

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
MEETING MINUTES – APRIL 3, 2013**

Present: Ruth Mulnard (Chair), Donald Mastronarde (Vice Chair), Divyakant Agrawal (UCSB), Jutta Heckhausen (UCI), Ari Kelman (UCD), Valerie Leppert (UCM), Joseph Nagy (UCLA), Kwai Ng (UCSD), Martin Olsson (UCB), Bruce Schumm (UCSC), Youngho Seo (UCSF), Michael Vanderwood (UCR), Matthew Gorlick (Student Representative-UCLA), Charles Saenz (Student Representative-UCSD), Robert Powell (Council Chair), William Jacob (Council Vice Chair), Eric Zarate (Committee Analyst), Consultant Pamela Jennings. Guests Todd Giedt and Tyrus Miller.

I. Chair's Report/Announcement/Updates

- March 11 UCORP/CCGA Meeting in Sacramento with LAOs
Vice Chair Mastronarde explained that CCGA joined with other UC advocates in Sacramento to meet with a number of leadership representatives including governor's office staff, representatives from the Senate, and the governor's education adviser. Most of the meeting was devoted to the enthusiastic presentation of what research means at UC. Conversely, most of the subsequent discussion focused on undergraduate education; approximately 10 minutes were devoted to graduate education. State representatives suggested that the University plan to make similar presentations annually to ensure that new members are informed about UC's issues. Professor Mastronarde informed the committee that CCGA will have a more extensive meeting in Sacramento next year and that graduate issues will be better addressed at that time.

Chair Mulnard added that the Academic Council had shared the four handouts that UCORP made for the Sacramento meeting: UC Research Challenges, UC Research Highlights, UC Research Impacts, and Research as a Central Mission at the University of California. She distributed copies to the committee and stated that they would be uploaded to SharePoint. She noted that they were good summary documents that could be used in many instances.

- March 22 UCOP Budget Call Meeting
Vice Chair Mastronarde stated that the Senate Budget Subcommittee hearing generally went well, however concerns about performance standards were voiced. The Department of Finance is working with an unspecified party on the standards; the primary concern is that the standards will be CSU-based and not appropriate for UC.

A trailer in one of the budget bills asks for all of the segments of higher education to provide the cost-per-campus for undergraduate and graduate research. Such an undertaking would place a huge administrative burden on the University.

Professor Mastronarde explained that the governor does not want any earmarks in the University's budget except for his earmark for online education. The Subcommittee is not amenable to that proposal as it has had earmarks in the UC budget previously. The Subcommittee voted against the governor's proposal for a unit cap.

According to projections, the revenue coming into the state is approximately \$5B more than what was anticipated in January.

There is tremendous concern regarding SB 520 (Steinberg) which would mandate that third-party courses to be accepted for UC credit. The Academic Senate is vehemently opposed to this bill and is hoping that changes will be made to it. SB 547 (Block) poses a different request

about online education: it states that the three segments of higher education should cooperate in creating online courses at all three institutions. The details of this bill are yet to be seen.

The group conferred about performance expectations and the difficulty with tracking students in California. It is especially hard to track students in K-12, the community colleges, and CSU, all of which have students who come and go fairly frequently. The future of this issue is unclear at this time.

Lastly, the group discussed UCPATH. The executive vice chancellors are not comfortable with the benefit rates that are currently in the proposal and want changes to be made. They are concerned that there could be a danger of more benefit costs being applied to the general fund and fewer on the auxiliary fund. The Academic Senate is arguing that the process needs to start over again – that the model developed by the consultant was flawed from the beginning and does not seem to be “fixable.” However, there may not be time to start over.

- March 27 Academic Council Meeting

A strategic decision was made to pull main item about academic efficiency and faculty workload from the Regents’ March agenda.

The Senate has taken robust action against SB 520 (Steinberg). Heretofore, Senate President pro Tem Steinberg has been a friend to UC; it was very alarming when he put forward this bill. SB 547 language is very vague and includes elements regarding statutorily enacted course approval.

