.

O. Proposal to establish a PhD in Language Science at the Irvine Campus

Action Taken: *Gina Dent was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

P. Proposal to establish an MS in Natural Language Processing at the Santa Cruz Campus

Action Taken: *Amr El Abbadi was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

Q. Proposal to establish an Online MBA Program on the Davis Campus [SSGPDP]

Action Taken: *Priya Ranjan was assigned as Lead Reviewer.*

VI. Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishments, and Discontinuances

All program proposals are posted to [CCGA's SharePoint site](#).

A. Proposal for a Name Change from an MS/PhD in Civil Engineering to an MS/PhD in Civil and Environmental Engineering on the Irvine Campus

Action taken: *The name change was approved 9-0-1.*

VII. UC-Mexico Program Consolidation Proposal

The Chair explained that this is a one-time expedited review requested by the Provost and the President. The materials had been distributed before the meeting and feedback requested by the Chair. The committee discussed the proposal at length and agreed on feedback that should be given as CCGA's review.

Action Taken: *The Chair agreed to write a letter on behalf of CCGA and forward it to the Provost for inclusion of systemwide review.*

VIII. Updates from the Campuses

The campuses did not have much to report since the year had just begun. There will be more updates in the following months.

The meeting adjourned at 3:44.