

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs Handbook

**August 2016
Revision**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	I
Establishing Academic Senate Bylaw	I
Types of CCGA Business	I
Procedures for Proposals for New Graduate Degree Programs	2
Adding a Master's Degree to an Approved Doctoral Program	2
Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Degree Programs	3
Joint Programs	3
Proposal Submission	3
Steps in the CCGA Review Process	4
Procedures for Proposals to Change Academic Programs and Units	7
Policies Affecting Graduate Degree Programs	8
Procedures for Proposals for New ORUs and MRUs	9
Procedures for Five-Year Perspectives	10
Procedures for Systemwide Courses	11
Procedures for Review of Other Matters	11
Procedures for Information Sharing	11
Procedures for New Issues	11
Appendix A: Glossary of Acronyms and Shorthand Terms	13
Appendix B: Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal	14
Appendix C: Overview: Review Process for New Graduate Degree Proposals	20
Appendix D: Graduate Degree Program Proposal Lead Reviewer's Responsibilities	22
Appendix E: Sample Letters to Reviewers of Degree Program Proposals	25
Appendix F: Letter to Lead Proposer of Graduate Degree Program Proposals (major revisions)	29
Appendix G: Formats and Recipients for Chair's Letter on Graduate Degree Program Proposal	30
Appendix H: Information about Degree Proposals of Interest to State Authorities	34
Appendix I: Master's Degree Capstone Requirements (Thesis, Comprehensive Exam, or Project)	36
Appendix J: Guidelines for Professional Master's Degree Titles	39
Appendix K: Guidelines for the Review of New and Continuing Self-Supporting Programs	43
Letter: Recommendations Regarding Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs	46
Appendix L: Guidelines for Conversion of Graduate Degree Programs from State-supported to Self-supporting and from Self-supporting to State-supported Status	49
Appendix M: Guidelines for Reviewing Proposed MAS Programs	50
Appendix N: Role of CCGA in Evaluating Proposals to Begin Charging Professional Degree Supplementary Tuition (PDST)	52
Appendix O: Guidelines for Reviewing Applied Doctorate Proposals	55
Appendix P: Role of CCGA in the Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units	57
Appendix Q: Role of CCGA in Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Units	63
Appendix R: Guidelines for Reviewing Proposed and Existing MRUs	65
Appendix S: Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning ORUs	67
Appendix T: Academic Senate Oversight of Professional Schools and Role of CCGA in the Review of Professional Degrees	75
Appendix U: Criteria for Reviewing Proposed Joint UC/CSU Doctoral Programs	80
Appendix V: Procedures for the Re-Review of UC/CSU Joint Ed.D. Programs	82

Introduction

This handbook has been prepared for members of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), a standing committee of the Academic Senate of the University of California. The CCGA Handbook is a compilation of relevant Bylaws of the Academic Senate; excerpts from various reports; policies and procedures of University offices and committees; policies put forward by CCGA as recorded in its minutes; and descriptions of common practice. The handbook is intended to provide new members with an overview of CCGA's responsibilities and procedures and assist all members in carrying out certain complex duties, particularly the review of proposals for new graduate degree programs. It also serves as an important reference for campus faculty and staff members tasked with preparing graduate degree program proposals for submission to CCGA. The 2014 revision contains some significant revisions and additions to reflect current practice and policy, but since relevant Presidential policies are in the process of revision, CCGA is likely to make further revisions in 2015.

Establishing Academic Senate Bylaw

The membership and duties of CCGA are established by Academic Senate [Bylaw 180](#) (1986 Bylaw revision, formerly Bylaw 104) which falls under Title IV, Standing Committees of the Academic Senate.

Bylaw 180. Graduate Affairs, Coordinating Committee on

- A) Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. Two graduate students shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128.D.1 and 128.D.3. (Am 6 June 1979; Am 28 May 2003)
- B) Duties: The committee shall:
- 1) Advise the President of the University and all agencies of the Senate regarding the promotion of research and learning related to graduate affairs.
 - 2) Establish basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various Graduate Councils and Divisions.
 - 3) Recommend to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students (see Bylaw 311C [1]).
 - 4) Act for the Academic Senate in the approval of new programs for established graduate degrees, including the joint doctoral degrees with campuses of the California State University (CSU).
 - 5) Review proposals from Graduate Councils for the establishment of new graduate degrees that require approval of the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval, and submit recommendations thereon to the Assembly (see [Standing Order of The Regents \(SOR\) 110.1](#) and [Bylaw 116C](#)).
 - 6) Review standards and policies applied by Graduate Councils, and policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies.

Types of CCGA Business

CCGA conducts seven main types of business. The basic routine for handling all types of business is to send out an agenda with any written materials (enclosures) in advance of a face-to-face meeting; discuss matters during the meeting; share drafts of any necessary follow-up written communications via e-mail, or at a subsequent meeting; vote if needed on a motion relevant to the written materials; and revise and transmit the final communication. Meeting protocol is per [Sturgis](#), in [The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure](#). Much of this business is carried out in conjunction with other Academic Senate committees and the UC Office of the President. The committee also makes use of a number of electronic resources to facilitate its business, including the Academic Senate content management system website and tele-conferencing as needed. The Senate also posts all of its public agendas and minutes on the respective [committee website](#). Public versions of agendas and minutes have been stripped of any enclosures and confidential information. The public CCGA website is located at: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ccga/>.

Specific procedures of the various types of business are described in the sections that follow:

- 1) Consideration of proposals for new graduate degree programs;
- 2) Consideration of proposals to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue academic programs or academic units or to reorganize them through a combination of two or more actions;
- 3) Consideration of proposals for new ORUs and MRUs;
- 4) Review of and commentary on campus's five-year perspectives;
- 5) Review and/or commentary on other matters including proposed changes in policies or regulations of either the Academic Senate or UCOP, five-year reviews of existing MRUs or Cal ISIs, establishment or major change of schools and colleges, UCOP think pieces, and various reports;
- 6) Information sharing among representatives of the Divisional Graduate Councils, the CCGA Chair and Vice Chair, the Systemwide Academic Senate committees, the Planning Unit in the UC Office of the President, the Council of Graduate Deans, the UC and campus Graduate Student Associations, and various guests (ordinarily from the Office of the President); and
- 7) Consideration and development of a position on any new issue that CCGA members themselves believe should be addressed.

Procedures for Proposals for New Graduate Degree Programs

A central responsibility of CCGA is the review of proposals for new graduate degree programs. CCGA approval is necessary but not sufficient for program implementation. Proposals also are sent to the UC Provost and designated staff at UCOP for review; implementation requires approval from the President. Before closing in November 2011, the [California Postsecondary Education Commission](#) (CPEC) also reviewed proposals, noting whether or not it “concurred” with the each proposal to establish a new graduate program. So far no new post-secondary oversight body has been established, but periodically there is interest from state policymakers in re-creating one. Proposals for new programs no longer require the “CPEC Questionnaire” that was included in older templates.

For any proposal involving a new degree title never before offered on that campus (i.e., per Standing Order of the Regents 110.1, the campus is not authorized to award the degree), the Assembly of the Academic Senate—or Academic Council on behalf of the Assembly—reviews the proposal in addition to those noted above. In these cases, CCGA forwards a letter of approval to the Academic Senate Chair instead of to the Provost. If Systemwide planning issues arise, they may be referred to the [Academic Planning Council](#) (APC) for deliberation. Systemwide review processes for graduate degree program proposals are described in detail in [The Compendium of Systemwide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units](#), located at: [<http://www.ucop.edu/acadaff/accomp/>].

New Graduate programs also may be subject to a substantive change review by UC's accrediting body, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). WASC defines substantive change as “one that may significantly affect an institution's quality, objectives, scope, or control.” Though limited, the circumstances that most often trigger substantive change reviews for UC include proposal of new programs in which 50% or more of instruction is offered off-campus or online and programs at a degree level for which the campus does not have general authority. Please check with your campus Accreditation Liaison Officer and/or consult the WASC website for updated information (<http://www.wascenior.org/>).

Adding a Master's Degree to an Approved Doctoral Program

On occasion, campus proposals for new doctoral programs may not initially include an associated master's degree. However, at a later date, a campus may wish to add a master's program to a CCGA-approved doctoral program. In such cases, a campus may add a master's degree to an approved doctoral program without further CCGA review if CCGA determines that the following conditions pertain:

- 1) The master's has the same name as the doctoral program;
- 2) The courses that will be required for the master's degree are substantially those currently offered as part of the doctoral program;
- 3) The master's requirements fall within norms typical for UC master's programs (Plan I/Plan II

master's, etc.), including an appropriate capstone element;

- 4) The master's is not intended to be a terminal master's program.

If the proposed master's has a different title from the approved doctorate, requires a significant addition of courses, or will have unusual requirements for completion, CCGA reserves the right to require a fuller form of review. A campus that wishes to add a master's to an existing doctoral program should, upon approval of the Divisional Graduate Council, send a notice to CCGA and the Office of the President, addressing the four points above.¹

Any graduate degree program proposal that CCGA receives has been developed by participating faculty and approved or supported by them, by the relevant disciplinary dean, the Graduate Council, and the Chancellor or his/her designated representative. If the degree involves a title that is new to the campus (or school/college/division) and, therefore, not included in the Regents provisions (e.g., Doctor of Musical Arts but not likely the Ph.D. in Music), then the proposal has also been approved by the Divisional Representative Assembly or designated alternative.

Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Degree Programs

Undergraduate/Graduate hybrid degree programs are those degree programs that allow undergraduate students to complete undergraduate and graduate programs simultaneously. Typically such programs feature a 5-year combined bachelor's and master's degree in which the student applies for admission in the third year and begins graduate courses in the fourth year, while still an undergraduate.

The Compendium provides specific guidance about the nature of review of such proposals at the campus and states that, once approved, any hybrid program proposal is to be forwarded to CCGA for review. In many cases, the hybrid program involves the establishment of a new graduate program, and CCGA will then review this in the same manner as it reviews any other new graduate degree proposal. If, however, the proposed hybrid program is simply a new articulation between an existing bachelor's degree program and an existing graduate degree program, CCGA will normally provide pro forma concurrence with the campus action, unless it judges that there are particular issues that justify a more extended review.

Joint Programs

If the proposed UC graduate degree program also involves another UC campus, a California State University (CSU) campus, or some other academic institution, then necessary support and approval must also have been obtained at that campus or institution.

Proposal Submission

The submission that should be forwarded for systemwide review should include:

- the complete proposal and all appendices (see Appendix B for format);
- a contact information sheet (located at the front of the proposal) with the lead proponent clearly identified;
- transmittal letters indicating the necessary campus approval and support.
- feedback from campus review committees and other entities as well as the proposers' responses (separate from proposal and appendices);
- a list of the chairs (or program directors) of comparable UC programs to whom the proposal was sent, a sample of the cover letter, and any feedback received from those chairs;
- additional requirements for special circumstances, including new degree title, degree to be offered by as an interdepartmental program or with participation from other institutions (see notes below);
- *strongly recommended*: list of potential internal and external reviewers.

For each participating UC campus, there should be clear indication of the approval of the Graduate Council, consultation with Planning and Budget by Graduate Council and endorsement by the Chancellor or his/her representative. With respect to review letters, program proposers are encouraged to solicit rigorous reviews that address the issues spelled out in the sample letters in Appendix E and respond to any concerns raised in such reviews before passing their proposals along to campus Graduate Councils. In compiling their lists of potential reviewers, proposers should try to avoid naming reviewers with possible

¹ CCGA Annual Report, 2005-06; CCGA 06/06/2006 Meeting Minutes.

conflicts of interest, such as those who are involved in joint research projects/grants with members of the proposed program.

If the degree has a title new to the campus (or school/college/division) and, therefore, is not included in The Regents' provisions, then the Divisional Representative Assembly or alternative must also have approved it. If the new program is being offered by a unit that does not/has not offer(ed) graduate degrees, then a setting forth of "the Department or Group that will administer the program", as per Appendix B, Section 1.6 is required, and the proposal should include bylaws associated with the new program (Appendix B, Section 8). Bylaws should also be included with all proposals submitted by interdepartmental programs (IDPs). IDPs are graduate degree granting programs that are not offered by a single department, but administered by a group of faculty who are constituted for that purpose, and whose governance lies outside that of any single department. Likewise, if other institutions participate in the proposed degree program, there should also be clear indications of support by the appropriate parties there. While a letter from the campus librarian is not required, CCGA has found that such a letter often provides the most credible means of documenting the library estimates presented in the proposal.

The Chancellor or his/her designee should send a complete proposal in a single PDF file to the following people: the UC Provost, designated UCOP staff, the CCGA Analyst, and the Chair and Vice Chair of CCGA. In addition, the Academic Council Chair should be copied on the transmittal letter.

Steps in the CCGA Review Process

The section that follows lists the steps involved in the CCGA review process.² Before listing these steps, however, it's helpful to note some timing and logistical issues that will be of special interest to program proponents.

- Program proposals received by CCGA typically take four to six months to be reviewed and can take longer depending on whether the program is complicated or the proposal is especially problematic, and on when in the calendar year it is submitted. The amount of time required to complete this process varies enormously according to the quality and completeness of the proposal, the ease of obtaining internal and external reviews, the responsiveness of the campus to the lead reviewer's requests, and the lead reviewer's diligence. Submitting a proposal late in the academic year is likely to lengthen the approval process; historically, it has proven very difficult to obtain reviews during the summer months. Submitting a proposal no later than September will facilitate completion of the review before the end of the academic year.
- Program proponents should keep this time-line in mind in connection with the listing of courses in campus catalogues. If a program is to be included in a campus catalogue that goes to press in January, the proposal for it must be submitted to CCGA in time to be considered at the committee's meeting of the previous March at the latest (and while the program awaits approval, proposers should take steps to assure that catalogue copy will be ready for publication at the campus level once the program is indeed approved). Even with a ten-month lead-time, however, there is no guarantee that a decision on the program will be rendered by the following January.
- CCGA's procedures allow for flexibility in the review process. Not all the steps listed below need to be carried out for all program proposals. Potential exists for elements of the review process to be shortened or eliminated at the discretion of CCGA. Most program proposals require at least one external and one internal review in addition to any submitted by the proposers; CCGA often requests 3 or 4 letters. In rare circumstances, a site visit may be conducted, if additional information is needed or the committee agrees that meeting with the proponents will facilitate the ultimate approval of the program.
- Streamlining: In some cases, CCGA lead reviewers may suggest streamlining the review process, though the committee must approve any shortening of reviews through such means as forgoing external reviews. Only well-written proposals that have been approved by all necessary local campus

²Excerpted and adapted from *Academic Program Review*, October, 1976; CCGA Minutes, 10/18/77, 3/15/83, 4/19/83, 5/17/83, 10/18/83, 12/13/83, 6/18/85, 7/18/89, 2/91, 9/12/95, 10/17/95, 11/5/96, 5/6/97; previous editions of the CCGA Handbook; and current practice.

bodies and that require no new resources would be considered for streamlined review.

- Uniformity of process: all graduate degrees offered by UC are expected to be of very high quality and capable of satisfying exacting standards of review. In view of the fact that it is increasingly difficult to identify distinguishing criteria that separate self-supporting graduate and professional degree program (SSPs or SSGPDPs [whether MAS or not]) proposals from state-supported graduate degree proposals, CCGA will treat all proposals in the same way, determining in each case how extensive the review needs to be. Proposers should not make their timeline for development and approval of a program depend on a presumption that it will require only a streamlined review.

Listing of Steps

- 1) Selection of lead reviewer. The proposal and associated review materials are distributed by campus to the CCGA analyst who then distributes the proposal to the chair, the vice chair (if they have not already received it), and posts it on committee's content management system, where is accessible to the committee as a whole. At the next meeting, a lead reviewer is selected (see Appendix D for responsibilities). He or she must be from a campus other than that from which the proposal originates and should not have any vested interest in the outcome for the proposal. Usually, a member volunteers to serve as lead reviewer. No member takes on two proposals until everyone has one.
- 2) Preliminary discussion. All members read the proposal and all other available, pertinent material in advance of the meeting at which the proposal is first discussed by the whole group. At this CCGA meeting, members share their reactions to the proposed graduate degree program, identifying specific strengths and weaknesses and indicating where additional information or opinion is needed. At this first discussion, and any time thereafter, the group could decide to reject the proposal, return it for reconsideration by campus reviewers, return it to the proposers with suggestions for revisions, request additional information from the campus, other campuses, or any other relevant place, or proceed with the usual review steps. If, in the opinion of CCGA members, the proposal does not contain adequate information upon which to base an informed judgment about the degree program, the review should not proceed until that information is provided by the proposing faculty.
- 3) Lead reviewer's work. The lead reviewer carries out several responsibilities (see Appendix D). In order to ensure a timely review of the proposal, the lead reviewer will identify experts in the field to serve as reviewers as soon as possible, using both suggestions made by the proposers and suggestions developed independently. Obtaining written reviews from two or more reviewers is often the step that takes the longest amount of time. Other lead reviewer responsibilities include: obtaining additional information from the proposing faculty, campus administration, other campuses, or whoever is appropriate; conducting, if necessary, a site visit on the proposing campus (es); keeping CCGA members and the proposing campus informed; recommending final action on the proposal; and preparing a written report. Some of these steps can be performed simultaneously or sequentially, in whatever order and to whatever degree makes sense for the particular proposal.
- 4) Internal Reviews. CCGA expects the lead reviewer to obtain at least one (and normally two) reviews from UC experts not from the proposing campus. Some proposals may contain feedback received by the proposers when they sent copies to chairs (or program directors) of comparable UC programs, and the lead reviewer, in consultation with other members, may take such feedback into account when deciding how many internal reviews to seek. Internal (UC) reviewers are not offered compensation for their time in preparing the reviews.
- 5) External Reviews. Generally, CCGA expects the lead CCGA reviewer to obtain two or more external reviews from outside (non-UC) experts (see Appendix E for sample letters to external reviewers). A \$250 honorarium is authorized to compensate external reviewers for their work. External reviewers are typically senior academics in comparable programs at research universities. Once the external reviewer has submitted his or her review letter, the CCGA analyst should forward the UC "One Time Payee Form" to the reviewer, who should return the completed form to the CCGA analyst.
- 6) Evaluation criteria. In evaluating the proposed graduate degree program, the lead reviewer and other CCGA members consider such issues as programmatic content, demand, faculty quality, availability of faculty and other resources needed to offer the program (including information technology and

library resources and physical space), effect of the new program on the quality or viability of the programs in which the faculty are already involved, student support, subsequent employment opportunity, support of campus administration, benefit to the campus, and relationship to Systemwide graduate offerings. In addition, the lead reviewer evaluates the proposal with respect to CCGA policies, including compliance with the proposing campus's graduate enrollment plan and recommendation for Divisional Academic Senate review within three years of establishment. Additional evaluation criteria have been established for proposed joint UC/CSU doctoral programs (see Appendix U). They may be generalized to apply as well to degree program proposals involving multiple UC campuses or other institutions of higher education. It is incumbent on those proposing the new degree program to provide clear and comprehensive information in all portions of the proposal (see Appendix B for format).

- 7) Conflict of interest. CCGA members or representatives from the campus proposing a new graduate degree program are permitted to participate in discussion regarding the program, but they are expected to avoid advocacy (or antagonism). When members have a conflict of interest (e.g., from the same campus) with any proposal, they are expected to recuse themselves from voting.
- 8) In-progress reports and activities. A progress report, oral or written, is given by each lead reviewer at every CCGA meeting. The discussion may touch upon whether the initial submission is clear and complete enough to be sent out to reviewers or whether the proposers must clarify any points first; how many reviewers to seek or how to identify reviewers other than those nominated by the proposers; potential problems or questions raised by the lead reviewer, any CCGA member, or the written reports of the invited reviewers; what further questions to direct to the proposers; how effectively the proposers have replied to questions. If available and needed for any discussion, written materials and correspondence sent to and received from degree program proponents are to be distributed with the agenda and/or made available on the content management system. At its discretion, CCGA may either accept the additional statements made by the proposers or ask the proposers to edit the proposal to reflect any changes and provide a new version of the full proposal.
- 9) Site visit. Site visits are optional, but may be deemed necessary by the committee if clarity on certain issues has not, or cannot, be achieved through e-mail and telephonic communication.
- 10) Decision. When the lead reviewer is satisfied that there have been sufficient reviews obtained and sufficient discussion with the committee, the lead reviewer prepares a written report with her recommendation, describing the proposed graduate degree program and the review process and providing an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The external reviewers' reports are appended as are any formal modifications or additions to the proposal and any important additional information provided by the proponents. The report and attachments are distributed to CCGA participants in advance of a meeting, read by them, and then discussed at the meeting. At this meeting, on a motion by the lead reviewer, members may vote on the disposition of the proposal. There are four possible outcomes. (a) CCGA may approve the proposal, sometimes adding suggestions or recommendations that are left to the discretion of the campus to consider. (b) CCGA may approve the proposal with certain conditions to which the proposing faculty and the Divisional Graduate Council (and, if appropriate, the campus administration) agree in writing. In the case of conditional approval, the proposing faculty or the Divisional Graduate Council from the proposing campus will be asked (either during the normal review process or at a time agreed upon with CCGA) to provide a report on the steps the proposing campus has taken to meet the conditions that CCGA has attached to its approval. The Academic Council office will maintain a log of CCGA conditional approvals and will notify CCGA when action needs to be taken in connection with such approvals (for example, if CCGA sets as a condition that a program be reviewed after a certain amount of time, the Academic Council office will notify CCGA in time for CCGA to confirm that the program has been reviewed within that time). (c) CCGA may return the proposal to the originating campus for reconsideration and resubmission in substantially revised form. In this case, CCGA will offer clear guidance to the proposers as to the reasons for rejection and the revisions expected before resubmission. Campus-level review and endorsement of any revision may be appropriate. (d) CCGA may disapprove the proposal.
- 11) Communication with the campus. The communication protocol with the campus varies, depending on the nature of CCGA's concerns. If CCGA requests only minor revisions or clarifications to the

proposal, then all correspondence is conducted between the lead reviewer and the lead proponent (usually via e-mail). As a courtesy, the member of CCGA from the proposing campus is normally copied on such e-mails. If CCGA has reached a final adverse decision or if CCGA's criticisms are substantial in nature, then communication comes instead from the CCGA Chair (see Appendix G), whose letter will be accompanied by the lead reviewer's report. Such correspondence will be forwarded through the committee analyst to the lead proponent with a copy to the respective Graduate Council chair and other relevant campus officials. A positive final decision may be conveyed informally by the lead reviewer or proposing campus member, but the official approval is not complete until other steps have been completed (see 13 below).

- 12) Official voting procedure. The final decision must be made by a majority vote of the CCGA members. The student representatives' votes are recorded in the minutes but do not count in decision making. Other participants in CCGA meetings (such as consultants) do not vote. Any CCGA participant from the specific proposing campus must recuse himself or herself from the vote. Any CCGA member or student representative with a conflict of interest must abstain.
- 13) Informing others. The CCGA analyst and/or Chair prepares a letter announcing the final disposition of the proposal (see Appendix G for formats and recipients). The content of the letter varies according to the decision and how much relevant information is contained in separate enclosures to the Chair's letter. The lead reviewer's report and attachments are always enclosed when the graduate degree program proposal is approved by CCGA. The approval letter is generally addressed to the Provost with copies going to the Academic Council Chair, Senate Executive Director, lead reviewer, the Principal Analyst for Academic Initiatives, and the lead program proponent. According to the Academic Senate Bylaws (125.B.7), the Assembly of the Academic Senate (or the Academic Council if the Assembly is not meeting within 60 days of CCGA's approval) must approve new degree titles. In these cases, the approval letter is sent to the Council Chair in order for the degree title to be approved by the Academic Council or the Assembly. New degree titles must also be approved by the President, under delegated authority from The Board of Regents.

Procedures for Proposals to Change Academic Programs and Units

CCGA reviews proposals to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, discontinue, and reconstitute academic programs and academic units. Proposals also are sent to the UC Provost and designated staff at UCOP review them. Depending on the action, other participants may include UCEP, UCPB, the Academic Council or Assembly, and the Board of Regents. If Systemwide planning issues arise, they may be referred to APC for deliberation. Systemwide review processes are explained in the previously described Compendium.