The remuneration study that the Senate was pressing to have redone has now been approved and will move forward. This study will closely examine faculty and staff salaries and benefit comparisons with UC competitors.

SB 259, regarding the unionization of graduate students, is up again; UC is likely to oppose it. The bill did pass last year and then was vetoed by the governor. UC thinks it is in a better position this year to oppose it and establish a stronger position with the students, because the University has approved a systemwide childcare plan for graduate students, which was one of the main issues of the bill.

Provost Dorr spoke about the \$10M online initiative carved out of our budget by the governor; the Provost is moving forward with it and assuming the University will have that money on an ongoing basis. Two workshops will take place on April 13 -- one in southern California and one in northern California -- to discuss online education. The groups will communicate by teleconference in the afternoon. An RFP for the online initiative that will be funded by a portion of the \$10M will be coming out shortly. It is believed that a large chunk of the \$10M will be for IT infrastructure across the campuses.

The presidential search is on track and has a strong advisory group with representatives from each campus. Similarly, the nomination for the next Academic Council vice chair has been determined. Professor Mary Gilly from the Irvine campus won the nomination. That nomination will be moving forward to the UC Assembly.

- March 28 Academic Planning Council iLinc Meeting

Provost Dorr understands that the the PDST revision and the SSP policy are intimately related, and would like the groups working on them to cross-reference each other to ensure there are no inconsistencies.

On the whole, things are moving in a positive direction. Everyone now agrees that conversions should be a very infrequent and uncommon occurrence. That said, no one is yet willing to address the issue of how many new SSPs UC should have and their rapid proliferation as of late. The PDST Task Force is continuing to move through the policy. The Task Force is a large group and is student dominated. Student Representative Matthew Gorlick will report back to the committee at the next meeting.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: *Members approved the agenda; the draft minutes were not available.*

III. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for review

A. Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Political Science at UC Merced

Professor Ng said that he is in the process of getting a fourth reviewer, and hopes to be ready soon.

B. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in the Interdisciplinary Humanities for the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees at UC Merced

Professor Shumm indicated that he also is missing a last reviewer. He is going to ask for reviews by the middle of May.

C. Proposal to Establish a Graduate Program Leading to the Ph.D. in Public Health at UC Irvine

Reviewers have been secured, and are proceeding in an efficient manner.

D. Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to the Master of Information and Data Science (MIDS) at UC Berkeley

Professor Agrawal has most reviewers in place for this proposal, and discussed some concerns he had with the committee.

E. A Proposal for a Graduate Program Leading to the M.S. Degree in Games and Playable Media at UC Santa Cruz

ACTION: *Members approved the proposal for a Graduate Program leading to the M.S. Degree in Games and Playable Media at UC Santa Cruz.*

IV. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs

Graduate Studies Director Pamela Jennings noted that her office is working with the communications department to highlight the GSR benefit. There is some difference from campus to campus as to how it is being implemented. Davis and UCSF are offering it to all graduate students, but most campuses feel that they cannot do that at this time. Some campuses are going to implement it as soon as this fall.

The graduate deans and the graduate students have continued their advocacy efforts in Sacramento. They have received clearance to request a meeting with the governor, and are hoping to set up a direct meeting between him and graduate students in the near future.

V. Updates/Inquiries from the Divisional Senates

A. UC Irvine: Name Change Request for Graduate Program in Environmental Technology

ACTION: *Members approved the Name Change Request for Graduate Program in Environmental Technology at UC Irvine.*

B. UCLA: Recent Campus Enforcement of the *In Absentia* Policy at UCLA

Professor Nagy informed the committee regarding UCLA's *in absentia* practices and asked how other campuses handle the situation. Since 2009, the Office of the President's policy is that leaves of absence for graduate students can no longer to be granted for academic reasons. Nevertheless, UCLA continued the preexisting policy of leaves of absence if a good argument was made by the student. UCLA's new dean of the graduate division is now enforcing the UCOP policy. In response, the GSA passed a resolution and presented it to the dean asking for academic leave to remain. The *in absentia* policy, which remains in place, is valid only for activities outside of California. The committee discussed the campuses' various practices and the possibility of considering a time (as opposed to geographical) limit on the *in absentia* policy. Also discussed was the concern of insurance liability for graduate students in relation to the policy. It was agreed that the graduate deans should discuss the situation and determine how it should be resolved.

