

**Minutes of Meeting**

Wednesday, October 7, 2015

**Item****I. Consent Calendar**

## A. Approval of the Agenda

***Action Taken:*** *The agenda was approved with the addition of the Provost at noon to discuss the VP ORGS position.*

**II. Chair's Welcome and Report**

## Welcome and Introductions

Members and the Chair briefly introduced themselves. Via an informal vote, it was determined to return to holding the meetings from 10am – 4pm, throughout the rest of the year.

## Overview of Committee Charge and Processes

The Chair acquainted members with CCGA, particularly with the changes that have come about in recent years. She explained that OP review after CCGA approval is taking more time now than previously. Chair Leppert also talked about the tremendous increase in the number of SSGPDP proposals, and how their number and concerns about them have impacted what had been the “standard” CCGA practice. She stated that CCGA is most concerned about the impact of overload teaching on the traditional academic programs and if the University should consider alternative ways to staff the SSGPDPs. She noted that Lead Reviewers should be sure to include UCPB comments in their final reports on proposed SSGPDPs.

The Chair emphasized the need for Lead Reviewers to communicate promptly and thoroughly with the proposers throughout the process, including once proposals have been approved and the review closed. Internal and external reviewers should be identified right away. Chair Leppert stated that it is a good strategy to approach more people than you need, as not all potential reviewers will accept (or even respond) or return reviews. She encouraged members to refer to the [Handbook](#). She said that members should work to have their reviews back in two months for discussion. Sometimes the reviews will contradict each other, in which case more reviews may be needed, as well as more extensive committee discussion to come to a consensus on next steps for the program proposal.

## Travel Reimbursement Guidelines

Mona Hsieh visited the committee and discussed the forms and requirements for travel reimbursement.

**III. Announcements from the President's Office, Academic Affairs**

Director Jennings circulated *What's Next* and a one-page hand out on graduate studies. She encouraged members to contact her if they had questions or needed information. She also spoke about UC [Grad Slam](#), a contest that challenges UC graduate students to summarize their research in just three minutes. It was hosted by the President and awarded \$10,000 in prizes to students. Grad Slam allowed an opportunity for some students to publish on a website called “The Conversation.com” which has a great re-publication rate.

The Director also discussed the [UC-HBCU initiative](#), which has proven very successful. UC has hosted over 230 students and has enrolled 20 PhD students. The HSI/TCU (Hispanic-Serving Institutions/Tribal Colleges and Universities) program is still very much in its development stages. A task force and deans have been looking at how to implement it; CCGA will have a chance to provide input, but not until more progress has been made. The committee discussed the real and political impacts this program might have for students and for UC.

#### **IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership**

Council Chair Hare remarked that the last two Regents meetings set the context for what was discussed in Council. Some are suggesting a change in governance for UC Health. They would like a more nimble approach, particularly in the large-dollar issues. The main idea brought forward in July was to delegate this authority to an independent board. Another proposal was developed in September and then the systemwide committees and the Senate were invited to comment. The review voiced concern about relinquishing authority for UC employee healthcare to non-Regents. It also highlighted worries that the financial aspects of the Medical Centers seem to be becoming ascendant to their teaching and learning missions. Separately, the Senate presented the Regents with the results of the Total Remuneration Study, but heard little from them in terms of questions or critique of the study analysis. This Study now can serve as part of the historical record that UC benefits no longer make up for its relatively low salaries. It also can serve as a baseline for retirement starting after 2016.

The Council Chair said that in the aftermath of the UCLA cyberattack, there would be legal action and additional cyber training.

The University is working to try to develop a statement of intolerance that does not infringe on free speech and academic freedom. A draft is expected by the end of January, and the Senate will be part of an expedited review by the end of February. There will be a public forum, and it will have a deliberate, more open process.

A number of programmatic initiatives associated with the budget deal were discussed. The budget deal requires that we achieve these initiatives; failure is not an option. Most do not concern CCGA, but are focused on BOARS and UCEP. There is a great deal of concern about 5K students for \$25M; this figure represents only about half of what UC would need, and only for one year. The specter SCA1 (which is designed to repeal UCs autonomy) is looming behind this agreement.

Additional transfer pathways are being developed. They have been very well received by some of the University's major critics.

There have been several meetings of the retirement options task force. The process thus far is somewhat chaotic and probably will come together late in the calendar year. The process is hindered because many of the people now involved were not part of the first iteration and need to be brought up to date on the complexities of the issue.

Finally, Chair Hare said that the new VAWA (Violence Against Women Act) draft policy is out for review. The original proposal underwent Senate review and was redrafted over the summer. Those who were involved feel that the current policy is better, but that it still may not address the questions raised by the Senate. He asked that the committee review it first as faculty members and then also with the concerns of graduate students (both as students and as TAs) in mind. There will be only one time to review this policy.