There are variations in how CCGA handles these change proposals. CCGA may request review of proposals to transfer, consolidate or discontinue graduate degree programs. If neither CCGA nor the UC Provost request review, the campus decision is final. Such proposals typically involve non-controversial discontinuance of moribund programs, or transfer or consolidation actions supported by the participating faculty. Proposals to transfer, consolidate or disestablish academic units (schools, colleges, divisions or other title that appoints Senate faculty voting under Bylaw 55—*not* departments) involve review by CCGA UCEP, UCPB, Academic Council and the UC Provost. Disestablishment of schools and colleges also requires approval

In November 1993, CCGA adopted a general process for reviewing transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance proposals (see Appendix P; see also Appendix Q discussing any combination of these actions, which is terms "reconstitution"). It involves the following elements:

- 1) Early discussion. As soon as possible after it becomes known the campus is considering such an action, it is discussed at a CCGA meeting. The discussion focuses only on whether there is adequate Divisional Academic Senate involvement in the process and whether any Systemwide issues are raised by the proposed action.
- 2) Investigation. If there are questions about Senate involvement or Systemwide issues, a subcommittee of one to three members is formed to explore them. The subcommittee reports at the next meeting.

- 3) Intervention. If CCGA members determine either that the Divisional Senate is not adequately involved or that Systemwide issues are raised by the proposed action, the Chair endeavors to get the Senate involved or to have the campus consider the Systemwide issues.
- 4) Approval. If Divisional Senate involvement is appropriate and Systemwide issues do not exist, then it is expected that CCGA will approve or recommend approval of the proposed action without further review. Approval or recommendation for approval is understood for those proposed actions handled administratively by UCOP. It may also be given at the first or a later CCGA discussion of the proposed action, becoming effective when the action has been approved on the campus and sent forward for Systemwide review. Decisions about proposed actions for which CCGA questions the adequacy of the Divisional Senate's involvement or the Systemwide implications are made on the basis of a full review of a written proposal approved by the campus and submitted for Systemwide review.
- 5) Informing others. If CCGA discusses a proposed transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance, then it usually communicates its approval or recommendation for approval to the Office of the President, with copies to the campus and the Academic Council Chair. Communication is to the Academic Council Chair, with copies to the campus and UCOP, when the proposed action affects a unique degree title, school, or college. A copy is included as an information item in the next CCGA agenda packet whenever the proposed action is complex or disputed by CCGA members.

At times, a campus develops a unified plan that involves a combination of two or more separate transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, discontinuance, or establishment actions. CCGA uses the term *reconstitution* to describe such a plan and in May 1994 established procedures for reviewing it (see Appendix Q).

The process for reviewing proposals to change academic programs and academic units usually takes somewhat more than a month if it comes before CCGA rather than being handled administratively by UCOP. Most will take not more than about two months. Proposed actions for which CCGA questions the adequacy of Divisional Senate involvement or the Systemwide implications will span a period of time beginning with CCGA's first discussion of the proposed action and ending about two months after the final proposal, as approved by the campus, has been submitted for CCGA review.

Policies Affecting Graduate Degree Programs

Over the years, CCGA has established a number of policies that affect graduate degree programs. These policies are outlined below:

- 1) Re-establishment of CCGA Authority over Reviews of First Professional Degree Proposals (7/2008): Academic Council approved the request from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to reinstate CCGA's plenary authority to approve new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs. CCGA has concluded that its 1995 decision exempting these degree titles from Senate oversight, thereby allowing relevant professional schools to approve new programs with these degree titles, was not made with an appreciation of the distinction between the approval and oversight roles of the Senate. While CCGA concurs that ongoing oversight is best left to professional schools offering these five degree titles pursuant to Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b), it is the experience of CCGA that two aspects of its review – the removal from internal pressures and influences within host campus, and the mandate to solicit expert reviews from outside the University – provide compelling motivation for conducting a review of proposed new degrees within the structure of the system-wide Senate. CCGA also noted that the satisfaction of accreditation requirements should not serve as a proxy for the rigorous review of new graduate programs performed by the Academic Senate. See Appendix T.
- 2) Composition and Review of Existing Master's Degree Programs (03/2000 & 01/2001): CCGA asserts that the norm should be that a thesis or a comprehensive examination follows the course work, both in order to integrate the intellectual substance of the program and also as a means of quality control. Substitution for this requirement can be considered if there is a strong academic justification. If changes are made in Master's programs that are already approved, the Graduate Council in conjunction with the Graduate Division must authorize those changes. (3/7/00): CCGA added the

following resolution: “CCGA withdraws its approval from any master’s degree program that has dropped its capstone requirement or any doctoral program that has dropped its dissertation requirement without the approval of its campus Graduate Council.”³ See Appendix I.

- 3) Collaborative Capstone Projects in Master’s Programs (05/2007 & 02/2014): CCGA approved the use of group work to satisfy capstone projects in master’s programs if such work meets the following conditions: 1) that each individual show substantial contributions to the project; and 2) that each individual be assessed for competence.⁴ Additional guidance about such capstone projects is provided in the February 2014 document included in Appendix I.
- 4) Ed.D. Dissertation Committees (2005/06): Historically, CCGA has maintained that Ed.D. dissertation committees be comprised of four members – two faculty members from the UC campus and two CSU faculty members. However, two divisions have requested exceptions to this rule: UCSB and UCB. In 2005, the composition of dissertation committees in the joint UCSB-Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (SLO) Ed.D. was changed to a 2+1 model (one member from Cal-Poly SLO, one member from UCSB, with the remaining member coming from either institution). In 2006, members approved a UCB request from the Joint Doctoral Program in Leadership or Educational Equity for a three-member dissertation committee structure (one member from CSU, one faculty member from the Graduate School of Education at UCB, and one outside faculty member from UCB).⁵
- 5) Academic Senate review of new proposals to charge PDST (2011): Appendix N describes the role of Senate committees in opining about proposals to initiate the charging of PDST and the considerations that are most important in formulating an opinion.
- 6) Professional Degree Titles (2014): The proliferation of new professional degrees, especially those proposed as self-supporting, prompted CCGA to offer the guidelines included in Appendix J. In brief, without some specific and cogent justification, CCGA would prefer to see new professional degrees named Master in X or Master of X, rather than M.A. or M.S. in X. The title M.A.S. in X is also acceptable for a self-supporting professional degree, but since this title is not widely used, it is perhaps not as clear to the world at large as Master in/of X.

Procedures for Proposals for New ORUs and MRUs

CCGA is one of several Systemwide reviewers of proposals to establish new ORUs and MRUs. Other participants are the President or his/her designated representative (usually the Provost and Senior Vice President – Academic Affairs), Vice Provost – Research, Coordinator – Research Planning, UCORP, UCPB, and the Academic Council. For MRUs, the Board of Regents also participates. If Systemwide planning issues arise, APC is involved. For the Academic Senate portion of the Systemwide review, UCORP is the lead committee. Systemwide review processes for ORUs and MRUs are explained in the previously described Compendium.

The ORU/MRU proposal CCGA receives has been developed by participating faculty and approved or supported by them, the Divisional Academic Senate(s), and the Chancellor(s) or designated representative(s). The submission from the lead campus directly to CCGA includes the complete proposal, all appendices, and transmittal letters indicating the necessary approval and support on every participating campus. The lead UC campus submits all materials (usually in PDF format) to the CCGA program analyst, as well as sending copies to the Office of the President. CCGA subsequently receives a staff analysis from the Vice Provost--Research.

In the conduct of its review CCGA should be guided by (1) *the Guidelines for Review of Proposed and Existing MRUs* (Appendix R) and (2) *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units* (Appendix S).

The procedure for CCGA review of an ORU/MRU proposal is ordinarily similar to that for a new graduate degree program proposal (see the section “Procedures for Proposals for New Graduate Degree Programs”). There are, however, three very important differences: (a) the lead Academic Senate committee for these

³ CCGA Annual Report, 1999-2000

⁴ CCGA Annual Report, 2006-07; CCGA 05/01/2007 Minutes

⁵ CCGA Annual Report, 2005-06

proposals is UCORP, not CCGA; (b) CCGA makes recommendations as to the approval, revision, or disapproval of an ORU/MRU proposal, but it does not have the authority to approve, approve contingent on certain revisions, or disapprove the proposal; and (c) CCGA makes its recommendation to the Chair of the Academic Council. There are, in addition, the following modifications to specific elements of the procedure for reviewing graduate degree program proposals:

- 1) Preliminary discussion. At this first discussion, and any time thereafter, the group could decide to recommend rejection of the proposal, request additional information from the campus, other campuses, or any other relevant place, or proceed with the usual review steps.
- 2) Lead reviewer's work. The lead reviewer must coordinate his or her activities with the other Academic Senate committees reviewing the proposal, particularly with UCORP, the lead committee.
- 3) Evaluation criteria. In evaluating the proposed ORU/MRU, the lead reviewer and other CCGA members judge the extent to which the proposed unit is likely to conform to the purposes, scope, structure, and functions of ORUs and MRUs, as established by the Regents and President (see Appendices R and S), availability of faculty and other needed resources, and campus administration support. CCGA should focus particularly on the role and contribution of the proposed ORU/MRU to graduate education and on Systemwide considerations.
- 4) Final disposition. CCGA may recommend approval of the proposal, recommend approval of the proposal with certain revisions, or recommend disapproval of the proposal.
- 5) Informing others. The CCGA Chair writes to the Chair of the Academic Council, announcing CCGA's recommendation as to the disposition of the proposal and explaining its reasons for the recommendation. The lead reviewer's report and attachments are always enclosed when the CCGA recommendation is to approve the ORU/MRU proposal.

The ORU/MRU review procedure may be truncated and the proposal nonetheless recommended for approval if the lead reviewer and other CCGA members agree it is warranted and the UCORP Chair is consulted. In some cases, a proposal could be recommended for approval based only on reviewing it. In others, communication with the campus(es) is sufficient. In still others, external reviews and/or a site visit are sufficient or reviews by non-participating UC faculty will replace reviews by non-UC experts. If truncated review is used and the recommendation is for approval, the Chair's letter and lead reviewer's report should provide clear justification for the truncation.

The amount of time required to complete this process varies enormously according to the quality and completeness of the proposal, the ease of obtaining external reviews and conducting a site visit, the responsiveness of the campus to the lead reviewer's requests, the lead reviewer's diligence, and whether some review elements are omitted. The shortest time is somewhat more than a month. On average, the CCGA review process for proposals for new ORUs and MRUs probably takes four to six months.

Procedures for Five-Year Perspectives

Five-Year Perspectives provide information needed for planning purposes and may in the future be needed for reports if and when an oversight body is established to do some of what the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) used to do. Five-year perspectives provide each campus with information that should be useful in its long-range planning. Analysis of the Five-Year Perspectives from all UC campuses also provides an opportunity to promote the information sharing, coordination, synergy, and specialization possible when UC operates as a system of inter-related campuses.

CCGA participates in the Systemwide review of the campus Five-Year Perspectives by reviewing the information provided by UCOP staff and determining whether it wishes to opine on any aspect of the information. The interval at which such Perspectives are updated has varied and as of 2014 the campuses are making biennial reports.

If CCGA wishes to distribute written comments on the Five-Year Perspectives, the Chair will notify the Council Chair who will be responsible for coordinating Systemwide committee responses and for facilitating

their distribution to interested parties. The Five-Year Perspectives and Senate comments may be an APC agenda item.

Procedures for Systemwide Courses

CCGA shall evaluate proposals for Systemwide graduate courses based upon the demonstration of multi-campus demand and scope, but also with attention to academic rigor, funding, and resources associated with the course. The proposed actions will be communicated to the campuses. Approval shall only be granted in cases where multi-campus importance has clearly been demonstrated.

Procedures for Review of Other Matters

CCGA is consulted on a variety of matters other than those already described. Other participants in the process vary according to the topic. For proposed UCOP or Academic Senate policies and procedures, UCEP, UCPB, the Academic Council, and the relevant UCOP staff and officers are the most likely other participants. For the proposed establishment or change of a school or college, UCEP, UCPB, the Academic Council and/or Assembly, the President or his/her designated representative, the Provost and Senior Vice President – Academic Affairs, the UCOP Academic Planning unit, and the Board of Regents are also involved. For five-year reviews of MRUs, UCORP, UCPB, the Academic Council, the Vice Provost-Research, the Coordinator-Research Planning, and the Provost and Senior Vice President-Academic Affairs are also involved. Systemwide review processes for proposed actions involving schools and colleges are explained in the previously described Compendium.

The procedure for reviewing proposed policies and actions almost always begins with a written document that is distributed a week or more in advance of a CCGA meeting. Most often the document has been sent to CCGA by the Chair of the Academic Council who received it from those who created it (most often an office at UCOP). All members read it. Sometimes, the Chair also asks member(s) to be prepared to lead off the discussion or to form a subcommittee to prepare an analysis. If necessary, the Chair will have contacted the Academic Council Chair, Systemwide committee chairs, UCOP staff, or others to find out who is going to do what after receiving commentary from CCGA. At the meeting, the Chair orients members to the goals of the discussion for information relevant to five-year MRU reviews. If they have been asked in advance, selected members or the subcommittee present their analyses. All members then discuss the document. Ordinarily, the Chair summarizes the discussion and obtains agreement about how to proceed. The Chair drafts a letter, statement, or resolution and sends it via e-mail to members. At their option, members review the draft and suggest revisions. As needed, revisions are made by the Chair and the final response is sent. Ordinarily the response is addressed to the Chair of the Academic Council. If not, he or she is copied. A copy of the Chair's letter is included as an information item in the next CCGA agenda packet. This process usually takes somewhat more than one month. Particularly complex or controversial proposals (e.g., proposal to establish a major new school or college) may require two or three months to allow for extended discussion, consultation with invited guests, or fact finding and analysis by selected CCGA members or staff.

Procedures for Information Sharing

Efforts are made to have in attendance at every meeting representatives of the ten Divisional Graduate Councils, the Council of Graduate Deans, the UC and campus Graduate Student Associations, and UCOP Academic Affairs. Separate agenda items allot time at every meeting for information sharing by the Chair, representatives of all the Divisional Graduate Councils, UCOP Academic Affairs, the Council of Graduate Deans, and the UC and campus Graduate Student Associations. Each speaker chooses what he or she wishes to say; the Chair includes in his or her comments a summary of the various meetings attended as CCGA representative. Sometimes questions or discussions ensue; sometimes they do not. Sometimes areas for follow-up are identified and pursued.

Procedures for New Issues

New issues may be brought before CCGA by anyone attending the meeting or by a written communication to any member. Usually they are raised by one or more of the 12 CCGA members. After a brief oral or written presentation, the issue is discussed and CCGA members decide whether they want to pursue it. If so, a reasonable course of action is determined. Ordinarily, it will lead to a written statement, resolution, request, briefing paper, or background paper. Members will vote whether and where to send it. Student representatives' votes are recorded. Options for transmittal include, but are not limited to, other Systemwide Academic Senate

committees and/or the Academic Council, the Office of the President, and Divisional Academic Senate committees. Ordinarily, transmittal is to the Chair of the Academic Council. If not, he or she is copied. A copy is included as an information item in the next CCGA agenda packet, which is usually distributed at least one week before the scheduled meeting. These procedures require amounts of time ranging from a short discussion at one CCGA meeting to many months.

Appendix A

Glossary of Acronyms and Shorthand Terms

APC (a-p-c) – Academic Planning Council

Assembly – Assembly of the Academic Senate

Board – Board of Regents

BOARS (boars) – Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

Cal ISI (cal i-si) – California Institute for Science and Innovation

CCGA (c-c-g-a) – Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

COGD (c-o-g-d) – Council of Graduate Deans

COVC (c-o-v-c) – Council of Vice Chancellors

Council – Academic Council

CPEC (c-peck) – California Postsecondary Education Commission. This oversight body was defunded and disbanded in 2011.

CSU (c-s-u) – California State University

Division – any one of the nine campuses' Academic Senates

GSA (g-s-a) – Graduate Student Association

MRU (m-r-u) – Multi-campus Research Unit, also referred to as University-wide ORU

OP (o-p) – Office of the President of the University of California

ORU (o-r-u) – Organized Research Unit

PDST – Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition

Regents – Board of Regents

SSP – Self-Supporting Program (see SSGPDP). This term was used up until the approval of a revised policy in 2014

SSGPDP – Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program (see SSP). This term replaced SSP as part of the policy revision in 2014.

TCDD (t-c-d-d) – transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance

UC (u-c) – University of California

UCAP (u-cap) – University Committee on Academic Personnel

UCEP (u-sep) – University Committee on Educational Policy

UCFW (u-c-f-w) – University Committee on Faculty Welfare

UCOC (u-c-o-c) – University Committee on Committees

UCOP (u-cop) – University of California Office of the President

UCORP (u-korp) – University Committee on Research Policy

UCPB (u-c-p-b) – University Committee on Planning and Budget

Appendix B

Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal

The proposal must adhere to the following specifications. Failure to do so will result in the return of the proposal to campus and an associated delay of at least one to two months in the review process. The following items should be included in a single PDF file:

- the complete proposal and all appendices (formatted as described below);
- a contact information sheet (located at the front of the proposal) with the lead proponent clearly identified;
- transmittal letters indicating the necessary campus approval and support.
- feedback from campus review committees and other entities as well as the proposers' responses (separate from proposal and appendices);
- a list of the chairs (or program directors) of comparable UC programs to whom the proposal was sent, a sample of the cover letter, and any feedback received from those chairs;
- additional requirements for special circumstances, including new degree title, degree to be offered by as an interdepartmental program or with participation from other institutions (see notes below);
- *strongly recommended*: list of potential internal and external reviewers.

Title

A proposal for a program of graduate studies in (e.g., English) for the (e.g., M.A., Ph.D.) degree(s).

NOTES: (1) for Master's degrees, please see Appendix J concerning degree titles; (2) if the program proposes to charge PDST please expand the phrasing to read "a program of professional graduate studies with PDST in"; if the program is self-supporting, please expand the phrase to read "a Self-Supporting Professional Graduate Degree Program in"; if the program is a self-supporting M.A.S., please expand the phrasing to "a Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Program in."

Date of Preparation

NOTE: if the proposal has been revised in the process of campus review, please include all dates: that of the first submission and that of each revision. The content forwarded to CCGA should be the latest version.

Contact Information Sheet

A contact information sheet with the lead proponent clearly identified; at least one Academic Senate member must be identified as a contact person.

Executive Summary

A concise exposition setting forth the chief features of the program in language accessible to those outside the specific field.

Section 1. Introduction

A statement setting forth the following:

- 1) Aims and objectives of the program. Any distinctive features of the program should also be noted. Include a description of the expected profile of the target audience (e.g., educational background; work experience; proportion of in-state, out-of-state, and international students).
- 2) Historical development of the field and historical development of departmental strength in the field.
- 3) Timetable for development of the program, including enrollment projects. Consistency of these projections with the campus enrollment plan. If the campus has enrollment quotas for its programs, state which program(s) will have their enrollments reduced in order to accommodate the proposed program.

- 4) Relation of the proposed program to existing programs on campus and to the Campus Academic Plan. If the program is not in the Campus Academic Plan, why is it important that it be begun now? Evidence of high campus priority. Effect of the proposed program on undergraduate programs offered by the sponsoring department(s). In the case of SSGPDP, explain clearly how any possible negative effects on existing graduate and undergraduate programs will be avoided or mitigated.
- 5) Interrelationship of the program with other University of California institutions, if applicable. The possibility of cooperation or competition with other programs within the University should be discussed. Proposers should make themselves aware of any similar proposals for new programs that may be in preparation on other campuses. Proponents are required to send copies of their proposal to the chairs (or program directors) of all departments (or programs) on other campuses offering similar degrees, with a cover letter such as the sample provided at the end of this Appendix. Any feedback received from these chairs should be included in the full submission. This solicitation is most useful if it occurs early enough to allow the proposers to take advantage of any feedback before local campus review.
- 6) Department or group which will administer the program.
- 7) Plan for evaluation of the program within the offering departments(s), by the Academic Senate and campuswide.

Section 2. Program

A detailed statement of the requirements for the program including the following:

- 1) Undergraduate preparation for admission.
- 2) Foreign language. "CCGA recognizes that foreign language competence may be an important element of graduate education of doctoral programs. It is the responsibility of the Divisional Graduate Councils to insure that the proponents of new doctoral programs have carefully considered the value of a foreign language requirement. We shall assume that when a proposal for a new doctoral degree has been forwarded to CCGA, this issue has been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Division. Divisional Graduate Councils should apply the same standard adopted for new programs in reviewing existing doctoral programs." (CCGA Minutes, 5/14/85, p.6)
- 3) Program of study:
 - a) Specific fields of emphasis
 - b) Plan(s): Master's I (with thesis) and/or II (with comprehensive exam or capstone); Doctor's A (5-member committee, mandatory oral defense) or B (3-member committee, optional oral defense)
 - c) Unit requirements
 - d) Required and recommended courses, including teaching requirement
 - e) (For Master's II only) Description of capstone element, either a comprehensive exam or an individual or group project (include details about supervision and evaluation)
 - f) When a degree program must have licensing or certification, the requirements of the agency or agencies involved should be listed in the proposal, especially the courses needed to satisfy such requirements (CCGA Minutes, 1/17/78, p.5)
- 4) Field examinations – written and/or oral.
- 5) Qualifying examinations – written and/or oral.
- 6) Thesis and/or dissertation.
- 7) Final examination.
- 8) Explanation of special requirements over and above Graduate Division minimum requirements.
- 9) Relationship of master's and doctor's programs (if applicable).

- 10) Special preparation for careers in teaching.
- 11) Sample program.
- 12) Normative time from matriculation to degree. (Assume student has no deficiencies and is full-time.) Also specify the normative lengths of time for pre-candidacy and for candidacy periods. (If normative time is subsequently lengthened to more than six years, prior approval of CCGA is required.) *Other incentives to support expeditious times-to-degree:* what policies or other incentives will assure that students make timely progress toward degree completion in the proposed program?

Section 3. Projected need

A statement setting forth the following:

- 1) Student demand for the program. Please estimate proportion of in-state, out-of-state, and international enrollment.
- 2) Opportunities for placement of graduates. It is important for proposals to provide detailed and convincing evidence of job market needs. This is especially true for programs in graduate fields now well represented among UC campuses and California independent universities, as well as programs in the same field proposed by more than one campus. If UC already offers programs in the field, what are their placement records in recent years? What recent job listings, employer surveys, assessments of future job growth, etc. can be provided to demonstrate a strong market for graduates of this program, or for graduates of specialty areas that will be the focus of the program? If enrollment will be heavily international, are international graduates expected to seek employment in U.S. or to work abroad?
- 3) Importance to the discipline.
- 4) Ways in which the program will meet the needs of society.
- 5) Relationship of the program to research and/or professional interests of the faculty.
- 6) Program Differentiation. How will the proposed program distinguish itself from existing UC and California independent university programs, from similar programs proposed by other UC campuses? Statistics or other detailed documentation of need should be provided.

Section 4. Faculty

A statement on current faculty and immediately pending appointments. This should include a list of faculty members, their ranks, their highest degree and other professional qualifications, and a citation of relevant publications; data concerning faculty should be limited to only that information pertinent to the Committee's evaluation of faculty qualifications. If proposers wish to submit full CVs for participating faculty, they should combine the CVs into a single, separate PDF supporting document, to be submitted simultaneously with the proposal.

For group programs only, one copy of letters from participating faculty indicating their interest in the program should be included. MOUs for teaching resources required to administer the graduate program curriculum must be provided by each of the affected departments. In addition, comments from all chairs of departments with graduate programs closely related to or affected by the proposed program should be included.

For a SSGPDP, please also refer to **Appendix K for additional information required to be included.**

Section 5. Courses

A list of present and proposed courses including instructors and supporting courses in related fields. The catalog description of all present and proposed courses that are relevant to the program should be appended, along with descriptions of how the courses will be staffed and how the staffing of the program will affect existing course loads, as well as descriptions of the relationship of these courses to specific fields of emphasis and future plans.