C. UC Merced: Name Change Request for Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics IIGP Emphasis to Mechanical Engineering IIGP Emphasis

ACTION: *Members approved the Name Change Request for Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics IIGP Emphasis to Mechanical Engineering IIGP Emphasis at UC Merced.*

D. UC Merced: Name Change Request for Physics and Chemistry IIGP Emphasis to Physics IIGP Emphasis

ACTION: *Members approved the Name Change Request for Physics and Chemistry IIGP Emphasis to Physics IIGP Emphasis at UC Merced.*

E. UCSB "Simple" Name Change Request for the M.S. and Ph.D. in Geological Sciences and Proposed Discontinuation of the M.S. in Geophysics

ACTION: *Members approved the "Simple" Name Change Request for the M.S. and Ph.D. in Geological Sciences and Proposed Discontinuation of the M.S. in Geophysics at UC Santa Barbara.*

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Academic Senate leadership met with Senate President pro Tem Steinberg about the bill he has put forward (SB 520) regarding online courses between UC, CSU, and the community colleges. Senator Steinberg was not pleased with UC's opposition to the bill, which will be heard by the Senate Education Committee on April 24. SB 547 (Block) proposes that each of the three entities create their own online courses for their students. UC is not vocally opposing this bill.

UC is waiting on the May revise of the governor's budget. If the University is not allowed to restructure its debt, it will have difficulty surviving the tuition freeze put in place by the governor. In addition, several new tuition freeze bills are being proposed that the University plans to oppose. The connection between tuition and access remains a difficult argument to convey to the state.

Regent Chair Sherri Lansing has voiced dubious concern regarding faculty workload. The Provost met with her to explain the difference between the number of courses and student credit hours.

A huge enrollment management effort is being put forth systemwide. Its two major foci are the Master Plan and funding streams. Non-resident enrollment also plays a part. The Senate has been concerned about enrollment management for quite some time.

Executive Vice President Brostrom has expressed enthusiasm for restructuring the UCOP tax.

VII. Draft PDST Policy Revision

Chair Mulnard explained that the copy of the PDST policy seen by the committee is currently being modified by the PDST Task Force. Both the PDST and SSP groups are trying to be clear about separating policy from implementation guidelines. Current policy holds that there is always a return to aid. The issue of financial aid is being examined closely by UCOP for both PDSTs and SSPs. Some SSPs are developed for very discrete programs that will be 100 percent employer-supported; not all will necessarily have return to aid. The committee discussed the issue of SSPs and accessibility/financial aid at length. Also discussed were the annual reviews by the Regents, professional versus non-professional degrees, and the possibility of WASC implications.

Chair Mulnard stated that the revision viewed by the committee did not reflect the two-hour iLinc meeting held to discuss it. She shared with the committee the general outcomes of that meeting. A strong area of agreement was that the rationale for a SSP cannot be purely financial. Also, newly-approved SSPs should be reviewed just as any other proposal would be.

Much of the discussion surrounded conversions. It was determined that new programs and conversions will be required to have a letter of support from the campus stating where the burden of that program will fall if it should fail as an SSP. State funds cannot be used to finalize the program if it closes. In addition, conversions that have a change in their academic program will need to undergo review like a new proposal.

Chair Mulnard stated that the work on the PDSTs and SSPs is moving forward fairly quickly and will be reviewed by the campuses and by the Academic Senate committees.

VIII. Draft SSP Policy Revision

This topic was discussed in conjunction with Item VII.

IX. New Business

There was no New Business.

X. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest: Ruth Mulnard, CCGA Chair
Prepared by: Fredye Harms, Committee Analyst