#### **Provost's Update on the VP ORGS Position**

The Provost informed the committee that she deliberately did not search for a new vice president last year because the President was in the midst of making decisions about how she would organize the role. The President wants SVP who will be very outwardly focused on research innovation and entrepreneurship – someone who appreciates research and can move in the corporate and government worlds. ORGS will stay and then a new position will come in. The Provost asked to come to the next meeting to bring the job description and changes. Chair Hare remarked that the new position will probably act as a science advisor to the President.

## V. Proposed Graduate Degrees and Programs for Review

- A. Proposal to establish a new Master of Chinese Economic and Political Affairs (MCEPA) at the Graduate School for International Relations and Pacific Studies at UC San Diego [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Susan Charles (UCI) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- B. Proposal to establish a new Ph.D. and M.A. (in lieu or en route) in Economics within the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts at UC Merced  
**Action Taken: Jan DeVries (UCB) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- C. Proposal to establish a new Master of Science degree in Environmental Policy and Management at UC Davis  
**Action Taken: Michael Dawson (UCM) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- D. Proposal to establish a new Master of Science in Business Analytics at UC Davis [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Jason Rock (UCSF) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- E. Proposal for Master of Science (M.S. Plan I & II) and Ph.D. Degree (Plan B) in Interdisciplinary Energy Studies at UC Davis  
**Action Taken: Dar Roberts (UCSB) assigned as Lead Reviewer. The analyst is to look for comments on a previous iteration of this proposal under Chair Goodhue.**
- F. Proposal to Establish the Herb Alpert School of Music at UC Los Angeles  
**Action Taken: Kwai Ng (UCSD) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- G. Proposal to establish a new Master of Embedded and Cyber-Physical Systems (MECPS) at UC Irvine [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Laurel Beckett (UCD) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- H. Proposal to establish a new Master of Human Computer Interaction and Design at UC Irvine [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Don Smith (UCSC) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- I. Proposal to establish a new Master of Science in Pharmacology at UC Irvine [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Michael Coffey (UCR) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- J. Proposal to establish a new Master of Computer Science at UC Irvine [SSGPDP]  
**Action Taken: Ioanna Kakoulli (UCLA) assigned as Lead Reviewer.**
- K. Proposal to establish Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for the Master of Biomedical and Translational Science at UC Irvine  
The UCI representative explained the history of the proposal, and Chair Leppert explained previous-chair Heckhausen's concerns. The Chair stated that CCGA does not need to review PDST proposals unless local Graduate Councils recommend against their approval. However, she asked the committee to weigh in on how UCI might join the MD and BS programs. After some discussion, it was agreed that CCGA would not be involved in this (as a concurrent program), and that it should be addressed by UCI's local Graduate Council.

## VI. Proposals Continued from 2014-15

- A. Proposal for a Master of Public Affairs at UC Berkeley [SSGPDP]  
Professor Duderstadt said that the proposal was very thorough and that she had just received the last review September 25. She recommended approval and remarked that UCB had done its due diligence in responding to questions from reviewers and from UCPB. The Chair questioned why the UC reviewer was

from the UCB campus. Professor Duderstadt responded that she had declines from all the other UCs – even the ones that were recommended. The reviewer seemed far-enough-removed from the program. In addition, UCB plans to do a review at the third year. The chair warned the committee that the instance of a same-campus reviewer should be considered a very rare exception, based on the number of declines Professor Duderstadt received and the number of reviewers she pursued. Since the three external reviewers all agreed that the proposal was positive, she was willing to accept the exception on this occasion.

**Action Taken: *The proposal was approved 11-0-1.***

- B. Proposal to establish a Master’s Entry Program in Nursing [MEPN] M.S.N. at UC Davis [SSGPDP] – The program is from the Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing and is an entry SSGPDP program for Nursing. Lead reviewer Dr. Lo noted that Davis has been very eager to get this approved and had included a half a dozen reviews in their original proposal; Dr. Lo then got additional reviews. The program-provided reviews were very positive and had a few comments that the revised proposal addressed. Dr. Lo wrote up a critique that the campus responded to, as well, based on the program-provided reviews and additional ones that he solicited. Dr. Lo observed that a number of the reviewers noted that while the SSGPDP seemed to be viable, it was not clear how it was going to survive after the first five years after the current donor gift is gone.

Chair Leppert noted, and the committee agreed, that the included reviews seem to be more like letters of support; only one review seemed substantively critical. The additional reviews solicited by the lead reviewer were mixed, and with the one critical review included with the proposal there were still not the four substantively critical reviews that the committee normally requires. She asked committee members to provide Dr. Lo with suggestions for obtaining more substantive reviews so that the proposal could come back for discussion and a possible vote in November.