NOTE: for online courses, include details about the platform to be used; delivery partner, if any; plan for initial creation of online content, and plan for periodic refreshing of content; synchronous vs. asynchronous contact with faculty and TAs; provisions for cohort-formation and peer learning; assessment of student work, including provisions for security or identity authentication.

Section 6. Resource requirements⁶

Estimated for the first 5 years the additional cost of the program, by year, for each of the following categories:

- 1) FTE faculty
- 2) Library acquisition
- 3) Computing costs
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Space and other capital facilities
- 6) Other operating costs

Indicate the intended method of funding these additional costs.

If applicable, state that no new resources will be required and explain how the program will be funded. If it is to be funded by internal reallocation, explain how internal resources will be generated.

State Resources to Support New Programs. The resource plan to support the proposed program should be clearly related to campus enrollment plans and resource plans. Campuses should provide detailed information on how resources will be provided to support the proposed program: from resources for approved graduate enrollment growth, reallocation, and other sources. What will the effects of reallocation be on existing programs? For interdisciplinary programs and programs growing out of tracks within existing graduate programs: What will the impact of the new program be on the contributing program(s)? When the proposed program is fully implemented, how will faculty FTE be distributed among contributing and new programs?

Section 7. Graduate Student Support

It is recommended that all new proposals include detailed plans for providing sufficient graduate student support. In fields that have depended on federal research grants, these plans should also discuss current availability of faculty grants that can support graduate students and funding trends in agencies expected to provide future research or training grants. Are other extramural resources likely to provide graduate student support, or will internal fellowship and other institutional support be made available to the program? If the latter, how will reallocation affect support in existing programs? Describe any campus fund-raising initiatives that will contribute to support of graduate students in the proposed program.

How many teaching assistantships will be available to the program? Will resources for them be provided through approved enrollment growth, reallocation, or a combination? How will reallocation affect support in existing programs?

⁶ For guidelines on discussion of resource requirements for SSGPDPs, see Appendix K, and for discussion of resource issues related to conversions of state supported to self-supporting or self-supporting to state-supported degree programs, see Appendix L.

Provide an estimate of the average per student support (from all sources) and compare the estimate to systemwide norms or other comparators.

NOTE: An SSGPDP and any proposal involving PDST should explain what financial aid will be available or why it is not necessary to make a provision for financial aid, and should discuss the implications of the fee structure for the diversity of the projected clientele.

Section 8. Governance

If the new program is being offered by a unit that does not/has not offer(ed) graduate degrees, then a setting forth of “the Department or Group that will administer the program” is required, and the proposal should include bylaws associated with the new program. Bylaws should also be included with all proposals submitted by interdepartmental programs (IDPs). IDPs are graduate degree granting programs that are not offered by a single department, but administered by a group of faculty who are constituted for that purpose, and whose governance lies outside that of any single department.

Section 9. Changes in Senate regulations

The proposal should state clearly whether or not any changes in Senate Regulations at the Divisional level or in the Assembly of the Academic Senate will be required. If changes are necessary (e.g., for all proposals for new degrees), the complete text of the proposed amendments or new regulations should be provided.

Optional Appendices

In addition to the main document outlined above, many proposals contain appendices, offering supporting detail, e.g., some or all of the following: the complete CVs of the principal faculty administering and teaching in the new program; documentation of market surveys or other evidence of demand for the degree; letters of support from local industry or other potential employers or sponsors of potential students; budget spreadsheets; listing of comparable degree programs; sample syllabi of proposed new courses.

SAMPLE LETTER SENT BY PROPOSERS TO CHAIRS OF PROGRAMS OFFERING THE SAME OR A COMPARABLE DEGREE AT ANOTHER UC CAMPUS

(to be sent to all appropriate chairs or program directors)

Dear Chair (or Program Director),

At UCX we are in the process of proposing a new graduate program leading to [degree title]. In accordance with the review policy established by the systemwide Coordinating Committee of Graduate Affairs (CCGA), I am providing you, as the Chair of an existing comparable program, with a copy of the current draft of our proposal. We would be very grateful for any feedback you may wish to offer us, so that the proposal may be made as strong as possible before submission.

As background, please understand that the format and contents of the proposal follow the required outline found in the CCGA Handbook, and that internal and external reviewers will later be asked to address the following four points when examining our final submission:

- Quality and academic rigor of the program
- Adequacy of the size and expertise of faculty to administer the program
- Adequacy of the facilities and budgets
- Applicant pool and placement prospects for the graduates

If you wish to provide feedback, we would like to receive it within four weeks of the date of this letter, since we expect to submit the proposal for campus review at that time.

Appendix C

Overview: Review Process for New Graduate Degree Proposals

Based on the CCGA Handbook and the Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes.
[formerly Appendix E]

Divisional Graduate Council

- Approves proposal for new graduate degree program after consultation with divisional Planning and Budget committee.

Divisional Assembly or Divisional Executive Committee

- Approves new degree proposals and explicitly approves use of any new degree title.

Chancellor

- After approval by the Chancellor or designee, sends all required materials to Systemwide reviewers, including the UC Provost, designated UCOP staff, Academic Council Chair, CCGA Chair and Vice-Chair, and CCGA analyst. The items to be sent are as follows:
 - the complete proposal and all appendices (see Appendix B for format);
 - a contact information sheet (located at the front of the proposal) with the lead proponent clearly identified;
 - transmittal letters indicating the necessary campus approval and support.
 - feedback from campus review committees and other entities as well as the proposers' responses (separate from proposal and appendices);
 - a list of the chairs (or program directors) of comparable UC programs to whom the proposal was sent, a sample of the cover letter, and any feedback received from those chairs;
 - additional requirements for special circumstances, including new degree title, degree to be offered by as an interdepartmental program or with participation from other institutions (see notes below);
 - *strongly recommended*: list of potential internal and external reviewers.

CCGA

- Assigns CCGA lead reviewer.
- Conducts review.
- CCGA review normally includes full committee discussion, interchange with the campus to clarify issues, and written review of the proposal by at least two disciplinary experts external to UC. If needed, one or two internal UC reviews may also be requested. If the CCGA or consultation by the lead reviewer with the Chair and Vice-Chair deems it necessary, a site visit may be performed by the lead reviewer. Program proposers must cover all costs of a site visit.

CCGA approval

- For new degree with a title already authorized for the campus, Letter to UC Provost copied to Council Chair.
- For new degree with a degree title that has never been used before on the campus, then the approval letter is sent to the Academic Council Chair, who will arrange for approval by the Assembly (or the Council if the Assembly is not meeting within 60 days) and then submit the approval to the Provost. (See *Compendium*, Section II.C).


President

- Designated UCOP staff draft letter to forward UC Provost's recommendation for approval to the President.
- President reviews proposal and campus is notified of President's action.
- If approved, campus may proceed with program implementation.

WASC

In some circumstances, a new degree proposal requires approval by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

Flow Chart



Appendix D

Graduate Degree Program Proposal Lead Reviewer's Responsibilities

[Formerly Appendix F]

The lead reviewer's responsibility is to do the work that allows CCGA to give a proposal for a new graduate degree program a full and fair review, considering the quality of the proposed program, its role on the campus, and its Systemwide implications. Every effort should be made to complete CCGA's portion of the Systemwide review process just as rapidly as possible consonant with conducting a full and fair review. The lead reviewer must be diligent and efficacious. He or she should keep the campus well informed of what is happening in CCGA's review. A brief telephone call or e-mail update to the proponents every month will be appreciated if contact has not been made any other way.

What follows is a roughly chronological description of the main activities and responsibilities of the lead reviewer. It is meant as a guide rather than a prescription. Steps 5, 6, 7, and 8, in particular, should occur in whatever order makes the most sense for the particular proposal under review.

- 1) You will receive a copy of a proposed graduate degree program electronically, or download it from the content management server. It may be an attachment to a meeting agenda, or be sent to you directly by the committee analyst.
- 2) You will be asked to be the lead reviewer (you may decline) or you may volunteer to be the lead reviewer. You may not be a reviewer for a proposal from your own campus or one for which you believe there is a conflict of interest.
- 3) You will lead any CCGA discussions about the proposal. You may highlight any concerns you have and solicit comments from other CCGA members at the preliminary discussion and/or during later stages of the review. Members will ask questions, give evaluations, and offer advice on how to proceed with the review.
- 4) After CCGA's preliminary discussion of the proposal, and after you have checked to make sure that the proposal includes all of the requisite components that are spelled out in Appendix B, you will contact the lead proposer(s) directly to introduce yourself as the lead reviewer and let them know what to expect in the process. Confirm that the lead proposer(s) listed on the proposal are still performing that role. If the proposal does not already contain a list of suggested internal and external reviewers, then invite the lead proposer(s) to submit suggestions as soon as possible. You may wish to ask them if there have been any changes at the campus level since the proposal was submitted originally of which CCGA should be aware. If the proposal is missing any necessary discussion, or if any supporting documents are missing, you will want to request them from the proposer at this time, emphasizing that an incomplete proposal cannot be sent out to reviewers.
- 6) As a result of the preliminary discussion, or any discussion thereafter, you (or the Chair in extraordinary cases) will communicate to the proposing faculty one or more questions, requests for clarification, or recommendations for additions or deletions to the proposal. According to your judgment, you may distribute copies of this communication to CCGA members as well as to the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council Chair (and the GC's Academic Senate Analyst) of the proposing campus. The proposing faculty are informed that a response must be received at least 10 working days in advance of a CCGA meeting to allow time for distribution to and study by all CCGA members. You will decide whether campus-level review and endorsement of any response is appropriate and, if so, be sure the proposing faculty obtain it. For example, a response to a question expressing concern about the level of graduate student support may require an updated endorsement by the graduate dean or other administrators committing resources to the program.

- 7) You will be responsible for obtaining reviews of the proposal. You should begin this process as soon as possible since obtaining reviews often takes the longest amount of time in the review process.
- a) The reviews are based entirely on the written material you provide and on the reviewer's expertise in the field. There is no site visit or other investigation required of the external reviewers. Each review must be submitted in writing.
 - b) Generally there are a minimum of four reviews; two from outside the UC system and two from UC faculty members who are not from the proposing campus. The reviewers should be distinguished scholars in the disciplines of the proposed program. For some proposals, especially multi-disciplinary proposals, more reviewers may be necessary. It is desirable, although by no means necessary, for at least some of the reviewers to have experience in administering a graduate program and/or a department in the field. This experience tends to enhance their ability to assess the adequacy of resources proposed for the program, including faculty resources.
 - c) It is customary to aim for a mixture of reviewers suggested by the proposers and reviewers not named by the proposers. You may seek suggestions from other CCGA members or from relevant UC faculty or deans on a campus other than the proposing campus. People who submitted letters of support for the proposal or are otherwise already involved in supporting the proposed degree program are usually not selected as reviewers.
 - d) Having identified potential reviewers, you will need to contact them, and if they are able to serve as reviewers, send them the proposal and any additional materials prepared by the proponents and others on that campus. You need to give them some guidance about the review content and timetable, agree about confidentiality, and (for external reviewers only) confirm the \$250 honorarium (see Appendix E for a description and sample letters). In the interest of avoiding prolonged delays, it is important to follow up when there has been no response to an email inquiry, and eventually it may be necessary to move on to another possible reviewer.
 - e) You will need to ascertain the level of confidentiality desired by the individuals consulted and to maintain it in all oral and written communications. Usually, reviewers agree to have themselves identified in the lead reviewer's report, their reviews appended to the report, and their comments quoted in the report. This is preferred because their stature lends weight to their evaluation and suggestions. However, you should establish with each reviewer the least restrictive level of confidentiality to which he or she will agree and then operate accordingly.
 - f) Whenever you receive reviewers' reports, substantive responses to queries, additional letters of support, or a revised version of the full proposal, either upload the new material to CCGA content management system or seek the assistance of the CCGA Analyst to do so.
 - g) An honorarium in the amount of \$250 will be paid to each outside, *non-UC* reviewer participating in the CCGA program review process (letter from Bovell, Chair of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate, to Russell, Chair of CCGA, 2/91). When the written review has been received, inform the CCGA Analyst (cc: CCGA chair), providing contact details. The Analyst will take care of payment.
- 8) You may want or be requested to make a site visit, although site visits are made only rarely. **All expenses associated with this visit must be paid for by the proponents.** If it becomes clear that a site visit is advisable, please inform the program proponents as soon as possible. During a site visit, you should plan on talking with faculty members, students who might be enrolling in the program, the academic dean, and anyone else considered helpful. You may ask to see the facilities. You may wish to discuss any concerns raised by CCGA or reviewers (if you have chosen to contact them before the site visit).
- 9) You will make progress reports at every CCGA meeting. Substantive discussions of the proposal may occur at more than one meeting. You may contact the proponents as often as needed to request an oral or written response to concerns raised at any time during this process (including a written addition to, deletion of, or alteration of some aspect of the proposal). Contacting proponents whenever questions or concerns arise and requesting a response may enhance the timeliness of the review process.

- 10) You will make a recommendation to CCGA to:
- a) Approve the proposal;
 - b) Approve the proposal with modifications agreed upon by CCGA, the program proponents and, when appropriate, the campus;
 - c) Return the proposal to the campus for more extensive modifications; or
 - d) Reject the proposal.
- 11) CCGA consideration of your recommendation will be facilitated if you submit a written statement supporting the recommendation that can be distributed with the call to the meeting. If your recommendation is approval of the proposal, this written statement should be a preliminary version of the lead reviewer's report, and it should be submitted for members to review prior to the meeting at which it will be discussed. In the interest of avoiding prolonged delays, CCGA may decide to vote on the basis of a thorough oral report, with the written report to be submitted within 7 days of the meeting.
- 12) The lead reviewer's report should contain:
- a short description of the proposed degree program
 - a chronology of the review process
 - a description of the strengths of the proposed program
 - an identification and discussion of weaknesses or concerns identified by CCGA members or reviewers and any responses to them
 - and a recommendation with the supporting rationale for it.

Particular topics and extent of discussion of them will vary according to the nature of the proposal and reactions to it. The substance of the report should, on balance, support the recommendation. If the recommendation is rejection or a return to the campus, the report should be written so as to be helpful to the proposing faculty if they wish to revise and resubmit the proposal.

- 13) If the proposal is approved, you will amend your preliminary report as needed and send the final version to the Chair of CCGA along with the reports from the external reviewers (redacted for confidentiality if necessary), any additional materials submitted by the proponents and anything else you believe informative and relevant. For decisions other than approval, you and the CCGA Chair will agree what sort of report, if any, and additional materials are needed from you.

Appendix E

Sample Letters to Reviewers of Degree Program Proposals

[Formerly Appendix M]

In order to expedite the review process, CCGA recommends that committee members communicate with reviewers via either telephone or email, with at least one communication in writing (as an email or email attachment). Lead reviewers may choose to contact reviewers through a telephone call, followed by an emailed letter, or through two email letters (initial contact and follow-up). The letter(s) should do the following:

- Identify the proposal to be reviewed
- List all materials being sent to the reviewer
- Describe CCGA and its functions
- Explain the criteria CCGA uses to review all graduate degree program proposals
- Describe any specific issues or concerns with this proposal
- Handle the issue of confidentiality
- Establish the honorarium
- Set a date for receipt of the written review, and
- Indicate how to contact the lead reviewer.

On the following pages are sample letters from the lead reviewer. The first represents the first contact of a possible external reviewer. In modern email communication, however, it may be preferable to send a more condensed version to ensure that the recipient will read and respond to your request (second sample). The third represents follow-up and transmission of the review materials once a potential reviewer has agreed to serve. This should be the most formal and detailed communication. Letters for other scenarios can easily be created from these examples. Remember to remove any reference to an honorarium from letters sent to internal reviewers, who are ineligible to receive such payment.

**Sample CCGA Lead Reviewer's Letter
First Contact of Possible External Reviewer⁷**

Dear Professor [ABC]:

I am writing as a member of the University of California Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to ask your assistance in reviewing a proposal from Campus X to establish the Master of Dramaturgy and the Doctor of Dramaturgical Arts degrees on that campus. As an expert in the field, you can provide the scholarly evaluation we need. I will explain the review process briefly here and then call in about two weeks to see if you are willing and able to assist us.

Your evaluation of the proposed degree programs will be based on written materials I will provide and on your knowledge of the field. There is no site visit involved, nor do you need to do any additional investigation. Your evaluation is part of a review process conducted by CCGA, a standing committee of the UC Systemwide Academic Senate. CCGA is composed of faculty representatives from each of the ten UC campuses, a Chair, and a Vice Chair. It has the responsibility of final academic review of all graduate degree programs proposed in the UC system. As members, we are concerned with the academic quality of proposed programs as well as the ability of the campus to deliver the programs within the existing or committed resources. We are also concerned with system-wide implications of the establishment of the proposed programs, but you are not expected to address that issue unless you wish to do so.

If you are able to serve as a reviewer, you are invited to comment on all aspects of the proposed degree programs. We need to know their strengths, as well as their weaknesses. Even if the proposal is generally strong and is easily approved, we can pass on your recommendations about aspects of the program that could be strengthened. For all proposed graduate degree programs, CCGA is interested in the following issues:

- Quality and academic rigor of the program
- Adequacy of the size and expertise of faculty to administer the program
- Adequacy of the facilities and budgets
- Applicant pool and placement prospects for the graduates

In addition to evaluating these issues, should you be able to serve as a reviewer, you will be asked to address some specific questions that have arisen about the proposed M.D./D.D.A.

Your review may be treated at any of several levels of confidentiality. We hope that you will agree that it need not be confidential, because associating you with your evaluations and recommendations will enhance their value in the Systemwide UC review process. However, we are flexible and will respect your wishes on this matter.

Should you be willing to evaluate the proposed M.D. and D.D.A. programs, we would like to receive the review as soon as possible so that we can complete CCGA's review process in a timely manner. I am able to offer a \$250 honorarium for your review. I very much hope you will be able to serve as a reviewer for Campus X's proposed M.D. and D.D.A. degrees. Please do not hesitate to ask me any questions that you may have about the process. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Lead Reviewer, CCGA

⁷ Initial letters to internal (i.e., UC) reviewers may follow this same format, with the exception of the line in the last paragraph concerning the honorarium – CCGA does not offer honoraria to internal reviewers.

Sample Initial Email

Dear Professor X,

I am a member of the University of California systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and I have undertaken the assignment of lead reviewer for a proposal from UC Riverside to establish a new Master of X program in the School of X. My primary task is to obtain some evaluations, both from non-UC faculty and from UC faculty at campuses other than the proposing campus. You have been recommended highly to me as someone who could provide an expert assessment of this proposal.

If you agree to do this, I will send you the proposal as a PDF (23 pages describing the program and 165 pages of appendices--mostly long faculty CVs). This is also a self-supporting graduate professional degree program (SSGPDP), so I will also provide a copy of the current UC President's policy on SSGPDPs. Your evaluation should be based on these written materials and your knowledge of the field. There is no site visit involved, nor do you need to do additional investigation.

For your information, the proposal describes the differentiation of this degree as follows:

"..."

You are invited to comment on all aspects of the proposed degree program. We need to know its strengths, as well as its weaknesses. Even if the proposal is generally strong and is easily approved, we can pass on your recommendations about aspects of the program that could be strengthened. For all proposed graduate degree programs, CCGA is interested in the following issues:

- Quality and academic rigor of the program
- Adequacy of the size and expertise of faculty to administer the program
- Adequacy of the facilities and budgets
- Applicant pool and placement prospects for the graduates

If you agree, we would like to receive your report within 6-8 weeks. Your report may be confidential or you may allow us to reveal your identity to the proposers, whichever you prefer. [For external reviewer: CCGA is able to offer an honorarium of \$250 for your assistance.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you are unable to take this on yourself, I would be very grateful for any suggestions as to other potential reviewers.

Sample CCGA Lead Reviewer's Letter
External Reviewer Previously Contacted by Telephone or E-mail⁸

Dear Professor [ABC]:

Thank you very much for agreeing to review Campus X's proposed Master of Dramaturgy (M.D.) and Doctoral of Dramaturgical Arts (D.D.A.) degree programs. The proposal and its appendices are enclosed. In addition, I have enclosed two letters that Dean Y recently sent to provide additional information of interest to CCGA members. As you know, your evaluation should be based on these written materials and your knowledge of the field. There is no site visit involved, nor do you need to do additional investigation.

As we discussed on the telephone [or: As I indicated to you in my previous email], your evaluation of the proposed graduate degrees is part of a review process conducted by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), a standing committee of the UC Systemwide Academic Senate. CCGA is composed of faculty representatives from each of the ten UC campuses, a Chair, and a Vice Chair. It has the responsibility of final academic review of all graduate degree programs proposed in the UC system. As members, we are concerned with the academic quality of proposed programs as well as the ability of the campus to deliver the programs within the existing or committed resources. We are also concerned with Systemwide implications of the establishment of the proposed programs, but you are not expected to address that issue unless you wish to do so.

You are invited to comment on all aspects of the proposed degree programs. We need to know their strengths, as well as their weaknesses. Even if the proposal is generally strong and is easily approved, we can pass on your recommendations about aspects of the program that could be strengthened. For all proposed graduate degree programs, CCGA is interested in the following issues:

- Quality and academic rigor of the program
- Adequacy of the size and expertise of faculty to administer the program
- Adequacy of the facilities and budgets
- Applicant pool and placement prospects for the graduates

In addition to any comments that you find appropriate, we would appreciate your thoughts on the following two questions that CCGA members have raised about the proposed M.D. and D.D.A. at Campus X:

- 1) What are the employment prospects for M.D. and D.D.A. students? In your view, are there already sufficient numbers of such students being graduated each year to satisfy national demand?
- 2) How does the Campus X curriculum compare with the best programs in the country? Do the depth and breadth of the required coursework at Campus X meet the standards set by those programs?

As you indicated to me in your previous email [or: in our telephone conversation], your report will not be confidential. Knowing that you are the source of whatever evaluations and recommendations you offer will enhance their value in the Systemwide UC review process.

I understand I will receive your written evaluation of the proposed M.D. and D.D.A. by October 31 so that we can complete CCGA's review process in a timely manner. You will receive an honorarium of \$250 for the review. If you have any questions, you may reach me at the above address and telephone number or by e-mail.

Your willingness to comment on Campus X's proposed M.D. and D.D.A. programs is much appreciated. I look forward to receiving your review.

Sincerely,
Lead Reviewer, CCGA

⁸ Follow-up letters to internal reviewers may follow the same format as this letter, with the exception of the line in the second to last paragraph concerning an honorarium – CCGA does not offer honoraria to internal reviewers.

Appendix F
Letter to Lead Proposer of Graduate Degree Program Proposals (major revisions)

Note: This version is used when major proposal revisions are required.

[Formerly Appendix N]

Dear [LEAD PROPOSER]:

CCGA has had the opportunity to conduct a preliminary review of your [PROPOSAL NAME]. Professor [LEAD REVIEWER] has been selected as the lead reviewer for this proposal, and he/she has conducted an initial review of the proposal. In doing so, Professor [LEAD REVIEWER] has obtained a number of internal and external reviews of the proposal, which is part of the normal CCGA review process. In addition, CCGA members have had the opportunity to discuss the proposal in detail at a number of meetings.

Please read the enclosed initial CCGA report on the proposal, which highlights CCGA's concerns at this point. These issues have been raised by both the internal/external reviewers as well as CCGA members themselves. Please note that CCGA has not voted on the proposal yet, nor should this report be taken as a final disposition of the proposal. Rather, it is our intent that this report serves to open a dialogue between yourself and the lead reviewer. Through this process, we look forward to working with you to address our concerns, ultimately leading towards the successful approval of the program.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,
Chair, CCGA

Appendix G
Formats and Recipients for Chair's Letter on
Graduate Degree Program Proposal

[Formerly Appendix O]

CCGA's final decision for every graduate degree program proposal is communicated by the CCGA Chair to all those with a vested interest in knowing the outcome. To whom the Chair's letter is addressed and what information it contains depend on the nature of the graduate degree program proposed, CCGA's decision, and the nature and content of any lead reviewer's report that will be attached to the Chair's letter. There are five categories of recipients of the CCGA Chair's letter:

- 1) Proposing faculty – whomever the lead reviewer has identified as the main contact and others routinely copied or contacted;
- 2) Campus administration: Graduate Dean; Dean of the relevant School or College; Provost
- 3) UC Office of the President – Provost and Executive Vice President (UC Provost);
- 4) Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate/Academic Council; and
- 5) CCGA members.

