

R. Dyche Mullins, Ph.D.

Professor

Cell. and Molec. Pharmacol.

Investigator

Howard Hughes Medical Inst.

Mail

Genentech Hall UCSF School of Medicine 600 16th Street San Francisco 94107-2200

Telephone: 415-502-4838

FAX: 415-476-5233

E-mail:

dyche.mullins@ucsf.edu

April 30, 2021

Katherine Yang, PharmD, Chair Rules & Jurisdiction Committee

Re: Proposed addition to Appendix II Regulations & Procedures of the Graduate Council, specifically section X.

Dear Chair Yang:

The Graduate Council has proposed a change to the Appendix II Regulations & Procedures of the Graduate Council, specifically an addition of section X, entitled: Governance of Graduate Groups.

Please see the attached Statement of Purpose.

Thank you for your attention,

R. Dyche Mullins



Proposed addition to Appendix II Regulations & Procedures of the Graduate Council

Statement of Purpose:

The aim of our proposal is to bring the Interdisciplinary Graduate Groups at UCSF into compliance with existing standards of governance, as outlined in the University of California's *Compendium:Universitywide Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units* (2014)¹. Section II.D of the *Compendium* states that, "CCGA requires that all proposals for interdepartmental graduate programs (IDP) or graduate groups include a set of governance bylaws..." As most of our graduate groups were created before 2014, when the *Compendium* was published, they do not currently operate under Senate-approved bylaws. To close this significant loophole in faculty governance we propose to add a new section (§ X) to Appendix II of the Regulations & Procedures of the Graduate Council, entitled: "Governance of Graduate Groups." This section comprises two subsections (A&B), described below.

A. Subsection A officially delegates to leaders of graduate groups the authority to formulate and amend program bylaws (subject to approval by Graduate Council —see below) and to regulate faculty membership and/or participation in graduate gropus. Although this authority is currently exercised by graduate group directors and executive committees, it has never been explicitly granted by Graduate Council or the UCSF Division of the Academic Senate.

B. The second subsection will: (i) ensure that every interdisciplinary graduate group at UCSF operates under a set of senate-approved bylaws, and (ii) establish procedures for the review and approval of graduate group bylaws. The language of this subsection is modeled on examples from UC Davis, whose Graduate Council has overseen the creation and maintenance of graduate group bylaws for more than fifteen years.²

¹ https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/ files/compendium sept2014.pdf

² https://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/sites/d/files/dgvnsk3876/files/inline-files/gc2011-02 rev5.pdf



Pros:

- Subsection A of the proposal closes a potential regulatory loophole by officially delegating to graduate group leaders the authority to formulate program bylaws and to regulate faculty membership. This addition formally acknowledges the central role of faculty in designing and administering academic programs under the University of California's shared governance model.
- 2. Subsection B will bring the Interdepartmental Graduate Groups at UCSF into compliance with existing standards of governance, as outlined in the University of California's Compendium:Universitywide Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units (2014)¹. Although Section II.D of the Compendium states that, "CCGA requires that all proposals for interdepartmental graduate programs (IDP) or graduate groups include a set of governance bylaws..." many IDP's at UCSF currently operate without any governance bylaws.
- Together, these additions to our Rules and Procedures will provide mechanisms for transparent and consistent oversight of UCSF graduate programs and will help resolve any ambiguities regarding the program expectations and decision-making authority.

Cons:

- 1. Reviewing and approving graduate group bylaws will increase the workload of the Graduate Council but, given the relatively low rate at which new graduate groups are proposed, this should not create a significant long-term burden.
- 2. Similarly, creating new bylaws for a graduate group is a significant chore for the leadership team but making use of existing templates from other UC campuses (e.g. UC Davis¹) and a draft set of bylaws created by a UCSF task force² should help mitigate this problem.

¹ https://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/sites/g/files/dgvnsk3876/files/inline-files/gc2011-02 rev5.pdf

² Chaired by Professor of Mircobiology and Immunology, Carol Gross, and Assistant Dean of the Graduate Division, D'Anne Duncan.



Proposed Additions to the Appendix II Regulations

https://senate.ucsf.edu/graduate-council-regulations

- X. Governance of Graduate Groups
- A. Authority to define criteria for faculty membership in the various graduate groups is delegated to the executive committees of these graduate groups, including criteria for inclusion, exclusion, and removal, unless otherwise specified. Further, authority is also delegated to graduate group executive committees to propose and administer bylaws governing faculty participation and conduct.
- B. All graduate groups must operate under a set of bylaws that has been reviewed and approved by Graduate Council. For new graduate groups, a set of draft bylaws must be provided to Graduate Council with the graduate group proposal, and approval of the graduate group will be contingent on approval of the bylaws. For existing graduate groups, a draft set of bylaws must be submitted to the Graduate Council within six (6) months of the approval of this appendix (X.B) to Appendix II Regulations & Procedures of the Graduate Council. To expedite the development, revision, and review of bylaws, a sub-committee of the Graduate Council (the Bylaws Subcommittee) will review and forward bylaws to Graduate Council for approval.