- C. Proposal to establish a Master of Laws in American Law (LL.M.) at UC Irvine [SSGPDP]  
Professor Salmon said that this proposal was meant to enhance and prepare students for the California and New York bar exams, with a specialization on international and translational law. It is a one-year terminal masters, with a two-semester normative time to completion. Professor Salmon said that three reviewers had agreed to look at the proposal, but only one letter had come in. He has a tentative lead on a fourth reviewer. Committee members discussed some points with the agreement to wait until next month for more reviewer input.
- D. Proposal to establish a Master Degree of Social Sciences (MaSS) at UCLA [SSGPDP]  
Professor Kletzer said that he has received three of the reviews; two are positive but not detailed and the third is quite detailed. The committee discussed some of the issues raised by the reviewer with the agreement to wait until next month for more input and the analysis from UCPB.
- E. Proposal to establish a Master of Arts in Teaching Asian Languages at UCLA  
Professor Bolander stated that he had four reviews and that they raised a series of questions that he addressed with the proposers – however they did not change the proposal. CCGA had expressed some concerns about the title and the proposers also did not offer to change it. After some discussion, it was agreed that Professor Bolander would reiterate the committee’s concerns with the proposers, and again ask them to submit a revised proposal.
- F. Proposal to establish a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Public Health Sciences at UC Davis  
Professor Salmon said that the proposal said it intended to focus on rural issues and tie them to public policy due to Davis’ proximity to Sacramento. Professor Salmon got four reviews and they raised some critical issues, namely: there were no courses to do with rural public health, and no courses with public policy. Professor Salmon sent the feedback, and then the lead proposer retired. He will follow up with the campus to get official word on the status of the proposal.

- G. Proposal to establish a Master of Arts (4+1) in Art History at UC Irvine  
Professor Roberts raised several questions related to the proposal. He stated that the proposers said this would be a unique program and if it were, would it be a new title? Would be open to anyone at UCI who can meet the requirements? Would it require WASC review? He said there were no CVs included in the proposal and there was very little/no demonstrated demand or need. Chair Leppert asked him to advise them to address these issues up front before he works to get reviewers.

## **VII. Transfers, Consolidations, Disestablishment, and Discontinuances**

### THESE ITEMS WERE POSTPONED DUE TO LACK OF TIME

- A. Proposal to transfer the PhD in Ethnic Studies from the Ethnic Studies Graduate Group to the Department of Ethnic Studies and to disestablish the Ethnic Studies Graduate Group at UC Berkeley
- B. Proposal to discontinue the joint degree program at UC Santa Barbara leading to the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership with Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.
- C. Proposal to change the name of the M.A. and Ph.D. in Psychology to Psychological and Brain Sciences at UC Santa Barbara
- D. Proposal to redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture by focusing on four complementary departments (Art; Architecture and Urban Design; Design/Media Arts; and World Arts and Cultures/Dance) and transferring two departments (Ethnomusicology and Music) to the proposed UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music.

## **VIII. Discussion Items**

- A. VAWA Policy Draft

Director Lockwood explained that the policy was originally issued February 2014, and that there was supposed to be another systemwide review in 2015. Instead the President issued an interim policy in July 2015 to allow some time for Senate legal faculty to contribute to the development of the new policy as well as Title IX officers, HR, OGC, and Academic Personnel. That work resulted in the policy that is now up for systemwide expedited (one month) review. All of the feedback and comments will then be analyzed so that the policy can be effective January 1 of 2016. The Director strongly encouraged the committee to send in all of its feedback.

In response to a question, Director Lockwood said that the President has decided that all faculty and all student employees would be reporters for undergraduates only. Other populations can go to other sources; all reports get funneled to the Title IX officer. GSIs would report to the Title IX officer, not to the faculty member for whom he or she works. Faculty will have to be responsible for making sure that graduate students are aware of their responsibility to undergraduates.

The committee asked many questions, all of which served to illustrate the complexity of the policy and the confusion surrounding its eventual implementation. The group agreed to read the draft policy and provide feedback within the extremely brief timeframe.

- B. Update on the status of UCM's IIGPs.

THIS ITEM WAS POSTPONED DUE TO LACK OF TIME.

**IX. Discussion of Issues at the Divisional Graduate Councils and New Business**

*THIS DISCUSSION WAS NOT HELD DUE TO LACK OF TIME.*

**X. Executive Session (Committee Members Only)**

*THIS DISCUSSION WAS NOT HELD DUE TO LACK OF TIME.*

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.