Occasionally, others also need to be informed (e.g., CSU administrators in joint degree proposals). The following describes the circumstances under which the CCGA Chair's letter is addressed to each of three possible people. Others may be informed by a copy of this letter or a separate letter or both.

Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate: CCGA approved the proposed graduate degree program, which must also be approved by the Assembly because it is not included in the Regents' provisions as covered under Standing Order 110.1 – Academic Units and Functions, Affiliated Institutions, and Related Activities of the University;

Provost and Executive Vice President (UC Provost): CCGA approved the proposed graduate degree program and it need not be approved by the Assembly; or

Main Contact from Proposing Faculty: CCGA returned the proposal for extensive modifications or rejected the proposal.

The CCGA Chair's letter and the lead reviewer's report, if included, must together cover at least the following topics:

- Proposal that was reviewed
- Review materials and process
- CCGA decision, record of the vote, and date on which it was made
- If the vote was not unanimous, the division of votes and reasons for the division
- Reasons for CCGA's decision
- Any concerns, recommendations, or conditions CCGA expressed during deliberations
- Any attachments and enclosures to the letter
- Recipients of a copy of the letter
- If CCGA approved the proposal, enclose lead reviewer's report and attachments

Approval letters are usually short, because the enclosed lead reviewer's report and attachments contain almost all needed information. Other letters vary in length. Three sample letters, one for each of the three addressees above, follow.

**Sample CCGA Chair's Letter
Approved Proposal that must go to the Assembly**

CHAIR
Academic Council/Assembly of the Academic Senate

Dear [ABC]:

Enclosed are the materials needed for the January Academic Council agenda item regarding Campus X's proposed Master of Dramaturgy (M.D.) and Doctor of Dramaturgical Arts (D.D.A.) degree programs. I have included a thorough report by CCGA's lead reviewer for this proposal and eight attachments to that report, the most important of which are probably the opinions of four outside reviewers about the quality and feasibility of the proposed degree programs.

As the lead reviewer's report indicates, CCGA approved the proposed degree programs at our December 14, 1993 meeting. We were unanimous and enthusiastic in our approval, as were the student representatives to CCGA. The new degree programs are educationally sound and feasible. Moreover, they bring the Department of Dramaturgy's graduate offerings into line with national practices. The department currently offers the M.F.A., a terminal degree that is no longer in favor in the field. The new M.D. and D.D.A. degrees will replace the M.F.A., which will be phased out. The proposed degree programs have the strong support of the Dean, as well as the proposing faculty. Since Campus X is moving to a system in which resources are allocated to Provosts and Deans who then distribute them to departments and programs, the Dean's strong support is a good indicator that the degree programs will have the resources they need. Thus, even in these times of fiscal constraint, CCGA members believe it is appropriate to introduce the M.D. and D.D.A. programs at Campus X.

As you know, CCGA's approval is the last stop on the Academic Senate side of the Systemwide review and approval process except when the new degree title must be approved by the President, under delegated authority from the Board of Regents. According to Academic Senate Bylaws, the Assembly of the Academic Senate (or the Academic Council if the Assembly is not meeting within 60 days of CCGA's approval) must approve new degree titles. Since the Assembly is not scheduled to meet until March 1994, I look forward to consideration of the proposed M.D. and D.D.A. at the January meeting of the Academic Council.

Cordially,
CCGA Chair

cc: CCGA Members
Dean, School of Dramatic Arts, Campus X
Provost, Campus X
Chair, Department of Dramaturgy, Campus X
Graduate Dean, Campus X
Provost and Executive Vice President – Academic Affairs

Encls.

**Sample CCGA Chair's Letter
Approved Proposal that does not go to the Assembly**

**PROVOST & EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT – ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
University of California**

Dear [ABC]:

At its meeting of February 15, CCGA members approved the proposed M.S./Ph.D. programs in Aerospace Engineering at Campus X. Except for abstentions because of association with Campus X or one of the sponsoring departments, the votes of the CCGA members and student representatives were unanimous.

For your information and records, I am enclosing the report of CCGA's lead reviewer for this proposal, her letter to the two outside reviewers, their reviews, and two letters (dated December 16 and January 20) from the Campus X School of Engineering Dean, providing additional information about the proposed degree programs. If you should wish copies of the attachments mentioned in the Dean's letters, please contact the CCGA Committee Analyst directly.

In its discussion and approval of the proposed M.S./Ph.D. at Campus X, CCGA raised the following concerns:

- 1) The department should reconsider its qualifying exam procedures and seriously consider removing the research advisor from the examining committee.
- 2) The department should consider requiring a final research seminar of all the Ph.D. students.

By copy of this letter, I am conveying these suggestions to the Department of Aerospace Engineering for the faculty's consideration. However, approval of the proposed degree programs is not in any way contingent on adoption of these suggestions.

The Academic Senate has now completed all steps in its review of the proposed M.S. and Ph.D. in Aerospace Engineering at Campus X. The proposed degree programs have our hearty approval. We commend them to you.

Cordially,
CCGA Chair

Encls.

cc: CCGA Members
Chair, Academic Council/Assembly of the Academic Senate
Dean, School of Engineering, Campus X
Provost, Campus X
Chair, Department of Aerospace Engineering, Campus X
Graduate Dean, Campus X

**Sample CCGA Chair's Letter
Proposal that is Returned or Rejected**

**CHAIR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Campus X**

Dear [ABC]:

I regret to inform you that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), at its meeting of April 15, 1994, determined that it would not continue to consider the Proposal for a Joint Ph.D. Program in Paranormal Psychology between UC Campus X and Y University (revised proposal dated February 1993; original dated December 1990). With an abstention by the Campus X CCGA member, the vote was unanimous; the student representatives also voted in favor of the motion.

In its current form, the proposal does not present a compelling case for the joint degree program; oral and written communications received since CCGA began review of the proposal have not markedly changed our evaluation. I will describe here our three primary concerns. Should you believe it would be helpful, CCGA's lead reviewer for this proposal, the Campus X member of CCGA, and I are all happy to discuss the matter with you.

As you know, the Joint Ph.D. proposal was transmitted by the Campus X Executive Vice Chancellor to the UC Office of the President in September 1993. At the October CCGA meeting, the proposal was discussed in depth by all CCGA members. In a letter dated November 4, CCGA's lead reviewer for this proposal conveyed our concerns to you and subsequently talked with you by telephone about the review. Progress in reviewing the proposal was discussed at the monthly CCGA meeting. In a letter dated March 17, 1994, you responded to the concerns raised by the lead reviewer. At our April meeting, we discussed your response and the proposal at length and, as I've said, concluded that we would return the proposal to you.

We continue to question the value of the Joint Ph.D. for Campus X. [There follows an explanation of this concern and three paragraphs explaining CCGA's other major concerns.]

We know that conceptual development of the proposed graduate degree program and preparation of the proposal were arduous tasks. However, we believe that Campus X and Y University have not as yet demonstrated that the proposed Joint Ph.D. Program in Paranormal Psychology is fully developed conceptually, adequately supported at the two institutions, likely to succeed in attracting high quality applicants who engage in a demanding and fruitful Ph.D. program, and going to meet a defined need in the University of California. We trust that this letter will be helpful to you in reconsidering the proposal and deciding how you wish to proceed.

Cordially,
CCGA Chair

cc: CCGA Members
Chair, Academic Council/Assembly of the Academic Senate
Dean, Division of Social Sciences, Campus X
Provost, Campus X
Graduate Dean, Campus X
Chair, Department of Paranormal Psychology, Y University
Graduate Dean, Y University
Provost and Executive Vice President – Academic Affairs

Appendix H

Information about Degree Proposals of Interest to State Authorities

[replaces obsolete former Appendices C and D]

Formerly, the state agency for higher education, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), reviewed proposals for new University graduate programs as well as for new schools and colleges. CPEC employed the principles listed below to evaluate proposals.

Although CPEC was defunded in 2011, state interest in UC's academic offerings continues and at some point the state may resume formal review. The principles below capture areas of ongoing state interest and are at the core of periodic inquiries received by UCOP from state officials and agency staff (e.g., the Governor, the Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst). Information solicited for the University's own approval processes covers many issues the principles seek to address: student demand, societal need, placement of graduates, differences from other UC programs or from programs at other institutions in California, costs, and research and scholarly activity.

Student demand

Within reasonable limits, students should have the opportunity to enroll in programs of study they are interested in and qualified for. Therefore, student demand for programs, indicated primarily by current and projected enrollments, is an important consideration in determining need for a new program.

Societal need

Postsecondary education institutions bear a responsibility for preparing students to meet the state's workforce and knowledge needs. Workforce demand projections serve as one indication of the need for a proposed program. Although achieving and maintaining a perfect balance between supply and demand in any given career field is impossible, it is important nevertheless that the number of persons trained in a field and the number of job openings in that field remain reasonably balanced.

Appropriateness to the institutional and system mission

Programs offered by a public institution within a given system must comply with the delineation of function for that system, as set forth in the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Proposed new programs must also be consistent with the institution's own statement of mission and must be approved by the system's statewide governing body.

Number of existing and proposed programs in the field

An inventory of existing and proposed programs provides an initial indication of the extent to which apparent duplication or undue proliferation of programs exists, both within and among the higher education systems. However, the number of programs alone cannot be regarded as an indication of unnecessary duplication. This is because (a) programs with similar titles may have varying course objectives or content, (b) there may be a demonstrated need for the program in a particular region of the state, or (c) the program might be needed for an institution to achieve academic comparability within a given system.

Total Costs of the Program

The relative costs of a program, when compared with other programs in the same or different program areas, constitute another criterion in the program review process. Included in the consideration of costs are the number of new faculty required and the student/faculty ratios, as well as costs associated with equipment, library resources, and facilities necessary to deliver the program. For a new program, it is necessary to know the source of the funds required for its support, both initially and in the long run.

Maintenance and improvement of quality

Protecting the public interest and trust requires that educational programs at all levels be high quality. The primary responsibility for the quality of programs rests with the institution and its system.

Advancement of Knowledge

The program review process encourages the growth and development of intellectual and creative scholarship.

When the advancement of knowledge seems to require the continuation of existing programs or the establishment of programs in new disciplines or in new combinations of existing disciplines, such considerations as costs, student demand or employment opportunities may become secondary.

Appendix I
Master's Degree Capstone Requirements (Thesis, Comprehensive Exam, or Project)

[Former Appendix L, with 2014 addition]

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Bruce Schumm, Chair
schumm@scipp.ucsc.edu

The Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 587-6138
Fax: (510) 763-0309

August 12, 2008

Capstone Requirements
(Resolution endorsed by CCGA, March 7, 2000)

To: Graduate Deans
From: CCGA Chair Simon Williams

It has recently come to the attention of CCGA that some Master's programs on different UC campuses have either been dropping the capstone requirements for their degree programs or are requesting their respective Graduate Councils for permission to drop these requirements. In response to this news, CCGA passed the following resolution at its meeting of January 11, 2000:

With regard to Master's Degrees, CCGA asserts that the norm should be for a thesis or for a comprehensive examination following the course work, both in order to integrate the intellectual substance of the program and also as a means of quality control. Substitution for this requirement can be considered if there is a strong academic justification. If changes are made in Master's programs already approved, those changes must be authorized by the Graduate Council in conjunction with the Graduate Division.

I am now writing to request your cooperation in ensuring that there be no erosion in the requirements of UC graduate programs.

When CCGA approves a new graduate program, it does so on the understanding that the qualifications for admission, curriculum, and program requirements as they were stated in the proposal as reviewed by CCGA will be upheld by the program. CCGA realizes, of course, that over the years, circumstances such as changes in the field or new professional demands will require that the original program be modified. In the large majority of cases, such modifications can be approved by Graduate Councils. However, CCGA is concerned that whatever changes are made do not lead to a degradation of the program. In particular, it considers that a capstone requirement, as defined in Plans A and B for the master's program, or as embodied in the dissertation for doctoral degrees, is essential to maintain the distinctive, research-oriented quality of a UC graduate degree. It has therefore been additionally resolved that:

CCGA withdraws its approval from any master's degree program that has dropped its capstone requirement or any doctoral program that has dropped its dissertation requirement without the approval of its campus Graduate Council.

CCGA also is requesting all agencies responsible for the review of academic programs to use the review process that each department periodically undergoes to ensure the integrity of graduate programs. It suggests that this can be done by providing reviewers with a copy of the program as originally approved by CCGA and asking the reviewers to evaluate whether changes made since the initiation of the program are integral. It will, of course, be impossible to find founding documents for older graduate programs; in this case, we would ask that reviewers be requested to evaluate the appropriateness of current capstone requirements.

2014 GUIDANCE ON CAPSTONE PROJECTS

[email Feb. 26, 2014]

Dear Graduate Council Chairs:

On behalf of Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Chair Donald Mastronarde, I am writing to give you advance notice of some additions that CCGA intends to make to the CCGA Handbook in the next revision, to be completed in summer 2014, or earlier. The two enclosures express policies or guidance that CCGA has been discussing for some time, and we would like those working on new proposals or Graduate Councils currently reviewing new proposals to be aware of our thinking. One concerns what CCGA is looking for in Master's degree capstone requirements that take the form of a project rather than the traditional comprehensive examination or Master's thesis. The other concerns preferred titles of Master's degrees.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Todd Giedt
Associate Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

+++++

ACADEMIC SENATE University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12 Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

February 26, 2014

GRADUATE COUNCIL CHAIRS

Re: CCGA Guidance on Capstones

Dear Graduate Council Chairs:

CCGA suggests that both those proposing new Master's degrees, as well as the campus reviewers of new proposals, pay special attention to the requirement that all such degrees have a capstone element.

In many programs, the capstone is satisfied by the requirement of a Master's thesis or the requirement of a comprehensive examination. Where these mechanisms are not present, there is a capstone project of some kind (projects are common, for instance, in degrees for practicing professionals). CCGA pays very careful attention to the description of capstone projects in reviewing proposed new degrees, and proposers will experience a smoother review if they give a thorough and cogent treatment of this topic in their proposal.

In particular, CCGA will look for evidence of the following elements in the capstone projects envisioned by proposed new degrees:

- (1) Capstone projects should be synthetic, tying together two or more areas of specific content that would typically be the subject of a class or a sequence of classes.
- (2) Capstone projects can be individual or group-based exercises. If a project is group-based, the individual student's achievements and contributions should be assessed through robust means. This could be detailed, for example, through the generation of an individual report by the student, periodic performance evaluations at various points in the project, individual assignments, and/or comprehensive specification of the individual team member's role that can be tied to specific outcomes in a group report.
- (3) The report should be evaluated by at least two reviewers; and at least one of them should have no direct vested interest in the success of the student (e.g., the student is not the reviewer's GSR or collaborator).

(4) To ensure the consistent quality and scope of capstone projects, there should be a single coordinator or adviser who judges the appropriateness of planned projects and their timelines, following guidelines established by the program faculty.

CCGA recommends that program faculty and campus reviewers keep these same features in mind when a previously-approved Master's program is being reformulated to incorporate a capstone or group capstone project in place of a comprehensive examination.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Donald Mastronarde, Ph.D.
Chair, CCGA

Appendix J

Guidelines for Professional Master's Degree Titles

[new appendix added in 2014; this is an expanded version of a preliminary dissemination of this discussion originally communicated to Graduate Councils and Graduate Deans on February 26, 2014]

BACKGROUND

For a very long time there has been a widely-accepted distinction between academic or research graduate degrees and professional graduate degrees. Although it has never been true that there is an absolute distinction between these categories, and although there has been further blurring of the distinction in some areas in recent times, the distinction between academic and professional education is still incorporated in the structure of the modern university and reflected in assumptions that are widely, although not universally, shared.

In general, academic degrees have been regarded as more research-oriented and professional degrees as more practice-oriented. The National Center for Education Statistics in its glossary describes the convention as follows (<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/glossary.asp#m>):

Master's degree: A degree awarded for successful completion of a program generally requiring 1 or 2 years of full-time college-level study beyond the bachelor's degree. One type of master's degree, including the Master of Arts degree, or M.A., and the Master of Science degree, or M.S., is awarded in the liberal arts and sciences for advanced scholarship in a subject field or discipline and demonstrated ability to perform scholarly research. A second type of master's degree is awarded for the completion of a professionally oriented program, for example, an M.Ed. in education, an M.B.A. in business administration, an M.F.A. in fine arts, an M.M. in music, an M.S.W. in social work, and an M.P.A. in public administration. Some master's degrees—such as divinity degrees (M.Div. or M.H.L./Rav), which were formerly classified as "first-professional"—may require more than 2 years of full-time study beyond the bachelor's degree.

At Cornell University the Graduate School provides a listing of research degrees (<http://www.gradschool.cornell.edu/requirements/research-degrees>) and of professional degrees (<http://www.gradschool.cornell.edu/requirements/professional-degrees>), with M.A., M.S., and Ph.D. in the research category and Master of X titles in the professional category (including M.F.A., M.A.T., M.P.A., M.Arch., M.Eng., and others).

At UCB, in the College of Environmental Design, the Department of Architecture describes its research-oriented M.S. in contrast to the professional M.Arch. degree:


The Master of Science (M.S.) in Architecture is an academic, nonprofessional degree program that offers the opportunity for advanced research in the ever-broadening and increasingly complex subfields within architecture. It is intended to supplement but not supplant the Master of Architecture degree, the professional degree accredited for the practice of architecture. Students in the program generally hold a degree in architecture.

The interdisciplinary nature of much graduate student nowadays and the efforts of universities to meet the needs of working professionals who want to retool or advance their careers have caused some erosion of the clarity of the distinction between academic/research degrees vs. professional degrees. Many programs now have a hybrid quality and embrace elements of technical knowledge and research alongside aspects of practice, management, leadership, law, and the like. There can be many gradations along a continuum of different mixtures. An interesting example is provided by the M.S. in Chemical Engineering in the Product Development Program at UCB; whereas almost all PDST degrees at Berkeley have Master of X titles, the PDP degree is one of the two exceptions. This program acknowledges the existence of different styles of hybrid degree programs combining scientific and research elements with practice-oriented and management-related elements. The M.S. in Chemical Engineering in the Product Development Program offers the following description and a conceptual diagram of the degree's hybrid nature:

In the space of one calendar year, PDP graduates will gain exposure to real-world product development practices in a range of chemical process-intensive industries including biotechnology, microelectronics,

nanoscience and consumer products. The PDP does not require a research thesis, but students will find completing the extensive coursework and field study assignment challenging.

PDP fills a specific niche



Source: PDP

It may also be noted that in a recent list of 59 SSGPDPs offered throughout UC, 45 used the Master of X title, 11 used the M.A.S. (Master of Advanced Study) title, and only 4 used the M.S. title. A quick preliminary review of programs with PDST show that of about 60 degrees about one quarter use M.S./M.A.

The distinction in titles is thus widely embodied in practice. Nevertheless, there are indeed hybrid degrees that are not Master of X. In particular, the M.S. degree has sometimes been used (as well as Master of X) in the Health Sciences and Engineering and some other quantitative fields. But it should also be noted that in Engineering, many programs have shifted from using M.S. to using M.Eng. when new degrees with hybrid content (leadership, management, etc.) are introduced.

For example, there is a state-supported M.S. in Applied Economics and Finance at UCSC, which is described as follows:

The **M.S. Program in Applied Economics and Finance** is a one-year program that provides analytical graduate training **designed to prepare students for careers in business, international and domestic banking, consulting firms, government, and nonprofit organizations**. The program combines theory with meaningful applications that students are likely to face **in their professional careers**. The program has **a more applied orientation than a typical M.A. program in Economics and provides more training in economics, statistics, and econometrics than most M.B.A. programs**.

Another example is the second of the two exceptions to use of Master of X for PDST degrees at UCB. The M.A. in Statistics is described as follows:

The program is designed **to prepare students for careers in industries** that require statistical skills. The **focus is on tackling statistical challenges encountered by industry** rather than preparing for a PhD.

For a number of years CCGA has been persuading proposers to follow the convention of using Master of X for professional degrees unless there is a reason to use M.S. (such as widely accepted practice in this discipline at comparable research universities, or requirements of licensing or accrediting bodies, or relatively high research content in a hybrid degree). CCGA has not accepted the argument that using M.S. or M.A. is easier and

quicker because these are not new degree titles (new degree titles currently require extra approvals; CCGA is working to streamline that process and exploring whether there are ways to eliminate such extra approval).

Here are titles observed in the past three years that conform to the usage CCGA prefers:

Master of Professional Accountancy (D, I, R), all SSGPDP
Master of Information and Data Science (B), SSDPP
Master of Translational Medicine (B), SSGPDP
Master of Advanced Studies in Integrated Circuits (S), SSGPDP
Master of Public Health (online) (B), SSGPDP
Master of Engineering (B), SSGPDP
(FE)MBA (R), SSGPDP
Master of Finance (R), SSGPDP
Master of Technology Management (SB), PDST
Master of Finance (SD), SSGPDP
Master of Applied Economics (LA), SSGPDP

On the other hand, CCGA has also approved these degrees in the past three years:

M.S. in Healthcare Administration and Interprofessional Leadership (SF), SSGPDP
M.S. in Games and Playable Media (SC), PDST
M.S. in Biotechnology Management (I), PDST
M.S. in Engineering Management (I), PDST
M.S. in Engineering (online) (R), SSGPDP

CCGA Guidance on Degree Titles

In recent years CCGA has tried to uphold the distinctiveness of academic graduate degrees by strongly supporting the view that a professional Master's degree should not be an M.A. or M.S., but rather a Master of X (with X being whatever the professional specialization is; e.g., "Master of Professional Accountancy").

CCGA therefore recommends to proposers of new degrees and to local Graduate Councils and Graduate Deans that in the development and review of new proposals this distinction be carefully considered. Proposals for programs that are professional in nature (as indicated primarily by program content but also disciplinary practice, conventions of institutional peers nationally, students served, and likely employment prospects for graduates) should by default use Master of X rather than M.A. or M.S. degree titles. Programs deemed professional for purposes of being offered as Self-supporting Graduate Professional Degrees or of charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition should also use Master of X degree titles. Use of M.A. or M.S. titles in professional program proposals can be proposed, if an explicit justification is given. Such a justification might be the requirements of an accrediting or licensing authority, the generally accepted practice of a discipline on a national basis, or the relatively high research content in a hybrid degree (e.g., one combining research and technical elements with elements of applied practice and management).

Previously approved degrees that do not follow this practice are not required to change titles. We have no desire to create extra work for those who have already been reviewed and approved. But if any program wishes to seek a name change to conform to this recommendation, CCGA will look favorably upon such a request.

Appendix K
Guidelines for Review of New and Continuing
Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs¹
(Adopted by CCGA August 2016)

[Formerly Appendix T]

Campus Review of New Self-Supporting Programs

Each of the ten UC campuses has its own unique culture, and the guidelines for review of new and continuing self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) are intended to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate all of these cultures. Divisional Senate review should focus on the degree to which a proposed new SSGPDP embodies and reflects the values of the campus and the specific needs of the target student body.

Proposals should follow the format as specified in Appendix B, in addition to the SSGPDP-specific items listed below. As is the case with all graduate program proposals forwarded to CCGA for review, the academic rationale of the SSGPDP program should be explained. In addition to evaluating all new proposed SSGPDPs under the criteria set out in the 2014 Compendium, the July 2016 UC Policy on Self-supporting Graduate Degree Programs, and the CCGA handbook, Graduate Councils should address the potential impact of the addition of a SSGPDP on a department or school's established state-supported degree programs.

Proposals for new SSGPDPs shall provide a detailed explanation of the measures taken in designing the SSGPDP to ensure that faculty will continue to provide at least the current level of support and commitment of energy to existing state-supported programs, especially those programs leading to the granting of the doctoral degree.

Proposals for new SSGPDPs shall provide a detailed explanation of how teaching assignments will be managed. The explanation shall explicitly discuss teaching assignments in SSGPDPs in relation to the usual workload of involved faculty members and whether teaching in the SSGPDPs will be on a buyout or overload basis; the explanation shall be accompanied by a copy of any campus policies that deal with overload teaching and with teaching in SSGPDPs specifically (CCGA strongly recommends that each campus develop and maintain such policies).

Proposals for new SSGPDPs shall explain admissions criteria and outline measures taken to uphold the quality of admitted students comparable to those enrolled in similar academic programs. Proposals should also provide a detailed market analysis to demonstrate sufficient demand for the program and to show that the proposed program is likely to succeed as a self-supporting program. Graduate Councils may be ill-equipped to consider the financial aspects of proposed new SSGPDPs in the context of the broader planning and budget considerations facing campuses and the university as a whole; consequently, all new SSGPDP proposals shall be shared with the Divisional Senate Committee on Planning & Budget (P&B) or its equivalent (for campuses without a P&B) for comment. Proposers of a new SSGPDP should address the question of fiscal viability by including a copy of the cost analysis that is submitted to Budget and Capital Resources. Budgets are provisional estimates and should be treated as a reference only. P&B comments shall be considered by Graduate Council and the Graduate Council's view of P&B comments shall be communicated to CCGA following approval of the proposed program. CCGA will, in turn, seek the advice of UCPB in evaluating all proposed new SSGPDPs.

Graduate Program Reviews: Self-Supporting Programs

SSGPDP policy requires that all SSGPDPs be reviewed along with all other graduate programs during regularly scheduled program reviews, which typically recur on a 7 to 8 year cycle. SSGPDPs shall bear their full share of the cost of regularly scheduled graduate program reviews, including costs to the Academic Senate. CCGA has developed a set of [suggested guidelines for local Graduate Councils](#) to refer to for the periodic review of SSGPDPs.

Graduate program reviewers shall be tasked explicitly with evaluating the impact of SSGPDPs on state-supported programs. Graduate Councils shall consider the suspension of admissions to any SSGPDP that has been found, in the course of a graduate program review, to have had an adverse effect on state-supported programs. Given the sensitivity of SSGPDPs to market forces, it may be advisable for Graduate Councils to conduct their own reviews of SSGPDPs more frequently.

The Meaning of “Self-Supporting” in Self-Supporting Programs: Phase-in Period

The SSGPDP policy allows for a three-year phase-in period during which a SSGPDP may not be able to recoup its full

¹ For the text of the July 2016 UC Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs, see: http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/SSDPDP%20Policy_7.12.2016.pdf

costs. Any funds used to support a SSGPDP should be funds that are not being devoted to the support of existing programs. Graduate Councils, in consultation with P&B should request that departments and schools demonstrate on an annual basis that following the phase in period SSGPDPs are in fact recouping the full cost of their operation. Graduate Councils shall report the degree to which SSGPDPs are succeeding in recouping their full costs to CCGA at the end of each fiscal year. In the case of SSGPDPs that show a pattern of failing to recoup their full costs (such as incurring losses in two years out of three, for example), Graduate Councils shall consider suspending admission to the program(s) in question.

Uses of Self-Supporting Program Income in Excess of Cost

The process for reviewing proposed new SSGPDPs described here focuses on preserving the strength and potential for future growth of existing state-supported programs, particularly those leading to the Ph.D. degree. CCGA recommends that Graduate Councils conduct ongoing discussions with campus administrations on how SSGPDPs might contribute financially to the campus beyond full-cost reimbursement since the value and viability of these programs rests on significant, long-term, state-supported investment in University academic programs and research.

Review for Self-Supporting Programs

CCGA as of 2014 is removing reference to so-called “expedited” review for self-supporting programs. CCGA currently aims to complete its review of all new proposals within 6 months (and well- conceived and well-written proposals are often reviewed in less than 6 months, when proposals arrive at a propitious time of the academic year and reviewers are identified promptly and complete their tasks on time). This time frame should not be particularly burdensome to self-supporting proposals, and CCGA is convinced that such proposals raise significant issues that the Academic Senate must not neglect.

For all proposals, as described in Handbook section “Steps in the CCGA Review Process,” CCGA uses its discretion to decide how many and what kinds of reviews are needed. Self-supporting proposals, like state- supported ones, will receive more rapid review if they follow strictly and completely the guidelines for proposals (see Appendix B above).

Specifically, in following the guidelines stated in Appendix B, new SSGPDP program proposals shall include sufficient information to address the common concerns that have arisen in recent SSGPDP reviews:

- (1) Faculty Teaching and Advising
 - 1.1. Faculty teaching ratio: What fraction of the program courses will be taught by ladder rank faculty?
 - 1.2. Faculty workload: How many faculty members, and what proportion of the department’s/program’s faculty, will be involved in teaching courses in the proposed program? How many additional courses, on top of their state-supported program teaching load, will they be responsible for?
 - 1.3. Faculty overload: Among the courses taught by faculty, what percentage will be done by faculty overload? What percentage by faculty buyout (i.e., faculty using their remuneration from teaching in the program to buy out other course commitments)?
 - 1.4. New Faculty: Does the extra workload require the hiring of new tenure-track faculty and/or full or part-time lecturers?
- (2) Faculty Advising
 - 2.1. Will there be a program director for advising students or assisting with job placement? Is the person an existing faculty or staff member? How will the person be compensated?
 - 2.2. Are faculty involved in advising students on requirements such as capstone projects or master theses? If so, how many faculty members? What is the expected faculty to student ratio for these activities?
- (3) Facilities and Staff Support
 - 3.1. Any dedicated space for the proposed program?
 - 3.2. Will the courses be taught in existing facilities? If so, how will the arrangement impact the scheduling of existing classes, and how much will the existing facilities be used?
 - 3.3. Any additional facilities required for the program? E.g., classrooms, laboratories, recording facilities (for online lectures/discussions)
 - 3.4. Who provides support? Does the program require staff personnel? Will new additional staff personnel be hired? If so, how many?
 - 3.5. Will the courses of the program create needs for additional TAs? Are there enough graduate students to serve as TAs?
- (4) Financial Accessibility
 - 4.1 In accordance with the 2016 Presidential Policy on “Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs,” a proposal must state an articulated financial accessibility goal for their students and a

- student financial support plan for achieving that goal.
- 4.2 Examples of possible student financial support plan components include providing scholarships or grants from the program's own resources (e.g., return-to-aid from program tuition and fees assessed but not from state funds or tuition and/or fees charged to students in state-supported programs, or funds raised through private philanthropy), providing tuition and fee waivers, participation in federal and/or private loan programs, and participation in other external support programs such as veterans benefits.
- 4.3 If financial aid is the primary means to achieve financial accessibility, proposal shall state its rate of return-to-aid (if zero, state zero).
- (5) **Impacts on Related State-supported Programs**
- 5.1 Will the enrollment of any existing state-supported program(s) be adversely affected by the creation of the program?
- 5.2 How would faculty participation (both in teaching and advising of students) in existing state-supported programs be affected by the proposed program?
- 5.3 How would staff support of existing state-supported programs be affected by the proposed program?
- 5.4 Will there be foreseeable impacts on the class sizes of courses offered by the existing state-supported programs?
- 5.5 Will new courses offered by the proposed program be made available to students enrolled in state-supported programs of the same department or school?
- 5.6 Will the new program create competing needs for instructional facilities and physical and intellectual infrastructures in the proposed department/school? Will new infrastructures and facilities be created to share with related state-supported programs?
- (6) **Admissions Criteria**
- 6.1 What are the expected initial and steady-state enrollments?
- 6.2 What are the admissions criteria? How do they compare to other similar programs of comparable standing?
- 6.3 Do admissions criteria specify some type of work experience in the field?
- 6.4 What measures are taken to ensure that unqualified students are not admitted for financial reasons?
- (7) **Financial Viability Analyses**
- 7.1 A proposal should include a market analysis of the viability of the self-supporting program.
- 7.2 The proposal should include a copy of the cost analysis that is submitted to Budget and Capital Resources and UCOP. CCGA understands that the cost analysis submitted is of a provisional nature.
- 7.3 It should specify the source and nature of any financial support, including start-up funding and loan(s).
- 7.4 It should specify the launch date of the new program.
- 7.5 It should describe the phase-in process to demonstrate that it satisfies the self-supporting requirement of a SSGPDP and specify when the phase-in period is forecasted to end.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



ARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Jutta Heckhausen, Chair
heckhaus@uci.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

April 21, 2015

CAMPUS GRADUATE COUNCIL CHAIRS

Dear Colleagues:

CCGA has had several in-depth discussions of the issues associated with self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDP). The attached document summarizes our analysis of the situation and our recommendations. SSGPDPs raise important issues for each of our campuses and the UC system. They need close attention and in-depth discussion between the Senate and administration on each campus. This will hopefully result in joint action guided by strategic academic planning.

We ask you, as chair of your campus Graduate Council, to bring this issue to discussion in your council, and then – informed by this discussion – start a conversation with the administration (provost's office and planning and budget leaders) on your campus. In this process, it likely will be useful to also involve the Council on Planning and Budget on your campus.

All the best and please keep us posted (via your CCGA representative) on how things progress!

Jutta Heckhausen

Jutta Heckhausen, Ph.D.
Chair, CCGA

cc: Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair
Daniel Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair
Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director
Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning
Kimberly Peterson, Academic Planning Analysis Manager

Enclosures (1)



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Jutta Heckhausen, Chair
heckhaus@uci.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

April 21, 2015

CCGA Recommendations Regarding Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Current planning on different campuses in the UC system indicates that three campuses (UCI, UCLA, UCSD) anticipate starting a relatively large number of new self-supporting graduate professional degree programs, whereas the other campuses have plans for few or no such programs. Given the potentially substantial impact - for better or worse - of these programs on our campuses' instruction and research, CCGA has developed the following statements and recommendations for consideration by the divisional Graduate Councils. We hope you find these helpful in the immediate and intermediate future to guide your judgment and initiatives as well as joint academic planning with the administration on your campus.

Self-supporting graduate professional degree programs differ from traditional academic programs.

The complementary missions of a Research One university are research and instruction. What distinguishes UC from the Cal State system is its dedication to research, both pure and applied. Professional programs do not typically focus, as do our doctoral programs, on the generation of new discovery. They exist, in large part, to train and to certify working professionals. Apart from our well-established state-supported professional schools of law, medicine, public health, social work, and business, these programs supplement our core mission in research and instruction. In the aftermath of large budget cuts to the University of California system, the development of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs promises new streams of revenue for our campuses. At the same time, these professional programs help address the needs of the State's working professionals for high quality graduate education. Of course, all educational programs need the robust involvement of the faculty in the relevant academic unit. Faculty engagement is a prerequisite for creating any educational programs, whether traditional academic or professional.

A distinguishing feature of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs is that they have a predominantly applied focus,

as seen in reviews of recent proposals for new self-supporting programs. This is often reflected in the capstone requirement and its focus on applied research and not on generating new discovery. Students in professional programs are typically working full-time or are looking to pursue a specific career.

CCGA recommends that Graduate Council and Provost's Offices on the individual campuses should jointly engage in strategic planning for self-supporting professional graduate programs.

For the already very active campuses in this regard, the conversation probably needs to focus on prioritizing and sequencing new proposals and their start-up funding. For the less active campuses, Senate-administration discussions might focus on exploring opportunities and identifying and overcoming possible obstacles (e.g., regional constraints may be overcome with online formats). CCGA would like to see in the introduction section of every proposal for a new self-supporting program answers to the following questions: How does this program fit into the campus' priority planning for self-supporting programs and into its overall strategic

academic plan?

We recommend that campuses conduct rigorous marketing analyses to identify the professional graduate programs that will attract robust cohorts of applicants over the next decade. Launching a self-supporting program takes a significant investment of faculty and administrative time as well as start-up funds. To assess the market for some self-supporting programs, campuses may look at the professional education needs in their local or regional community, whereas for evaluating the potential for other programs, particularly those that promise the on-line delivery of courses, campuses may want to evaluate national or international demand. Estimates of market need for a given professional program should be based on high-quality and specifically targeted analyses, which may require seeking the input from a consulting company for higher education institutions or for economic modeling.

We recommend that campuses invest in these programs with sufficient start-up packages for developing new courses and advertising, additional faculty where needed, and support services necessary to ensure not just self-supporting status, but sufficient growth to yield revenue beyond mere cost-coverage.

CCGA believes strongly that self-supporting professional master programs must adhere to UC's commitment to affordability and accessibility and should have solid financial aid components. This implies that a significant part of the revenue from a new program should be reinvested in financial aid, particularly in programs that are targeting applicants with limited financial means.

Our campuses and their respective Senate Graduate Councils and Offices for Planning and Budget should assess at regular intervals (possibly every three years) whether these programs are thriving, whether the funds they generate are supporting the core mission of the university, and whether they are draining faculty time from teaching in traditional academic programs or from research.

If programs do not thrive, there needs to be a process in place, administered by the respective Graduate Councils, to sunset them. With the judicious choice of particular programs to develop, self-supporting programs should be generating strong revenue by year five.

We strongly recommend that campuses think ahead about the proper distribution of "profits" from these programs. We know that some programs will be more financially successful than others, and we fear that serious inequities might result. We strongly recommend, therefore, that campuses think ahead about the proper distribution of "profits" from these programs between the sponsoring department, school, and general campus. We realize the need for incentives, but we also fear a situation in which some parts of a given campus may enjoy the lion share of revenue generated by professional programs, while other parts of that campus, where entrepreneurial efforts are less promising, languish with far less support for their research and doctoral programs.

In sum, CCGA recommends that the Graduate Councils on all campuses engage in serious strategic academic and budgetary planning efforts regarding SSGPDPs with the cooperation of their campus' Provost and key leaders in budget and planning.

Appendix L
Guidelines for Conversion of Graduate Degree Programs from State-supported to Self-supporting and from Self-supporting to State-supported status

(Revised and adopted by CCGA June 2011)

[Formerly Appendix U. This appendix will need to be reviewed and revised when the new SSGPDP policy is finalized.]

CCGA has determined that the conversion of an existing graduate program from state-supported to self-supporting status or from self-supporting to state-supported status cannot be considered under the name change provisions in the Compendium. Such a conversion far exceeds those provisions.

State-supported graduate degree programs are designed to, and in fact do, operate to further the University's primary goals under the Master Plan. Self-supporting graduate degree programs, by definition, serve an ancillary purpose. Frequently, a self-supporting program's objective, at least in part, is to make the knowledge generated through the research activities of the faculty and students in state-supported programs available to those groups of students identified in the self-supporting program policy. State-supported and self-supporting programs are, therefore, not identical to each other in a number of significant ways. Consequently, existing graduate degree programs may not convert from state-supported to self-supporting status or from self-supporting to state-supported status.

Existing state-supported graduate degree programs may request their own disestablishment as state-supported degree programs in accordance with policy. Concurrently, faculty involved in the research, teaching and administration activities of such existing state-supported graduate degree programs may present a proposal for the creation of a new self-supporting program. All such proposals must comply with self-supporting program policies.

Existing self-supporting programs may request their own disestablishment as self-supporting degree programs in accordance with policy. Concurrently, faculty involved in the research, teaching, and administration activities of such an existing self-supporting program may present a proposal for the creation of a new state-supported program. All such proposals must comply with University policies.

Divisional Graduate Councils may, at their discretion, allow the disestablishment of the existing graduate degree program and the proposal for a new graduate degree program to proceed concurrently. CCGA may review both actions simultaneously and, at its discretion, on an expedited basis.

Appendix M

Guidelines for Reviewing Proposed MAS Programs¹⁰

[Formerly Appendix I. This appendix may require further amendment once a new policy for self-supporting programs is approved. There is also a discrepancy between the initial description of MAS programs provided when President Atkinson established the title in 1998 and the way the title is now used on some campuses. When (after 1998) general SSGPDP policy had the criterion of “part-time” enrollment removed, some assumed that “part-time” no longer applied to MAS programs either.]

As originally created, the Master of Advanced Studies (MAS) was intended primarily for individuals who are engaged in full-time employment and wish to upgrade their skills and develop their knowledge in order to achieve professional advancement or other personal enrichment. The original idea was that the MAS indicates that recipients of the degree have adopted a part-time rather than a full-time approach to their studies. However, over the course of time some MAS programs have been proposed and approved that involve a full-time course of study and are essentially indistinguishable from the sort of Master’s degrees that are also self-supporting and carry a title of the form Master of X.

CCGA created guidelines for an abbreviated form of review for MAS proposals, but those guidelines are not appropriate when the MAS title is merely being used as an alternative to (self-supporting) Master of X. Upon receipt of a new MAS proposal, CCGA shall first evaluate whether the proposal should properly be treated like any other proposal or is somehow distinguishable from a self-supporting Master of X degree. In the first case, CCGA will follow the normal protocols for review; in the second case, CCGA may at its discretion decide to employ the abbreviated review described below.

The MAS title does not indicate that the degree in any way requires a less demanding course of study than full-time Master’s degrees. Proponents are required to provide the same level of detail and rigorous justification that are expected for other graduate degree proposals, and review by campus bodies and by CCGA should insist on the same standards of UC quality as for other degrees.

Instead of appointing one lead reviewer, CCGA may choose to designate at least two members of CCGA to review the proposal and report back at the next meeting. Based on their assessments and recommendations, CCGA will determine whether or not additional expert reviews are needed, and, if so, how many and whether the reviews should be internal, external, or both.

The following are some of the questions and criteria CCGA reviewers might wish to consider as they review new MAS programs:

- 1) Is there a demonstrated demand for this degree program? As the MAS is part-time and primarily vocational, does the proposal make a compelling case that a sufficient market exists either within the geographical region adjacent to the UC campus, or, in the case of those programs that will depend substantially on distance-learning, in the state of California? Does the proposal include a description and comparison of potentially competing programs? Wherever possible, proposals should include documentary evidence as to need, such as letters from prominent professionals in the field in which the MAS is being offered or the results of a market survey.
- 2) Is the faculty committed to teach the MAS? According to the 1996 UC Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Programs, all MAS programs should be staffed with ladder-rank faculty on the same basis as regular programs. Have adequate provisions been made to ensure the program will be permanently staffed so as to fulfill the requirements of this policy?
- 3) Will the MAS negatively impact the regular programs of the academic unit offering the MAS? Some faculty may teach in the MAS program as an overload and it is to be assumed that they will receive compensation for this, additional to their regular salary. Is there any danger that the regular programs

¹⁰ Although the original policy on the MAS title mentioned that such a program might be either state-supported or self-supporting, it is in fact the case that no state-supported MAS has ever been proposed. Refer to Appendix T for additional guidelines that apply to self-supporting programs.

at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and existing SSGPDPs, might suffer because of faculty teaching in the MAS? Information regarding teaching loads could provide some insight into the allocation of faculty teaching resources. Is there any indication that teaching in the MAS might negatively influence the research output of faculty?

- 4) What are the roles of the Academic Senate and University Extension? It may be the case that the proposed MAS program will be advertised and perhaps even administered by University Extension. Have the respective roles of these two entities been adequately defined? Is there a plan for maintaining distinctions between their roles? Do the two entities have equal expectations of the program?
- 5) What is the role of the department, interdepartmental program, graduate group, or certificate program? Does the academic unit have full control over the conception and development of the program? Does it have full control over determining the curriculum and staffing of the program?
- 6) What are the admissions requirements? Admissions standards for part-time graduate programs should be appropriate to maintain a high quality comparable to regular programs. Does the decision as to who should be admitted into the program rest solely with Academic Senate faculty members?
- 7) Does the proposed program have a capstone requirement? As the MAS degree is to be structured on the Master I or II models, it is to be assumed that there is a capstone requirement. (Note that a capstone requirement does not necessarily have to be a thesis or even a comprehensive exam. As the MAS is primarily vocational in intent, it can be expected that capstone requirements might be different from those expected in a full-time degree program). What provision has been made to ensure that students will have the opportunity, at the end of their studies, to engage in a thorough overview of the work undertaken through the entire program?
- 8) Is the workload for the proposed degree program reasonable? There is a particular difficulty and challenge in devising a master's program that both sustains the high standards required of UC graduate programs and enables students to study effectively while being employed full-time. How does the proposed program address this difficulty? What plans does it have for monitoring its success in meeting this challenge?
- 9) Is the advising system adequate? It can be anticipated that faculty advising may be crucial to the success of individuals completing the MAS program. Given the distinct possibility that MAS students will not be as familiar with the UC system as full-time students, advising will be particularly important. Are adequate provisions made for substantial advising? Are the faculty committed to it?
- 10) Have the financial aspects of the program been fully worked through? Although the original policy on the MAS title mentioned that such a program might be either state-supported or self-supporting, it is in fact the case that no state-supported MAS has ever been proposed. If the program is to be self-supporting, please respond to the questions raised in the financial section of Appendix K.
- 11) Is regular review of the MAS program guaranteed? As all MAS programs will be administered by academic departments, interdepartmental programs, graduate groups, or certificate programs, the MAS programs should be reviewed at the time of the regular review of the academic unit conducted at the campus level. Do the proponents demonstrate a full awareness of this requirement?

Appendix N
**Role of CCGA in Evaluating Proposals to Begin Charging Professional Degree
Supplementary Tuition (PDST)**

[New appendix, added belatedly in 2014. This appendix will need to be reviewed and revised when the new policy on PDST is finalized.]

April 29, 2011

**LAWRENCE PITTS, PROVOST AND EVP
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: Review of new proposals to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition

Dear Larry:

At its meeting on April 27, the Academic Council unanimously endorsed the enclosed guidelines that CCGA developed for use by campus Graduate Councils and Committees on Planning and Budget in reviewing new proposals to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition. New PDST proposals should be submitted to Divisional Graduate Councils and Planning & Budget Committees, allowing sufficient time for the Graduate Councils to communicate their opinions to the campus administration prior to submission of the proposals to UCOP.

The Academic Council requests that you disseminate the enclosed guidelines to the Executive Vice Chancellors and Graduate Deans. CCGA will forward them to the Graduate Councils.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Daniel L. Simmons".

Daniel L. Simmons, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl.

April 20, 2011

**DANIEL SIMMONS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR**

Re: CCGA Memo to Divisional Graduate Councils on the Review of Proposed PDST Proposals

Dear Dan:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has been discussing the review of new **Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST)** proposals for some time resulting in the attached revised guidelines. In brief, new PDST proposals shall be submitted to Divisional Graduate Councils for comment. In the case that such proposals have not also been submitted for comment to Divisional Planning & Budget Committees, Graduate Councils shall request comments directly from Divisional Planning & Budget Committees.

CCGA respectfully requests that Academic Council:

- 1) Endorse the draft guidelines;
- 2) Forward the draft guidelines to local divisions; and
- 3) Request that the Provost disseminate copies to Graduate Deans and EVCs on the campuses.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about these guidelines.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Carmody". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "J" and "C".

James Carmody, Ph.D.
Chair, CCGA

Copy: Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
CCGA Members

**CCGA Instructions to Divisional Graduate Councils:
Review of New Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Proposals**
(previously Professional Degree Fee)
April 2011

New Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) proposals shall be submitted to Divisional Graduate Councils for comment. In the case that such proposals have not also been submitted for comment to Divisional Planning & Budget Committees, Graduate Councils shall request comments directly from Divisional Planning & Budget Committees.

Campus entities seeking Regental approval for new PDSTs should inform Graduate Council of their intentions as early as possible. Given that all parties to this process are working to a timeline established by the calendar of Regent's meetings, consultation with Graduate Councils should begin before letters of intent are forwarded to UCOP. Graduate Councils shall communicate their evaluations, whether positive or negative, to all concerned parties on the campus in question as well as to CCGA before the deadline for final submission of the proposals to UCOP.

Proposals should specify whether the proposed PDST will be imposed on currently enrolled students or only on future entering classes of students. If the intention is to impose the PDST on currently enrolled students, proposers should indicate what measures will be taken to ensure that the diversity of the student body is not reduced as a result of students who cannot afford the increased cost being left with no option other than separating from the program.

The current process for requesting approval of new PDSTs includes requirements that concerned faculty and students be consulted. Satisfactory proof of adequate consultation of all concerned parties must be provided to Graduate Councils. Graduate Councils should take whatever steps they consider necessary to verify that the required consultations have taken place.

In addition to assessing the impact of the proposed PDST on the academic quality of the program, Graduate Councils shall consider: a) the potentially adverse impact of the proposed fee on the diversity of the applicant pool; b) the economic realities of the job markets that graduates of the degree program in question are expected to enter. In carrying out this evaluation, Graduate Councils shall bear in mind the public nature of the University.

Graduate Councils shall not consider whether or not the degree program in question is appropriately classified as "professional," as the term "professional" no longer serves as a useful guide in itself. Instead, Councils shall bear in mind that degree programs designed to prepare students for advanced research work, especially at the doctoral level, are considered academic programs by CCGA, regardless of how they may be named. The assessment of PDST is, therefore, not appropriate for such academic programs.

While Divisional Graduate Councils do not have the power to grant or deny approval to proposed new PDSTs (that authority ultimately resides with the Regents), their opinions are discussed by CCGA. When a Divisional Graduate Council advises against the imposition of a new PDST, CCGA will communicate that opinion, along with the analysis of the proposal upon which the opinion is based, to the Academic Council along with CCGA's recommendation for Academic Council action.

Appendix O

Guidelines for Reviewing Applied Doctorate Proposals

[Formerly Appendix J]

The applied doctorate is a degree designed to prepare individuals for professional practice rather than scholarly research and study. Examples of applied doctorates include: Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.), Doctorate of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.), Doctorate in Optometry (O.D.), and the Doctorate of Audiology (Au.D.). An applied doctorate reflects the mastery of a practice and the ability to adapt to future changes in practice, qualification for licensure certifying doctoral level training and/or the skills and ability to conduct a major applied research project, and a demonstrated contribution to the practice of the student's discipline.

The objectives of applied doctorate programs are directed toward preparing individuals with the theoretical foundations, applied skills and practical expertise required for professional positions within their respective fields. This degree prepares professionals to have a greater understanding and appreciation of research and the scientific basis of their discipline than can be accommodated within an applied master's program or other professional training. For existing practitioners, an applied doctorate can enable them to expand their knowledge and competency in their profession and aid in their career advancement goals. The applied doctorate also aims to train and prepare professionals to meet the needs of the community, state, and nation.

In reviewing these degrees, CCGA lead reviewers should consider the justification for offering the doctorate program and whether there is a compelling reason for a doctorate level degree in this profession. In some instances, professional degrees are externally regulated – graduates must be formally examined and licensed before they are allowed to practice. In other fields there may not be a professional licensing board specific for the degree awarded.

The following are some of the questions and criteria CCGA reviewers should consider as they review new applied doctorate programs:

- 1) Is the curriculum sufficiently advanced beyond a master's degree to justify doctoral-level training?
What types of methodology training or courses are offered?
- 2) What are the standards of the professional association or licensing board for doctoral training or other professional training in this field? How does this program meet these standards? A copy of the professional association standards should be included with the proposal.
- 3) Is there a demonstrated State need for this degree program? Is there a shortage of trained professionals in the State at the doctoral level? Which institutions are producing current practitioners? What is the priority that should be given to developing a new doctoral professional program in this field?
- 4) Is there a demonstrated demand for graduates of this degree program? Does the proposal make a compelling case that a sufficient market exists for the graduates of the program? Depending on the nature of the profession, it may be appropriate to consider the market as regional, statewide or national. Does the proposal include a description and comparison of potentially competing programs?
- 5) Does the proposal show evidence that the program has the potential for excellence?
- 6) Is the faculty committed to teach the applied doctorate? The academic leadership of the program should be by staffed with ladder-rank regular faculty. What provisions are proposed to ensure the program will be adequately staffed on a long-term basis? What is the anticipated balance of faculty (e.g. ladder rank, non-ladder rank, clinical, or adjunct faculty)? Does faculty have sufficient applied experience in the field?
- 7) Does the proposal address the relationship between the new applied program and other programs offered by the academic unit? Is there any danger that the regular programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels might suffer because of faculty teaching in the applied doctorate?

- a. Is there any indication that teaching in the applied doctorate might negatively influence the research output of faculty?
 - b. Are there adequate resources to assure suitable support for faculty's research and other programs?
- 8) What is the role of the department, interdepartmental program, or graduate group? Does the administrative unit have full control over the conception and development of the program? Does it have full control over determining the curriculum and staffing of the program? Will it have a negative effect on the existing administrative unit?
- 9) What are the admissions requirements? Does authority for final admissions decisions rest with Academic Senate faculty members?
- 10) What is the capstone requirement? What provision has been made to ensure that students will have the opportunity, at the end of their studies, to engage in a thorough overview of the work undertaken through the entire program? Note that a capstone requirement does not necessarily have to be a thesis or even a comprehensive exam. Absence of a capstone requirement must be strongly justified.
- 11) Is the workload for the proposed degree program reasonable? Is the program scheduled to accommodate working professionals?
- 12) Is the advising system adequate? Are adequate provisions made for substantial advising? Is the faculty committed to it?
- 13) Have the financial aspects of the program been fully worked through? Are the resources proposed for this program adequate to meet its goals? Is additional infrastructure (e.g., labs, libraries) necessary to support the program and is it being provided? Are resources being drawn from established programs in the department, interdepartmental program, or graduate group? Has sufficient financial aid (either scholarships or loan funds) been provided to allow access for qualified students and to ensure diversity in the student community?
- 14) How does the proposal plan for review of the applied doctorate program? As applied doctorate programs will be administered by academic departments, interdepartmental programs, schools, or graduate groups, the programs should be reviewed at the time of the regular review of the administrative unit is conducted at the campus level. Will this be the manner of review or is some other alternative proposed?

(1/04)

Appendix P

Role of CCGA in the Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units

(Adopted by CCGA November 16, 1993)

Introduction

Because actions to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue academic units and programs are proceeding on several University of California campuses and the role of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) in these actions is not well established, CCGA has prepared and adopted this statement. At the end is a description of CCGA's specific roles in the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance of academic units and programs. Preceding it is an accounting of the processes followed to develop the statement, an analysis of the range of roles possible under existing formal and informal policies, and a rationale for those CCGA intends to follow.

Development Process

There are several formal documents relevant to determining the role of CCGA in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance. These include the 9/19/79 system-wide "Policy on Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs," similar policy statements by each of the 9 campuses, the CCGA bylaws, and the divisional Graduate Council bylaws. These documents were all reviewed prior to preparation and adoption of this document. Also reviewed were correspondence, minutes, draft statements, and formal statements (from 1976 forward) identified by Karen Merritt (Director, Academic Planning and Program Review, Office of the President) as relating to transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance.

A search of CCGA minutes for the last several years revealed no agenda items dealing with transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance. Karen Merritt and Mohan Sitlani (Coordinator of Program Review, Office of the President) stated that previous transfers, consolidations, disestablishments, and discontinuances have been few in number and for the most part non-controversial. An Office of the President review of such actions, "University of California Degree Programs Established and Disestablished Fall 1980 to Spring 1993," identified 22 undergraduate degree programs and 15 graduate degree programs that were discontinued. Some involved consolidations and several were actually replacements of one degree with another (e.g., a Ph.D. in Social Welfare replaced the Doctor of Social Welfare degree). Thus, the total number of true discontinuances is smaller than this record suggests. By comparison, about 115 bachelor degree programs and 120 graduate degree programs (excluding certificate programs) were established during this same period. The discontinuances of degree programs were reported by individual campuses to the Office of the President, where records were adjusted accordingly. Up to now, these actions have been reported in the monthly "Report of the Status of New Academic Program Proposals and New ORU and MRU Proposals" prepared by the Office of the President and considered by CCGA as an information item on the monthly agenda. This arrangement has apparently been satisfactory to all concerned, no doubt because the discontinuances were few in number and for the most part non-controversial.

In developing this statement of CCGA's role in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance actions, Aimée Dorr, 93-94 Chair of CCGA, in September 1993 discussed options with Arnold Binder, 93-94 Chair of the Systemwide Academic Senate and the Academic Council, Calvin Moore, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Office of the President, and Karen Merritt, Director of Academic Planning and Program Review, Office of the President. In doing so, she drew upon the materials described above and discussions by 92-93 CCGA members in Spring 1993. Chair Dorr then prepared a working document that was discussed at the October CCGA meeting. A draft statement was subsequently prepared and distributed for comment to Chair Binder, Director Merritt, and Coordinator Sitlani, with an invitation to share it with as many people as they wished. The draft statement and reviewers' comments on it were discussed at the November CCGA meeting. This document presents the final statement that was unanimously approved by CCGA members on November 16, 1993.

Language

In written materials and conversation, the terms “disestablishment” and “discontinuance” vary in their meaning, causing difficulties of interpretation. At times, disestablishment refers to the permanent closing of an academic unit and discontinuance refers to the permanent closing of an academic degree program. At other times, disestablishment refers to the permanent closing of an academic unit or degree program and discontinuance refers to the temporary closing of an academic unit or degree program. Throughout this statement, “disestablishment” refers to the permanent closing of an academic unit and “discontinuance” refers to the permanent closing of an academic degree program. A term such as “temporary suspension” will be used for actions that put existing academic units or degree programs on hold without permanently removing them from those offered by a given campus.

Range of Options

The 9/19/79 Systemwide policy statement, the CCGA bylaws, and other Academic Senate bylaws neither explicitly describe nor expressly forbid any particular role for CCGA in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance. It is generally agreed, however, that campus and Systemwide administrations have final authority over academic units and the Academic Senate has final authority over academic degree programs. Recognizing that academic degree programs can only function when relevant academic units are also functioning, various bylaws attempt to provide for Academic Senate response should an administration act upon an academic unit in a way that significantly affected degree programs (e.g., a budget cut for the academic unit that was so severe that courses required for the degree program could not be offered). Nonetheless, final authority for the allocations to and organization of academic units rests with administrators.

There are several explicit statements that provide ample justification for considerable CCGA involvement in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance. The CCGA bylaws state that CCGA coordinates the activities of the separate divisional Graduate Councils and reviews the standards and policies applied by them. Given that divisional Graduate Councils are involved in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance actions (both de jure and de facto actions) involving graduate degree programs, CCGA could therefore also be involved in all these actions. The 9/19/79 Systemwide policy statement (p. 1) also provides a firm basis for CCGA involvement:

The decision to transfer, consolidate, disestablish or discontinue an academic unit or program should be founded on considerations as careful and thorough as those for establishment. For the most part the same issues need to be examined, and the same Senate agencies and administrative officers should have the opportunity to participate consistent with the traditional system of shared governance in which the Academic Senate has the responsibility for approving academic programs and evaluating the quality of courses and curricula, and the administration has the responsibility for allocating resources and determining administrative organization.

Historically, CCGA has had a central role in the establishment of new graduate degree programs, both those using a degree title that is already on the sponsoring campus (e.g., Ph.D.) and those using a degree title new to the sponsoring campus (e.g., Doctor of Music). Each proposed new graduate degree program is developed by the responsible academic unit(s) on the local campus. Each campus routinely informs the Office of the President of the degree program proposals that are being developed. When a formal proposal for the new degree program has been prepared, it is reviewed by the divisional Graduate Council, other divisional Academic Senate committees, and the divisional administration. All such degree proposals cannot go forward without approval from the divisional Graduate Council and Chancellor. If the proposal involves a title new to the campus, it must also be approved by the divisional representative body. If a formal proposal obtains all needed divisional approvals, it is sent forward to CCGA and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs in the UC Office of the President.

CCGA members review the proposal itself, an analysis of it from the OP Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), and often commentary from other UC campuses. A lead reviewer is appointed from among CCGA members. He or she obtains written reviews of the proposal from two or more experts in the field and conducts a site visit. CCGA may ask for revisions to the proposal that can be communicated in a letter or addendum or for

verification of support by relevant divisional administrators. It may return the proposal for substantial revision or disapprove it. If CCGA approves the proposal and sends it forward, the OAA completes the analysis and adds a recommendation for approval or non-approval. In the past, OAA then submitted the proposal, its analyses, and its recommendation to the Academic Program Planning and Review Board (APPRB), an Office of the President committee that included Academic Senate representatives. APPRB was recently disbanded. In its place is the Academic Planning Council (APC), also an Office of the President committee that includes Academic Senate representatives. It is anticipated that the APC will review degree program proposals early in the planning stage on the local campus (before a formal proposal has been written) and not review any formal degree program proposals that have been approved by CCGA. However, the APC has not yet met. The details of its operation and whether they affect transmission of an approved proposal from CCGA to OAA and from OAA to the President cannot be known. As of now, it seems most likely that OAA will continue its well established pattern of sending to the President the proposal CCGA approved, its analyses, and its recommendation. If the President concurs in approval, then the California Post-secondary Education Commission (CPEC) is given an opportunity to comment. If CPEC does not respond within 60 days after the proposal was sent, the University assumes concurrence. If CPEC raises questions, these are answered by the Office of the President with help from the originating campus. Proposals for degree programs with titles that are new to the campus must also be approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate and the Regents. If all parties are satisfied with the proposal, the program is approved and the President notifies the campus. Note that in this system CCGA's approval of a degree program proposal is necessary but not sufficient for implementation of the degree program.

Given the well-practiced precedent for CCGA's role in the establishment of new graduate degree programs and existing bylaws and policy statements, particularly the 1979 system-wide policy statement quoted earlier, CCGA could easily justify procedures as elaborate as those for new degree programs for the de jure or de facto transfer, consolidation, or discontinuance of every graduate degree program and for every transfer, consolidation, or disestablishment of an academic unit that significantly alters the ability of that unit to offer any of its graduate degree programs. Given CCGA's historical lack of participation in transfer, consolidation, and discontinuance decisions and the absence of any explicit requirement for CCGA participation in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance, CCGA could just as easily justify minimal involvement.

Rationale for CCGA's Role

Although the 9/19/79 Systemwide policy statement suggests that procedures for the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance of academic units and degree programs should be similar to those for their establishment, CCGA believes otherwise. In good times, academic units or degree programs could be consolidated for several reasons but they are only transferred, discontinued, or disestablished when campuses no longer have any investment in them. In bad times, they are likely to be transferred, consolidated, disestablished, or discontinued after a decision-making process rather like that for triage. Suffering will be widespread and any campus decision to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue an academic unit or degree program will have been painful and hard fought. If a review and approval process like that for establishment were followed, CCGA would receive transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance proposals too late to reverse effectively any decision the campus has managed to make. If the only implementable CCGA decision is endorsement of a campus decision to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue an academic unit or program, there is little reason for CCGA to review such a proposal.

Following this line of reasoning, CCGA believes that for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance actions CCGA needs to exercise its responsibilities for graduate education by devising procedures different from those for the establishment of new graduate degree programs. Specifically, it needs to find the means to become informed of possible actions when they are first being considered by a campus, to assure itself that the divisional Graduate Council is appropriately involved, to intervene if it is not, to assess the Systemwide implications for graduate education, and to interject any serious Systemwide issues into the campus's deliberations at the earliest possible moment. Very early involvement is necessary if CCGA is to have any impact on what actually happens to graduate degree programs that could be affected by transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance. Assuming that CCGA is able to effect early involvement when deemed necessary, then when campuses have actually made decisions to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue, review by CCGA should not become another hurdle before that action is implemented. Because CCGA is a Systemwide committee, it should examine divisional actions from that

perspective. In addition, in line with well-established principles of UC governance, CCGA needs to retain its responsibility for actions directed at graduate academic programs and recognize its vested interest in actions directed at academic units when these actions directly affect associated graduate academic programs.

To some extent, CCGA also needs to concern itself with the status of undergraduate education. The same faculty ordinarily serve both undergraduate and graduate education. Undergraduate courses offer teaching assistantships that provide graduate students with opportunities to learn to be good teachers and are a source of financial support for them. Some undergraduate students participate in research with graduate students, providing both assistance to graduate research projects and opportunities for graduate students to learn how to train researchers. Proposals to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, and discontinue academic units and degree programs for undergraduates can have repercussions for graduate education. Thus, CCGA also needs a means for early knowledge of and, if needed, early commentary on any transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance that is being considered for undergraduate academic units or degree programs.

Specific CCGA Roles

Based both on its reading of established bylaws, policy statements, and practices and on its analysis of how best to fulfill its responsibilities for graduate education in the University of California, CCGA has determined that it should handle proposed transfers, consolidations, disestablishments, and discontinuances of academic units and programs in the following manner:

- 1) CCGA should review transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance proposals while they are still at the divisional level to make certain that the divisional Graduate Council is appropriately involved and that any Systemwide issues are fully considered.
 - a) CCGA should use the occasion of its meetings to have divisional representatives identify transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance proposals at any stage of consideration on their campuses.
 - b) Members should make preliminary determinations about whether the divisional Graduate Council is appropriately involved and whether the proposed action raises any Systemwide concerns. So long as the divisional Graduate Council is appropriately involved and Systemwide issues either do not exist or are being considered by appropriate persons and groups, CCGA should not be involved in any way in divisional reviews of the proposed action.
 - c) If there are ever doubts about the involvement of the divisional Graduate Council or concerns about Systemwide issues, a subcommittee should be appointed to explore the matter further. The subcommittee should include the Chair or Vice Chair of CCGA and two CCGA representatives from campuses other than that (or those) considering the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance. The subcommittee should complete its work in 30 days.
 - d) If the subcommittee should determine and the CCGA agree that the divisional Graduate Council is not appropriately involved, the CCGA Chair should endeavor through informal conversation and formal communication to persuade those responsible to alter their procedures so as to include the divisional Graduate Council appropriately. The Chair should follow-up to ascertain that the divisional Graduate Council has become adequately involved in considering the proposal.
 - e) If the subcommittee should determine and the CCGA agree that the proposed transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance raises Systemwide issues, the CCGA Chair should so inform the division(s) involved (presumably, the Chairs of the Academic Senate, Graduate Council, Committee on Planning and Budget, and Committee on Educational Policy, the Chair of any campus planning board, the Graduate Dean, the Academic Vice Chancellor, and the Chancellor), the Systemwide arm of the Academic Senate (presumably, the Chairs of Planning and Budget and of Educational Policy, and the Chair of the

Systemwide Academic Senate), and the Office of the President (presumably, the Director of Academic Planning and Program Review, the Assistant Vice President for Planning, the Chair of the new APC, and the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs). The Chair should follow-up to ascertain that the Systemwide issues are being adequately considered.

- 2) CCGA should receive a report on every transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance adopted by a campus. When the action involves an academic degree program directly, then CCGA approval is necessary but not sufficient for its acceptance Systemwide. When the action involves an academic unit, then CCGA should have the opportunity to recommend to the Chair of the system-wide Academic Senate and the Office of the President that the proposed action be accepted or rejected. CCGA's approval or recommendation should be based on the impact of the proposed action on graduate education in the University of California. As a rule, CCGA should approve the proposed action on a graduate degree program and recommend acceptance of the proposed action on an academic unit.
 - a) Receipt of the report and transmission of CCGA response should both be carried out in a timely fashion. Campuses should be required to provide reports for Systemwide review within 30 days of final approval on the home campus. CCGA should normally have 60 days within which to respond.
 - b) When CCGA has determined that the Graduate Council was appropriately involved in campus decision making and that any Systemwide issues were considered (see 1 above), then the campus report need be no more than a one-page statement with a supporting letter from the Chair of the Graduate Council. If, however, CCGA believes that the Graduate Council was not appropriately involved or that Systemwide issues were not adequately considered, then a longer report is needed. This longer report should include description of the processes followed, the participants in these processes, how and why the final decision was made, all undergraduate and graduate degree programs associated with the involved unit(s), the impact on undergraduate and graduate degree programs, and any provisions needed to ensure that currently enrolled undergraduate and graduate students can finish their degree programs.
 - c) If the activities described in 1 above work as they should, CCGA's comments should be brief and, depending on whether it is a graduate degree program or an academic unit or undergraduate program that is under consideration, CCGA should either approve or recommend acceptance of the proposed transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance. CCGA's judgments would be based upon its early consideration of the proposed action (see 1 above) and the written report; they would not involve any additional, independent assessment by CCGA. When actions involving academic units and/or undergraduate degree programs are likely to affect the functioning of associate graduate degree programs, CCGA's letter would identify these graduate degree programs and suggest that they be reviewed by relevant divisional Academic Senate committees.
 - d) Should CCGA disapprove a proposed transfer, consolidation, or discontinuance of a graduate degree program, that action cannot proceed (analogous to CCGA's role in the approval of proposals for new graduate degree programs).
 - e) Should CCGA recommend rejection of the proposed transfer, consolidation or disestablishment of an academic unit or the proposed transfer, consolidation or discontinuance of an undergraduate degree program or express any serious concerns about any such proposals, these would be handled in a manner analogous to the handling of CPEC opinions about the proposed establishment of new degree programs. That is, the Office of the President and the originating campus(es) would be responsible for addressing CCGA's concerns prior to the President approving the proposed action.

Coordination with Other Systemwide Committees

CCGA believes that it should coordinate its consideration of any proposed transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of an academic unit or program with similar consideration by the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). We propose that these two committees adopt “early warning” systems too and the three committee chairs then share information and coordinate action. The three chairs should confer to share information about divisional proposals to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue academic units and degree programs, to coordinate as appropriate any efforts to ensure adequate Academic Senate participation on the campus level, and to consider any Systemwide issues raised by the proposed divisional actions. In difficult times, such conferences should occur monthly. In normal times, they should occur whenever any of the three Chairs believes it desirable but not less than twice a year in the fall and in the spring. CCGA directs its Chair to work with the Chairs of UCEP, UCPB, and the Systemwide Academic Senate to determine how best to coordinate with each other and to come to an agreement just as soon as possible.

Adopted by the University Committee on Educational Policy, February 10, 1994

Adopted by the University Committee on Planning and Budget, February 15, 1994

Presented to the Academic Council, February 16, 1994

Appendix Q

Role of CCGA in Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Units¹¹

(Adopted by CCGA May 17, 1994)

Introduction

Because complex reconstitutions of academic units and programs are proceeding on several University of California campuses and the role of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) in these actions is not well established, CCGA has prepared and adopted this statement. This statement, the November 16, 1993 statement "Role of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs in the Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units," and the well-established policies and procedures for the creation of new academic programs and units (described in the CCGA Handbook and Academic Senate Bylaws), when taken together, provide the basis for delineating CCGA's roles in approving or recommending approval of a single action or a combination of actions affecting either graduate degree programs or academic units involved with graduate degree programs.

Development Process

Creation of this statement was spurred by CCGA's examination of plans some divisions were developing for coping with the continuing UC budget crisis. Some such plans involved complex reorganizations of academic units and sometimes associated academic degree programs. Some included several different kinds of actions. For example, one proposal involved disestablishing academic units, creating new academic units, changing a school to a department, changing names of academic units and degree programs, adjusting degree programs, and planning new degree programs. CCGA's November 16, 1993 statement on its role in transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance applied to only some of the actions involved in plans like these. In particular, it did not address the creation of new academic units or degree programs within the context of related transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance actions.

Recognizing the need for a clear statement about how such complex proposals would be reviewed and acted upon, CCGA members discussed several options. In addition, Aimée Dorr, 93-94 Chair of CCGA, discussed options with Arnold Binder, 93-94 Chair of the Academic Council/Assembly, Daniel Simmons, 93-94 Vice Chair of the Academic Council/Assembly, Neil Smelser, University Professor and Special Assistant to the UC Provost and Vice President, Karen Merritt, Director of Academic Planning and Program Review, Office of the President, and Mohan Sitlani, Coordinator of Program Review, Office of the President. A draft statement was discussed at the April 1994 CCGA meeting. A revised statement was adopted at the May 1994 CCGA meeting.

Language

Reconstitution will refer to any combination of two or more actions treated as a unified plan by one or more divisions and intended to transfer, consolidate, disestablish, discontinue, change the name of, or create an academic unit or program.

Specific CCGA Roles

- 1) If a division submits a proposal involving two or more actions that the division regards as part of a unified plan, CCGA should ordinarily consider all the proposed actions together as part of one plan. CCGA's response should specifically address each proposed action that is presented as part of the unified plan. Ordinarily, CCGA's response should be transmitted within 60 days of receipt of the reconstitution proposal.
- 2) If the division requests it and the Chair of the Academic Council agrees, CCGA will do a preliminary review of reconstitution proposals while they are still being reviewed by divisional Academic Senate committees. However, CCGA will not take any final action nor make any final recommendation until all campus review processes are complete and CCGA is able to review a statement of the division's final decisions.

¹¹ See Appendix L for guidelines for converting State-Supported Programs to Self-Supporting Programs and Self-Supporting Programs to State-Supported Programs.

- 3) Any combination of proposed actions that involve only transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, discontinuance, and/or name changes for academic units and/or programs should be handled according to the procedures described in CCGA's November 16, 1993 statement. (See that statement for details and time frame.)
- 4) Any combination of proposed actions that involve only the creation of academic units and/or programs and for which a complete proposal has been submitted should be handled according to well established procedures described in CCGA's Handbook and Academic Senate by-laws. (See these for details.) Ordinarily, the recommendation to approve or disapprove the creation of an academic unit should be made within 60 days of receiving a complete proposal. CCGA's approval or disapproval of a proposed graduate degree program will ordinarily not occur until at least six months after receipt of a complete proposal. For this reason, when responding within 60 days to the division's full reconstitution plan, CCGA should provide a preliminary indication of whether it believes the proposed degree program is approvable and describe any particular concerns and issues it has regarding the proposed degree program. In most cases, this preliminary statement will be just like the letter the lead reviewer first sends to the academic unit whose proposed graduate degree program is under consideration by CCGA (see CCGA Handbook for details). If there is not a complete proposal for a new academic unit or degree program, then within 60 days, CCGA should provide a preliminary indication of whether it believes the proposed academic unit or degree program is worthwhile and warranted and a description of any particular concerns and issues it has regarding the proposed academic unit or degree program.
- 5) Those reconstitutions that involve both the creation and planned creation of an academic unit or program and the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of an academic unit or program should be handled, as appropriate, according to both sets of procedures, as described in 3 and 4 above.
- 6) In considering the various actions involved in a reconstitution proposal, CCGA should exercise care to evaluate each of them according to the same standards it would use were each action submitted separately for CCGA consideration.
- 7) In its response to a reconstitution proposal, CCGA should take care to identify any existing or proposed graduate degree programs involved, to suggest time frames within which these programs should be attended to, and to communicate its opinions to relevant persons and groups, particularly the divisional Graduate Council, in the proposing division.

Coordination with Other Systemwide Committees

In dealing with any reconstitution proposal, the Chairs of CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB and the Chairs of any other Systemwide committees that the Chair of the Academic Council asks to review the proposal will seek to coordinate their reviews and conclusions. For proposals involving graduate degree programs or units with graduate degree programs, the CCGA Chair will take responsibility for coordinating the committees. For proposals involving undergraduate degree programs only, the UCEP Chair will take responsibility for coordinating the committees.

Appendix R
Guidelines for Reviewing Proposed and Existing MRUs

- 1) What does the MRU bring to the campus that is not accomplishable through other graduate programs/groups on the home campus or other UC campuses? For example:
 - a) What types of students are attracted to the MRU? What types of research are they involved in? What published work and/or success at grantsmanship results from their scientific activities?
 - b) To what degree do graduate and postdoctoral students participate through assistantships, fellowships, traineeships, or how otherwise are these students involved in MRU work, including paid employment and graduate student research?
 - c) Are all students financially supported throughout their tenure and in what forms is that support provided?
 - d) Are there unique opportunities for training and mentoring students through alliances of post-doctoral students, visiting scholars, and/or professors?
 - e) Do students gain unique training (i.e. training not available in other graduate groups or programs) that enhances their opportunities in the job market and/or facilitates their research and professional development and in what form is that training provided (e.g., TAs, RAs, informal teaching, and/or technological expertise)?
 - f) Does the MRU provide access to colloquia, equipment, facilities, and/or professional networks for both faculty and students?
 - g) What are the direct or indirect contributions of the MRU to graduate and undergraduate teaching programs?

- 2) What makes the MRU distinct from graduate groups/programs? Does the MRU have a focus and/or interdisciplinary approach that distinguishes it? For example:
 - a) Does the MRU create a research environment and/or opportunity for acquisition of funds not otherwise possible through traditional graduate programs/groups?
 - b) Are there concerted efforts by faculty to acquire novel multi-authored research grants and/or training grants not obtainable through traditional academic alliances?
 - c) Through what academic units are grant proposals that support the MRU channeled (e.g., home department, graduate groups, or the MRU)?
 - d) Which specific faculty are members, and what does each add to the MRU?

- 3) What is the MRU accomplishing that ensures its current and future uniqueness, vibrancy, and relevance? For example:
 - a) Are there established procedures for assessing relevance and future directions?
 - b) Are there special requisites for membership and participation?
 - c) Is the original mission of the MRU still pertinent?
 - d) What is the justification for continuance of the MRU?
 - e) What would be lost if the MRU disbanded?

- 4) What is the relationship of the MRU with other MRUs and ORUs?
 - a) Are there ORUs that are members of the MRU, and if so, is continued membership of the ORUs warranted?
 - b) Is continuation of the MRU justified?

- 5) How is the MRU administered?
 - a) How is the director or chair chosen? How long does he/she serve?
 - b) How are members of the executive body chosen? How long do they serve?
 - c) How often does the administrative committee meet?

Appendix S
Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning ORUs

<http://www.ucop.edu/research/orupolicy.html>

[This appendix may require additional attention to bring into conformity with current policy. UCORP and ORGS should be consulted.]

I. Definition and Purpose of ORUs

Designation of ORUs
Lines of Responsibility

II. Administration, Budgetary Support, and Personnel

Procedure for Establishment
Procedure for Appointing a Director
Procedure for Five-Year Review
Procedure for Disestablishment
Phase Out Period
Procedure for Name Change
Review of Directors
Annual Report
Life Span
Exceptions

SECTION I. DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF ORUs

- 1) An Organized Research Unit (ORU) is an academic unit the University has established to provide a supportive infrastructure for interdisciplinary research complementary to the academic goals of departments of instruction and research. The functions of an ORU are to facilitate research and research collaborations; disseminate research results through research conferences, meetings and other activities; strengthen graduate and undergraduate education by providing students with training opportunities and access to facilities; seek extramural research funds; and carry out university and public service programs related to the ORU's research expertise. An ORU may not offer formal courses for credit for students of the University or for the public unless it has been specifically empowered to do so by the President after consultation with the Academic Senate and the appropriate Chancellors.
- 2) A Directory of Organized Research Units in the University of California is maintained and periodically issued by the Office of the Vice Provost for Research. Units ranging from special libraries, hospitals, clinics, art galleries, and museums to departmental laboratories are not ORUs unless they have been officially approved as such even though they may resemble ORUs in some respects. It is important to distinguish between formally established ORUs and other units of a less formal character. In the solicitation of extramural funds for a research project by a unit that has not been granted ORU status, care should be taken not to use terminology nor make representations which suggest that the proposing unit is in fact a University-approved ORU or is about to become one. The designations enumerated in the following paragraphs shall not be used as formal labels for units that are not ORUs, with the exception of Center, as noted. If a unit is likely to evolve into an ORU after a trial period of operation, the possibility should be mentioned at a suitable stage in the planning; in such a case, the designation Center or Project is suitable.

DESIGNATION OF ORUs

- 3) Units included in the Directory of Organized Research Units normally carry one of the designations enumerated and defined below. Institute, Laboratory, and Center are used most often, but other titles may be employed in particular situations. An ORU that covers a broad research area may in turn contain other more specialized units; for instance, an Institute may comprise several Centers, or a Station several

Facilities. It is recognized that some long-established units have designations that do not conform to the definitions that follow (some Centers are rather like Institutes in their activities) and that some have widely known names such as Bureau, Division, Foundation or Organization that are not listed below but that cannot be conveniently changed. However, insofar as possible, designations of new units shall be taken from those defined below.

Institute: a major unit that coordinates and promotes faculty and student research on a continuing basis over an area so wide that it extends across department, school or college, and even campus boundaries. The unit may also engage in public service activities stemming from its research program, within the limits of its stated objectives.

Laboratory: a non-departmental organization that establishes and maintains facilities for research in several departments, sometimes with the help of a full-time research staff appointed in accordance with the guidelines of Section 6a below. (A laboratory in which substantially all participating faculty members are from the same academic department is a departmental laboratory and is not an ORU.)

Center: a small unit, sometimes one of several forming an Institute, that furthers research in a designated field; or, a unit engaged primarily in providing research facilities for other units and departments.

Non-ORU Center. The term Center may be used for research units not formally constituted as ORUs upon approval by the Chancellor after consultation with the divisional Academic Senate. Before approval is granted for a Center that is not an ORU, the campus may stipulate terms and conditions such as a process for appropriate periodic review, including administration, programs, and budget; appointment of a director and advisory committee; an appropriate campus reporting relationship; and progress reports. Station: a unit that provides physical facilities for interdepartmental research in a broad area (e.g., agriculture), sometimes housing other units and serving several campuses. The terms Facility or Observatory may be used to define units similar in function but with more narrow interests.

LINES OF RESPONSIBILITY

- 4) All ORUs are aggregated into two categories for purposes of administration and review.
 - a) ORU (Single-campus Organized Research Unit): An Organized Research Unit serving a single campus is responsible to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee for administration, budget, space, personnel, and scholarship.
 - b) MRU (Multi-campus Research Unit): This category includes (1) all units with facilities and personnel on two or more campuses or locations associated with them, and (2) all units with facilities at a single location on or near one of the campuses if the participation of faculty or staff from other campuses is so extensive as to give such a unit a Universitywide character.

MRUs are responsible to the President and report through a Chancellor or Chancellor's designee at the campus hosting the MRU's administrative headquarters; the President retains ultimate responsibility for matters of general policy and intercampus coordination and the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee oversees the MRU's administrative relationship with the campus. The Directors of the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Water Resources Center, the Kearney Foundation for Soil Science, and the Giannini Foundation for Agricultural Economics report to the Vice President--Agriculture and Natural Resources and insure that the Chancellors are kept informed of all impending substantial changes in these units and that effective administrative liaison with the Chancellors is maintained.

If an MRU has facilities and personnel on two or more campuses or locations associated with them, the Director may be aided by an Associate Director on each campus or location at which the unit is active. The portion of such an MRU on a particular campus has some of the attributes of an ORU, and the chief administrator of that part of the MRU (i.e., the Director or Associate Director) is responsible to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee in such matters as personnel, services, and space. Each Associate Director is responsible to the Director for fulfillment of that portion of the MRU's mission that is carried out by the local branch.

SECTION II. ADMINISTRATION, BUDGETARY SUPPORT, AND PERSONNEL

- 5a) ORUs. Each ORU is headed by a Director who is a tenured member of the faculty and who may receive an administrative stipend in addition to the faculty salary, except that a faculty member who already earns such a stipend through another appointment (e.g., as associate dean) shall not receive a second stipend. Such dual administrative responsibilities should be avoided. The Director is aided by a standing Advisory Committee, chaired by a faculty member other than the Director, which meets regularly and participates actively in setting the unit's goals and in critically evaluating its effectiveness on a continuing basis. Specifically, the Advisory Committee provides counsel to the Director on all matters pertaining to the unit, including budgetary matters and personnel. The Chair of the Advisory Committee, and as many other members as practical, should meet with five-year review committees (see below under Section 10a) and otherwise be available for consultation by the five-year review committee during the course of its review. The Advisory Committee is made up predominantly of faculty members, but may include some members from the professional research series and may have some members from outside the University. The Advisory Committee is appointed by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee. The charge to the committee and its functions, membership, and reporting requirements are determined by the appointing officer but should include active participation in the planning and evaluation of the ORU's programs and activities.
- 5b) MRUs. All of the stipulations in Section 5a apply to MRUs, except that the members of the Advisory Committee to an MRU are appointed by the President or President's designee after consultation with the appropriate Chancellors or Chancellors' designees. An Advisory Committee may also be termed Steering or Executive Committee. MRUs may be aided by more than one committee acting in an advisory capacity; for example, MRUs may have an external Advisory Committee and a UC Executive or Steering Committee. The external Advisory Committee is typically made up of individuals from governmental agencies, the private sector and the public nonprofit sector and provides guidance to the MRU on how it might address the needs and priorities of the external constituencies for which the activities of the MRU are especially important. The Chair and membership of the external Advisory Committee are appointed by the President or President's designee.
- 6a) ORUs. In recognition of the role played by ORUs in the educational process, provision is made in the campus budget for the unit's core administrative support, Director's stipend, staff salaries, supplies and expenses, equipment and facilities, and general assistance. The budgets of some units, notably those primarily serving other academic units (e.g., survey centers) and those engaged in professional activities of specific interest to the State of California (e.g., agriculture, industry, public administration, transportation), may also contain provisions for Professional Research (or Agronomist or Astronomer) positions of a more permanent nature than is ordinarily associated with a research project. All permanent positions--professional, technical, administrative, or clerical--may be established and filled, regardless of the availability of funds, only after specific review and authorization of the proposed positions and of the candidates for them in accordance with University policies and procedures.
- 6b) MRUs. All of the provisions of Section 6a apply to MRUs. The President and Chancellor or their designees will decide what portions of administrative support for the unit will derive from the campus or the Office of the President.

PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHMENT

- 7) ORUs, MRUs. To establish an ORU or MRU, the faculty members concerned submit a proposal stating the proposed unit's goals and objectives. The proposal should describe what value and capabilities will be added by the new unit, and explain why they cannot be achieved within the existing campus structure. It should make clear how the ORU or MRU will be greater than the sum of its parts, for example, by fostering new intellectual collaborations, stimulating new sources of funding, furthering innovative and original research, or performing service and outreach to the public. The proposal should also contain the

following information:

- Experience of the core faculty in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research collaborations.
- Research plan for the first year of operation and projections for the five years following.
- Budget estimates for the first year of operation, projections for the five years following, and anticipated sources of funding.
- Names of faculty members who have agreed in writing to participate in the unit's activities.
- Projections of numbers of faculty members and students, professional research appointees, and other personnel for the specified periods.
- Statement about immediate space needs and how they will be met for the first year and realistic projections of future space needs.
- Statement of other resource needs, such as capital equipment and library resources, and how they will be met for the first year, and realistic projections of future resource needs.
- Statement about anticipated benefits of the proposed unit to the teaching programs of the participating faculty members' departments.
- Statement specifying the appropriate administrative unit's commitment of funds, space, and other resources necessary for the successful operation of the proposed ORU or MRU. Actual or potential availability of extramural funds shall not serve as the sole basis for proposing, approving, or continuing an ORU or MRU.

The proposal should also list similar units that exist elsewhere, describe the relation of the proposed unit to similar units at other campuses of the University of California, and describe the contributions to the field that the proposed unit may be anticipated to make that are not made by existing units.

- 8a) ORUs. The proposal is submitted for review via any Dean directly affected by the proposed unit's personnel, space, and equipment demands to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, who seeks the advice of the appropriate divisional Academic Senate committees. In cases of disagreement about whether to establish an ORU, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee consults with the Chair of the Academic Senate, but the Chancellor retains final authority for the decision to approve establishment of a new ORU. Establishment of an ORU must carry with it a commitment of space and funding adequate to the mission of the unit. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee informs the Vice Provost for Research of the establishment of the ORU.
- 8b) MRUs. The proposal for an MRU originates at the campus which will host the administrative headquarters of the unit. The proposal is submitted to the appropriate administrative officer, normally the Vice Chancellor for Research. The Vice Chancellor for Research seeks advice from all appropriate divisional Academic Senate Committees and administrative committees. After campus review, the proposal is submitted to the Vice Provost for Research by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee of the host campus. The Vice Provost for Research reviews the proposal and refers it to the Chancellors for comment. Campus review should include consultation with appropriate Divisional Senate committees. The Vice Provost for Research also refers the proposal to the Chair of the Academic Council for comment by The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). UCORP is the lead review committee. In cases of disagreement about whether to establish an MRU, the Vice Provost for Research, Chair of the Academic Council, and Chancellor or Chancellor's designee of the host campus will establish a process of adjudication; however, the Vice Provost for Research retains final authority for the decision to recommend establishment of a new MRU to the Provost and President. After Presidential approval, the Provost informs the Chancellors and Chair of the Academic Council of the action. The establishment of an MRU must carry with it a commitment of space and funding adequate to the mission of the unit.

The procedures for establishing a new branch of an existing MRU are the same as those for establishing a new MRU.

PROCEDURE FOR APPOINTING A DIRECTOR

- 9a) ORUs. The Director of an ORU is appointed by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee after a nomination procedure on which the Chancellor and the Academic Senate have agreed. The founding Director of an ORU may be specified in the proposal to establish the ORU. When the appointment of a new Director is for an existing unit, the Advisory Committee should be solicited for nominations.
- 9b) MRUs. The Director of an MRU is appointed by the Provost after consultation with the appropriate Chancellors and with the advice of a Search Committee appointed by the Vice Provost for Research. Nominations for membership on the Search Committee are solicited by the Vice Provost for Research from the Chair of the Academic Council and the Chancellors. Normally, at least one member of the Advisory or Executive Committee of an existing MRU seeking a new Director serves on the Search Committee.

PROCEDURE FOR FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

- 10a) ORUs. Periodic reviews of ORUs are necessary to ensure that the research being conducted under the units' auspices is of the highest possible quality and that campus resources are being allocated wisely and in line with campus priorities. Each ORU should be reviewed at intervals of five years or less by an ad hoc review committee. Reviews should address the ORU's original purpose, present functioning, research accomplishments (such as publications, grants, and new collaborations resulting from research conducted or sponsored by the unit), future plans, and continuing development to meet the needs of the field. The review should assess the adequacy of space and other resources made available to the unit. The review should look to the unit's success in meeting previously established objectives, planned changes in program objectives, and planned steps to achieve new objectives. The review committee should be provided explicit budget information, including amounts and sources of all funds and expenditures, and the committee should assess whether the budget is adequate and appropriate to support the unit's mission. Each ad hoc review committee should consider and make specific recommendations, if appropriate, for improvements in the mission, budget, administration, research focus, space and other resource requirements, and programs and activities of the unit. It should also consider whether the unit should merge with another similar unit, or be disestablished.

It is the responsibility of the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee to initiate five-year (quinquennial) reviews for ORUs. The Vice Chancellor for Research, in consultation with the appropriate Senate Committee, should assure that five-year reviews are conducted at the proper five-year interval for each unit. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee appoints the review committee for an ORU from a slate nominated by the divisional Academic Senate. Review committees may have one or more members from another campus or from outside the University. The review committee's report should be provided to the Director for comment. Justification for continuation of an ORU must be documented carefully by the review committee.

The report is reviewed by the appropriate Academic Senate committee(s) and a decision concerning continuation of the unit and any needed changes is made by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee upon consideration of the ad hoc and Senate committees' recommendations. The disestablishment of an ORU requires approval of the Chancellor, who forwards the information to the Vice Provost for Research (see Section 11a).

To permit the Vice Provost for Research to maintain an accurate portfolio of UC organized research, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee should transmit an annual report to the Vice Provost for Research listing ORU establishments and disestablishments and a summary of five-year reviews of ORUs.

- 10b) MRUs. Periodic reviews of MRUs are necessary to ensure that the research being conducted under the units' auspices is of the highest possible quality and that University resources are being allocated wisely and in line with University priorities. Each MRU should be reviewed at intervals of five years or less by

an ad hoc review committee, appointed by the Vice Provost for Research from a slate nominated by the Chair of the Academic Council and the Chancellors or Chancellors' designees. The Quinquennial Review Committee should include at least one member from outside the University and may include one or more Vice Chancellors for Research from within UC. The review should address all the criteria and areas identified with reference to ORUs in Section 10a. The Vice Provost for Research should assure that the quinquennial review of each MRU takes place at regular five year intervals. The review report is given to the Director for information. Each Quinquennial Review Committee should consider and make specific recommendations, if appropriate, for improvements in the mission, budget, administration, FTE or other resources, research focus, and programs and activities of the unit. It should also consider whether the unit should merge with another similar unit, or be disestablished. Justification for continuation of an MRU must be carefully documented by the review committee.

The Five-Year Review report is submitted to the Vice Provost for Research, who distributes it to the Academic Vice Chancellors for campus comment and the Chair of the Academic Council for comment by UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA. The MRU Director and the Chair of the Advisory and Executive Committees may also comment on the Five-Year Review Report. Based on the Five-Year Review Report and the comments on the Five-Year Review Report, the Vice Provost for Research approves continuation of the unit, implements changes in the structure or functioning of the unit, or recommends disestablishment of the unit to the President.

PROCEDURE FOR DISESTABLISHMENT

- 11a) ORUs. The recommendation for disestablishing an ORU may follow a five-year review of the unit or other process of review established by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee. After such campus review the Chancellor approves the request for disestablishment and the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee informs the Vice Provost for Research of the action.
- 11b) MRUs. The recommendation for disestablishing a MRU may follow a five-year review of the unit or other process of review established by the Chancellor of the host campus of the MRU or by the Vice Provost for Research. If the disestablishment initiates at the host campus, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee submits the request for disestablishment to the Vice Provost for Research after appropriate campus administrative and Senate consultation and after consultation with the Advisory Committee of the MRU. The request for disestablishment is referred by the Vice Provost for Research to the Chancellors for comment. Campus review should include consultation with the appropriate Divisional Senate committees. The Vice Provost for Research also refers the proposal to the Chair of the Academic Council for comment by UCORP, UCPB and CCGA. If the disestablishment is initiated by the Vice Provost for Research, comment is requested from the Chancellors and from the Universitywide Academic Senate. The Provost recommends disestablishment of the MRU to the President. After Presidential approval, the Provost informs the Chancellors and Chair of the Academic Council of the action.

PHASE-OUT PERIOD

- 12) ORUs, MRUs. The phase-out period for an ORU or MRU which is to be disestablished should be sufficient to permit an orderly termination or transfer of contractual obligations. Normally, the phase-out period should be at most one full year after the end of the academic year in which the decision is made to disestablish the unit.

PROCEDURE FOR NAME CHANGE

- 13a) ORUs. The director of the ORU prepares a proposal describing the rationale for requesting a new name for the unit. The request for a new name usually reflects new directions in the interdisciplinary research sponsored by the unit, the expansion or addition of new knowledge or fields of research to the unit's mission, or the institutionalization of new methodologies of study. After review by the Senate and appropriate campus administrators, the Chancellor approves the name change of the ORU and informs the Vice Provost for Research of the action.

- 13b) MRUs. The Director of the MRU prepares a proposal for a change in name of the MRU, certifying that the change does not signal a fundamental change in the MRU nor require substantial new resources. The MRU Advisory Committee endorses the requested name change. The proposal is reviewed by appropriate host campus administrators and Senate committees and by appropriate campus administrators and Senate committees of other participating campuses. The Director submits the proposal package to the Vice Provost for Research, who consults with the Chair of UCORP to secure his or her agreement that the name change is uncomplicated, and does not signal a fundamental change in the nature of the MRU nor require substantial new resources. After favorable review at the host campus and all participating campuses, the host campus Chancellor approves the name change and submits the full documentation to the Vice Provost for Research, who notifies the other campuses and the Chair of the Academic Council of the change in name.

REVIEW OF DIRECTORS

- 14a) ORUs. The effectiveness of each Director is reviewed near the end of an initial five-year term, or earlier, as appropriate; when possible, the Director is reviewed as part of the unit's quinquennial review. If the unit is to be continued, the decision whether to continue the appointment of the Director is made by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee. Directorships of ORUs are limited to ten years of continuous tenure in all but extraordinary circumstances.
- 14b) MRUs. The effectiveness of each Director is reviewed near the end of an initial five-year term, or earlier, as appropriate; when possible, the Director is reviewed as part of the unit's quinquennial review. If the unit is to be continued, the decision whether to continue the appointment of the Director is made by the President or President's designee after consultation with the Vice Provost for Research. Directorships of MRUs are limited to ten years of continuous tenure in all but extraordinary circumstances.

ANNUAL REPORT

- 15a) ORUs. At the end of each academic year, each ORU should submit a report to the officer to whom it is responsible. The Chair of the Advisory Committee should be consulted in the preparation of the report. The report should contain the following:
- Names of graduate students and postdoctoral researchers directly contributing to the unit who (a) are on the unit's payroll, (b) participate--through assistantships, fellowships, or traineeships, or are otherwise involved in the unit's work.
 - Names of faculty members actively engaged in the unit's research or its supervision.
 - Extent of student and faculty participation from other campuses or universities.
 - Numbers and FTE of professional, technical, administrative, and clerical personnel employed.
 - List of publications issued by the unit, including books, journal articles, and reports and reprints issued under its own covers, showing author, title, press run, and production costs.
 - Sources and amounts (on an annual basis) of all support funds, including income from the sale of publications and from other services.
 - Expenditures from all sources of support funds, distinguishing use of funds for administrative support, direct research, and other specified uses.
 - Description and amount of space currently occupied.
 - Any other information deemed relevant to the evaluation of a unit's effectiveness, including updated five-year projections of plans and resource requirements where feasible.

- 15b) MRUs. MRUs should submit annual reports to the Vice Provost for Research, with copies to the

Chancellors of the host and participating campuses and to the Council on Research and the Universitywide Committee on Research Policy. The Chair of the Advisory Committee should be consulted in the preparation of the report. The annual report of an MRU should contain the same information as stipulated for ORUs in Section 15a.

LIFE SPAN

- 16a) ORUs. All ORUs must establish a rationale for continuance, in terms of scholarly or scientific merit and campus priorities, at fifteen year intervals. The first such fifteen-year (sunset) review for all units established prior to 1981 will take place between July 1, 1996 and June 30, 2001, but may extend beyond 2001 if necessary. Campuses have the flexibility of carrying out fifteen-year reviews at the same time as, and in place of, regularly scheduled five-year reviews or at other times established by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, in consultation with the Academic Senate. For example, campuses may choose to carry out simultaneous or collective fifteen-year reviews of all ORUs in the same broad disciplinary area. To begin a fifteen-year review, an ORU should develop a formal proposal for continued ORU status, support funds, and space in the context of current campus and University needs and resources. The proposal should state a persuasive rationale for the unit's continuation and should include all of the information required of proposals for ORU establishment (see Section 7). In addition, the proposal should describe the ORU's achievements over the past 15 years, the contributions the ORU has made to research, graduate and undergraduate education and public service, and the consequences if the ORU were not continued. The proposal and submitting unit are reviewed by an ad hoc fifteen-year review committee established by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee after consultation with appropriate divisional Academic Senate committees. It is recommended that at least one member from outside the campus sit on the Fifteen-Year Review Committee. The report of the Fifteen-Year Review Committee is reviewed by appropriate campus senate committees and administrative officials. Approval for disestablishment of the ORU is made by the Chancellor. The Chancellor informs the Vice Provost for Research of the action.
- 16b) MRUs. All MRUs must establish a rationale for continuance, in terms of scholarly or scientific merit and University priorities, at fifteen year intervals. The first such fifteen-year (sunset) review for MRUs should take place between June 30, 1996 and June 30, 2001, but may extend beyond 2001 as necessary. During this period of time, according to a schedule to be established by the Vice Provost for Research, each approved MRU which has at least 15 years of existence must submit to the Vice Provost for Research a formal proposal for continued MRU status, support funds, and space in the context of the University's needs and resources at the time. The proposal should state a persuasive rationale for the unit's continuation and should include all of the information required of proposals for MRU establishment (see Section 7). In addition, the proposal should describe the MRU's achievements over the past 15 years, the contributions the MRU has made to research, graduate and undergraduate education, and public service, and the consequences if the MRU were not continued. Fifteen-year reviews of MRUs may be comparative; MRUs thus may be required to submit additional information required by the comparative nature of the fifteen-year review. A cluster of MRUs to be reviewed comparatively may be formed on the basis of related research interests, similar organizational structure, or other characteristics held in common.

A Universitywide ad hoc committee with representatives from the Council on Research and the Universitywide Committee on Research Policy and other such members as deemed necessary will constitute the review body for fifteen-year reviews of MRUs. The fifteen-year review committee should include at least one member from outside the University. The Fifteen-Year Review Committee will submit its report and recommendations to the Vice Provost for Research, who will distribute them to the Academic Vice Chancellors for campus comment and to the Academic Council for comment by UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA. UCORP is the lead review committee. The decision for disestablishment, continuation, or other change of an MRU following a fifteen-year review will be made by the President.

EXCEPTIONS

- 17) All exceptions to the above policies and procedures must be approved by the President.

Appendix T
Academic Senate Oversight of Professional Schools and Role of CCGA in the Review of Professional Degrees

[Formerly Appendix K]
August 15, 1995

DANIEL L. SIMMONS
Chair, Academic Council

Re: Academic Senate Oversight of Professional Schools

Dear Dan:

CCGA has concluded its review of Academic Senate oversight of the postgraduate degree programs in the professional schools of UC. Stimulated by your request in November, 1994 that CCGA comment on a number of issues related to professional schools, including the role of affirmative action in medical school admissions and the ramifications of charging differential fees for professional school programs, CCGA formed a Subcommittee on Professional School Oversight. The final report of that subcommittee is enclosed.

Alden Mosshammer, Chair, UCRJ, wrote in response to CCGA's request for an opinion on the authority of the Academic Senate over professional school degree programs, that, "while the Academic Senate lacks authority over courses in graduate professional schools, the Senate does have authority over degrees and degree programs." The Senate's authority over degrees derives from SOR 105.2.a." Thus, UCRJ took the position that graduate professional schools retain their own authority over course approvals and grading policies, but are otherwise subject to the same Senate oversight as any other graduate program.

The subsequent inquiry of the Divisional Graduate Councils by the CCGA Subcommittee on Professional School Oversight demonstrated clear consistencies in the oversight relations by Divisional Graduate Councils of campus professional schools. Professional degrees that are, in a sense, considered academic research degrees appear to be governed by the Graduate Councils. Degrees *not* reviewed by Graduate Councils are the: M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and (in at least one case) the J.D.

The CCGA subcommittee found that the oversight exemption practices that have historically evolved to give medical, dental, veterinary, pharmacy, and law schools autonomy appear to be effective and consistent. The exempt professional schools appear to have developed Faculty Councils or other faculty governing bodies that serve oversight functions analogous to those of the Divisional Graduate Councils, and the Graduate Councils do not report problems or compelling reasons for changing governance and review procedures. Because a shift to Senate oversight, motivated chiefly by constitutional considerations, would be gratuitously disruptive and counterproductive, the CCGA subcommittee proposes to formally and explicitly permit the Divisional Graduate Councils to delegate their oversight to the exempt professional schools.

The enclosed Report of the CCGA Subcommittee on Professional School Oversight was unanimously approved by CCGA on July 18, 1995. The final paragraph of the report represents CCGA's resolution to the Academic Council:

CCGA wishes to endorse the status quo of present exemption policies, stare decisis, as a willingness to stand by a settled state of affairs. In the interest of preserving rules of constitutional Senate jurisdiction, CCGA explicitly states its willingness to let Divisional Graduate Councils delegate their oversight responsibilities to professional schools offering the specific degrees of the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. Graduate Councils should base their delegation on the existence of rigorous and effective parallel review structures within the exempted professional schools. CCGA retains its right to review and make recommendations regarding any professional school policies and practices that do not result in effective faculty program reviews. CCGA also retains its right and obligation to review and make recommendations regarding professional school programs when the continuation or discontinuance of these programs have Systemwide implications.

Sincerely,

David B. Bogy
Chair, CCGA

Enclosure
cc: CCGA Members

Report from CCGA Subcommittee on Professional School Oversight
(July 18, 1995)

In 1994, CCGA was asked by the Academic Council to comment on a number of issues related to professional schools. These included the role of affirmative action in medical school admissions, and the ramifications of charging differential fees for professional school programs. Since CCGA has not traditionally approved or reviewed medical or law school programs and policies, CCGA chair David Bogy requested clarification from Dan Simmons, Chair of the Academic Council, and Alden Mosshammer, Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, on the extent and nature of Senate responsibilities to oversee professional school degree programs. In a letter on January 5, 1995, Alden Mosshammer replied:

“UCRJ came to the conclusion that, while the Academic Senate lacks authority over courses in graduate professional schools, the Senate does have authority over degrees and degree-programs. The Senate authority over courses derives from SOR 105.2.b, wherein the graduate professional schools are exempted from that authority. The Senate’s authority over degrees derives from SOR 105.2.a, which states that ‘the Academic Senate . . . shall determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees other than honorary degrees. It shall recommend to the President all candidates for degrees in course [sic].’ SOR 105.2.a does not exempt the graduate professional schools from the Senate’s authority over degrees. In general, UCRJ has taken the position that the graduate professional schools retain their own authority over course-approvals and grading policies, but are otherwise subject to the same Senate oversight as any other graduate program.”

Construing this response to mean that the Divisional Graduate Councils and CCGA have constitutional oversight responsibility over the UC professional school degree programs, Chair David Bogy appointed a CCGA subcommittee to determine the extent to which the Divisional Graduate Councils currently govern professional school degrees, and to formulate a recommendation about the proper role of the Councils and CCGA in overseeing professional school education in future. During March and April of 1995, CCGA members consulted their divisional Graduate Councils and reported their oversight practices to the subcommittee. The results of this inquiry, while neither complete nor comprehensive, indicated clear consistencies in the oversight relations by Divisional Graduate Councils of campus professional schools.

These patterns can be summarized briefly. UCD, UCLA, UCI, UCSD, and UCSF all have Medical Schools whose Ph.D. programs are reviewed by the campus Graduate Councils, but whose M.D. degrees are not. In the School of Dentistry at UCLA, only the Ph.D. programs are reviewed by Graduate Council; the D.D.S. degree program is not. At UCSF, the Graduate Council reviews all graduate “academic degrees,” but not the “professional degrees” of the D.D.S., M.D., and Pharm.D. The master’s and doctoral programs in Nursing are considered graduate academic programs, and are reviewed by Graduate Council at UCSF. The Veterinary Medicine programs at UCD are not under Senate review. Berkeley’s Law School is reviewed by Graduate Council, while UCLA’s is not. Graduate degrees in Engineering, Education, Schools of Business or Management, and other professional schools or programs (e.g. Information Management, Journalism, Architecture, Public Health, Public Policy, Social Welfare, Optometry, and the like) all appear to be reviewed by the Graduate Councils of their respective campuses. Senate oversight for these programs generally entails new program approval, approval of program requirements and curricular modifications, admission policies, and the formal granting of degrees. Divisional Graduate Councils tend to include representatives from the professional schools subject to their oversight.

These results suggest substantial uniformity in the patterns of Senate oversight over professional schools. With the exception of Berkeley’s Senate review of the UCB Law School, the Divisional Graduate Councils generally oversee all “academic degree” programs, whether they are housed in a professional school or not, but not the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., or J.D.

It is not entirely clear whether this established pattern was historically established on the constitutional ground that professional school authority over courses and grading was interpreted as extending to all aspects of a professional degree program, or for other reasons. There appear to be no uniform criteria or characteristics that

could be invoked as the basis of either a policy or a practice of exempting the profession degrees, listed above, from Senate supervision – including licensing and accreditation procedures. State licensing and professional accrediting are not unique to medical and law degrees, since social workers, clinical psychologists, and teachers, among others, are also licensed or credentialed by the state. Furthermore, the professionals who staff licensing and accreditation boards may include non-academics unfamiliar with academic traditions and therefore not competent to certify academic quality.

CCGA's recently clarified constitutional responsibility for overseeing professional degrees therefore confronts the Senate with a dilemma. The oversight exemption practices that have historically evolved to give medical, dental, veterinary, pharmacy, and law schools autonomy appear to be effective and consistent, but difficult to rationalize or justify. Pragmatically, there are good reasons for maintaining the present system of exempting the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. from Senate oversight. The exempt professional schools appear to have developed Faculty Councils or other faculty governing bodies that serve oversight functions analogous to those of the Divisional Graduate Councils. These appear to be working well to insure program quality, and Divisional Graduate Councils currently report no problems or compelling reasons for changing governance and review procedures. CCGA was approached by the Academic Council to consider problems of equal access by students to professional schools (affirmative action, differential fees) – not problems of quality. A shift to Senate oversight at this late date motivated chiefly by constitutional considerations would be gratuitously disruptive and counterproductive. CCGA therefore proposes to formalize the present system.

CCGA wishes to endorse the status quo of present exemption policies, *stare decisis*, as a willingness to stand by a settled state of affairs. In the interest of preserving rules of constitutional Senate jurisdiction, CCGA explicitly states its willingness to let Divisional Graduate Councils delegate their oversight responsibilities to professional schools offering the specific degrees of the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D.. Graduate Councils should base their delegation on the existence of rigorous and effective parallel review structures within the exempted professional schools. CCGA retains its right to review and make recommendations regarding any professional school policies and practices that do not result in effective faculty program reviews. CCGA also retains its right and obligation to review and make recommendations regarding professional school programs when the continuation or discontinuance of these programs have system-wide implications.



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT –
ACADEMIC AND HEALTH AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

September 8, 2008

EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS

The Academic Council has reinstated authority for the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to review proposals for *new* professional degree programs. These include new programs for the M.D., DD.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D. and the J.D. Enclosed is the Academic Council's report that clarifies the constitutional responsibility for CCGA to review degree proposals at UC professional schools.

For some years, the divisional Senate and professional schools have had oversight for these degree programs. Please inform the appropriate offices of the requirement to submit proposals to CCGA and the Office of the President. Questions may be directed to Director Carol Copperud, Academic Planning.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bob".

Robert D. Grey
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President for
Academic and Health Affairs

Enclosure

cc: Academic Council Chair Croughan
Vice Provost Greenstein
Director Copperud

Michael T. Brown

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council

Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: Michael.Brown@ucop.edu

Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

August 29, 2008

ROBERT GREY, PROVOST

Re: Re-establishment of CCGA Authority over Reviews of First Professional Degree Proposals

Dear Bob,

At its July 23, 2008 meeting, Academic Council approved the request from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to reinstate CCGA's plenary authority to approve new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs. CCGA has concluded that its 1995 decision exempting these degree titles from Senate oversight, thereby allowing relevant professional schools to approve new programs with these degree titles, was not made with an appreciation of the distinction between the approval and oversight roles of the Senate. While CCGA concurs that ongoing oversight is best left to professional schools offering these five degree titles pursuant to Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b), it is the experience of CCGA that two aspects of its review – the removal from internal pressures and influences within host campus, and the mandate to solicit expert reviews from outside the University – provide compelling motivation for conducting a review of proposed new degrees within the structure of the system-wide Senate. CCGA also noted that the satisfaction of accreditation requirements should not serve as a proxy for the rigorous review of new graduate programs performed by the Academic Senate.

CCGA is reinstating its plenary role in the approval of new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs effective immediately. It leaves the discretion of oversight of established degree programs to their campus Graduate Councils or their designees. Please inform the relevant staff and officers in those units associated with the review of new professional degree programs with these degree titles at both the Office of the President and the campuses about this change in CCGA policy. For your reference and convenience, I have enclosed CCGA's letter to Council and its rationale for the change. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this policy change.

Sincerely,



Michael T. Brown, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: President Yudof
Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Beckwith
Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director

Encl. 2

Appendix U

Criteria for Reviewing Proposed Joint UC/CSU Doctoral Programs

[Formerly Appendix H]

Since the inception of the joint doctoral programs agreement, a basic philosophy for the programs has emerged within the University. Joint doctoral programs are designed to combine intellectual and physical resources in a discipline where a program is being proposed, to be mutually beneficial to both UC and CSU, and to meet a need not now being met by UC. It is expected that the research interests and program strengths of the proposing UC and CSU departments complement and reinforce each other, rather than duplicate an existing program. Such a logical combination, therefore, broadens the base upon which the program is being developed and provides a wider breadth and depth of faculty and curricula.

The following criteria, most of which derive from the basic reasons for engaging in joint doctoral programs, are suggested to guide the University's review and approval of these programs:

- 1) Criteria for Granting Permission to Negotiate: When permission to negotiate is requested, the proposing UC campus should demonstrate in writing:
 - a) The interest of faculty members from the proposing department or group to participate in the program and the potential benefits to be derived from the program by UC;
 - b) Adequacy of existing staff and facilities by showing that faculty, courses, equipment, and library and other facilities are already in place, and only minimal resources will be required;
 - c) That there is an existing or closely related Ph.D. program in the discipline in which the joint doctoral program is being proposed; and if there is no existing Ph.D., show that the Ph.D. degree is an appropriate degree for the field in which the joint doctoral program is being proposed; e.g., a Ph.D. in Food Science that was proposed several years ago was not considered an appropriate degree for the field; and
 - d) That if the proposing campus has a closely related Ph.D. (rather than an existing Ph.D.) in the discipline in which the joint doctoral program is being proposed, there is an existing group of faculty whose expertise is in the discipline of the proposed joint doctoral program and who can and will exercise the same quality control over the proposed program that the campus applies to its own free-standing doctoral programs.
- 2) Proposal. The proposal for a joint UC/CSU doctoral program should contain the information requested for a graduate degree program proposal from a single UC campus (see Appendix B), whatever additional information is needed to demonstrate that the proposed program meets all the criteria for approval listed below in point 3, and a resume of all other joint programs in existence between the UC proposing campus and the CSU system with a brief history and current status of each program. The proposal should include the rationale for a joint program, e.g. its uniqueness; that the combined faculty provides needed expertise and can meet societal demand; that the program provides opportunities for equipment sharing and research collaboration. The proposal should indicate that the program has support from the faculty and departments involved.
- 3) Criteria for Approval. Before the final proposal for a joint doctoral program is approved, the criteria for granting permission to negotiate (above) should be addressed satisfactorily by the proposing campus and the proposing campus should further demonstrate:
 - a) that the proposed program has clear and valuable benefits for the UC department or program making the proposal, e.g., because of special facilities or program strengths that CSU has or because of unique expertise that CSU faculty possess in the discipline in which the joint doctoral program is being proposed which, when combined with UC facilities and faculty expertise, would enhance the academic quality of the program;

- b) that there is adequate student demand for the program by estimating student demand and providing related data and considering enrollment in relation to available spaces for similar programs, at its own campus and at other campuses, as the one being proposed;
 - c) that there is a favorable job market for the program's graduates by assessing the academic and/or non-academic employment prospects in the field of the proposed program and by substantiating employment trends with data from surveys or employment studies;
 - d) that the existing or closely related Ph.D. program has the capacity to accommodate the additional students or such capacity is planned for; the additional burden of the proposed joint program should readily be accommodated on the UC campus without substantial additional resources being required; if there is no capacity to expand in the existing Ph.D. program or closely related Ph.D. programs, then the proposed joint doctoral program will not be approved since the UC campus could not accommodate the students; and
 - e) that, when there is a closely related Ph.D. program rather than an existing Ph.D., an interdepartmental graduate group will be appointed or a department designated at the proposing UC campus and formally charged by the Senate and the administration with responsibility for giving the joint degree program the same attention a department or graduate group would give its free-standing Ph.D. programs.
- 4) Administration. A joint doctoral degree is granted by both UC and CSU. Therefore, the responsibility for the administration of the doctoral program should be equally divided between the two systems.
- a) UC and CSU are jointly responsible for admission of students.
 - b) Each participating segment should have a faculty member (graduate advisor) responsible for and knowledgeable about the program and a staff member to support the faculty member and assist students.
 - c) A student's examination and doctoral committees must have at least four members of which at least two must come from each of the cooperating segments.
 - d) The proposal should be explicit about the location of registration and payment of fees throughout the program, and the location of student support services, including assistance in securing financial support.
 - e) Joint programs may require additional resources, beyond those required by any new program at start-up because of their joint activities. This should be included in the budget submitted with the proposal.

(Appendix U [formerly H] Revised 11/2000)

Appendix V

Procedures for the Re-Review of UC/CSU Joint Ed.D. Programs

[Formerly Appendix G. This section is of historical interest only, since hardly any such joint programs remain in existence.]

With the passage of legislation permitting CSU campuses to offer unilateral doctoral degrees in education (Ed.D. degrees), a number of CSU campuses currently participating in programs with partner UC campuses have expressed an intent to withdraw or substantially reduce their involvement in the joint program. This has the potential to seriously impact the nature and quality of the UC program, and thus CCGA feels that such programs should be re-reviewed by CCGA.

Programs may admit up to two cohorts of students after the withdrawal, formal or de facto, of any CSU partner, without further CCGA review. However, any program for which the participation of one or more CSU is withdrawn or significantly reduced will need to provide supplemental material for Academic Senate review before the third cohort is admitted. Procedures and guidelines for the submission follow. Any program wishing to cease operation should follow the procedures for Discontinuance of Graduate Degree Programs delineated in *The Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units*.

CLASSES OF RE-REVIEW

There are two classes of review. Class I review criteria apply to programs that will retain their original, approved academic focus with limited changes to curricular and degree requirements. Class II review criteria apply to programs for which there is a substantial change to the academic focus and/or degree requirements. The recommendation of whether a program merits a Class I or Class II re-review shall be made by the local Graduate Council, in consultation with the chair of CCGA. CCGA retains the final authority over the determination

Class I Re-review

Class I programs are reviewed by the members of CCGA, without recourse to expert reviewers. The supplemental material may make reference to the existing, approved Ed.D. proposal, which should then be provided as background material. The thrust of the supplemental material shall be to demonstrate that the academic goals of the original proposal can be met with the new configuration. The supplemental material shall include sections on the following topics:

- Enrollment targets
- Changes to curriculum
- Changes to the nature of delivery (increase or reduction to online/remote learning, change of daytime to nighttime classes, etc.)
- Changes to degree requirements
- Description of how anticipated resources will be sufficient to meet curricular and advising needs, including faculty, space, staffing library, and computing resources. Where resources additional to those already available are required, timelines and letters of commitment for providing those resources should be provided. An amended five-year budget should be prepared.
- Student support

If one or more CSU campus is to remain as a partner, appropriately modified bylaws, and a draft of a renegotiated MOU, should be provided. If no CSU campuses remain as partners, but the degree requires interdepartmental or interdivisional cooperation, revised bylaws should be provided.

Letters of support from the overseeing Dean(s), including commitments to provide ongoing resources, as well as whatever additional resources will be necessary, should be provided. The committee report from the most recent program review should be provided, as well as responses to the report from the program and administration.

Class II Re-review

Class II programs will be subject to full external review, and the re-review will proceed essentially along the lines of a full CCGA review, as if the program were being proposed anew. The supplemental material should take the same form as a full proposal, although reference may be made, as appropriate, to the prior proposal. The prior proposal should be made available to CCGA, and the rationale for the changes to the academic focus, degree requirements, and curriculum should be discussed.

Re-review Process

For both Class I and Class II reviews, the review process should unfold similarly to that for new proposals. Materials should be developed by the program, and be submitted to the local Graduate Council. After approval by the local Graduate Council, the materials should be forwarded to CCGA by the appropriate administrator. The campus review should be expedited to a degree commensurate with the sense of this memo.

For Class I review, at the discretion of the program's proponents and the local Graduate Council, materials may be sent to CCGA for informal review at any point before the approval of the local Graduate Council is obtained. The purpose of this informal review is to improve the likelihood of smooth passage of the re-review materials through CCGA, although CCGA's eventual formal review will be no less rigorous than that for programs that do not request informal review.