

Graduate Council
Elizabeth Watkins, PhD, Chair

ANNUAL REPORT 2009-2010

Primary Focus Points for the Year:

- Change in UCSF Academic Senate bylaws as related to Membership of the Graduate Council
- Discussion of access to courses in self-supporting degree programs by UCSF graduate students
- Review and removal of the Medical Student's Option
- Review of seven Academic Programs (Bioengineering, Biological and Medical Informatics, Biomedical Sciences, Nursing, Pharmaceutical Sciences & Pharmacogenomics, Physical Therapy, and Tetrad)
- Review of two proposed programs (Masters in Biomedical Imaging, Joint UCI-UCSF Specialty Nursing)

Task Forces, Special Committees, and Sub-Committees:

- Academic Program Review of the Bioengineering Program (Jeff Lansman)
- Academic Program Review of the Biological and Medical Informatics (Robert Raffai)
- Academic Program Review of the Biomedical Sciences (Elizabeth Watkins)
- Academic Program Review of the Nursing Doctoral Program (Ed Yelin)
- Academic Program Review of the Pharmaceutical Sciences & Pharmacogenomics (PSPG) Program
- Academic Program Review of the Physical Therapy Program (Nancy Stotts)
- Academic Program Review of the Tetrad Program (Robert Raffai)
- Proposal for the Master of Science Degree in Biomedical Imaging (Daniel Fried)
- Proposal for a Joint UCI-UCSF Specialty Program in Nursing (Nancy Stotts)
- Task Force to Review the UC Commission on the Future Initial Recommendations (Ed Yelin)
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Steering Committee (Liz Watkins & Pat Calarco)

Issues for Next Year (2010-2011)

- Academic Program Review of BMI Program
- Establishment of guidelines for payment by affiliated institutes, research units and academic departments for the costs of administration of interdepartmental graduate programs
- Continuation of discussion regarding access to courses in self-supporting degree programs by UCSF graduate students and appropriate costs for these courses
- Improve relationship between the Council and program directors to insure Council is seen as advocates for, not adversaries of, programs
- Review of university-wide course access issues in an effort to develop and strengthen teaching efficiencies across schools at UCSF

2009-2010 Members

Elizabeth Watkins, Chair
Michael Beattie, Vice Chair and
CCGA Representative

Patricia Babbitt
Daniel Fried
Joseph Guydish
Mary Lynch
Sarah Nelson
Robert Raffai
Nancy Stotts

Colin Studholme
Ed Yelin

Ex-Officio Members

Pat Calarco, Dean, Graduate Division
Christine Des Jarlais, Assistant Dean, Postdoctoral Affairs
Peter Taylor, Assistant Dean, Graduate Council Secretary
Vuk Uskokovic, Postdoctoral Scholars Association Representative
Julie Hukapillar, Graduate Student Association Representative
Alison Cleaver, Academic Senate Liaison

Number of Meetings: 10

Council Secretary: Peter Taylor (Academic Senate Liaison, Alison Cleaver)

Systemwide Business

The Graduate Council took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

Comments on CCGA White Paper “UC as a Graduate Institution”

Committee members contributed comments via anonymous electronic survey on UCSF highlights. CCGA developed the paper for all UC campuses, the final document, which will be used in part as a promotional piece demonstrating the strengths and successes which result from graduate education in the UC system.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)

Committee Vice Chair Michael Beattie attended systemwide meetings on behalf of UCSF. Among items explored or initiated this year were:

- Reorganization of the Planning for Doctoral & Professional Education (PDPE), charged with studying sources of granted student support.
- Letter to Regents and Chancellors to advocate for Graduate Education
- Question of percentage return of educational fees per UC campus
- Question of legislative authority to create new program or UC campuses and its effect on UC's self-governance
- Inquiry from CSU system to generate professional doctorate programs.
- Academic Review of the Ph.D. in Epidemiology and Translational Science Program
- Academic Review of the Masters in Dental Hygiene Program

Review of Proposed Changes to the Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units

The Council reviewed and discussed the proposed changes, which affect graduate program review, creation of graduate programs or ORUs, and procedure for proposed name changes to degree programs. Separately, currently active graduate certificate programs must submit to the Graduate Council a two- to three-page summary describing the program, admission requirements, curriculum, completion requirements, student assessment, faculty expertise, number of students admitted, graduate and normative time. Members noted that UCSF only had one program, Training in Clinical Research (TICR) program for which this would apply. The committee did not opine on the proposed changes. ([Appendix 1](#))

President's Plan to Increase Graduate Student Fees

The CCGA drafted a letter to the UC President Mark Yudof opposes the proposed mid-year fee increases for graduate students as well as the forthcoming increasing next year. These fee increases directly impact principal investigators and cause immediate and long-term detrimental effects to graduate education and the mission of the UC system as a whole.

Task Force to Review the Initial Recommendations of the UC Commission on the Task Force

Council member Ed Yelin represented the committee on this task force. It weighed in on the first and second round of recommendations issued by the UC Commission on the Future. Foremost on the task force's response was the stressing of graduate education and ([Appendix 2](#))

Divisional Business

This year, the Graduate Council took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

Bylaws Change – Membership

Members initiated a bylaws change request to eliminate the requirement that the Graduate Council have two members who are physicians. The request was passed 8 to 1 within the council, and then reviewed

and approved by the Rules & Jurisdiction Committee. The bylaw change was later approved by a campus-wide electronic vote.

Communication to Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications (COLASC) on Mission Bay Library Space

The Council reviewed the proposal for creating a library space at the Mission Bay campus. Members unanimously agreed that providing safe places for students to study should be a planning priority for the University and endorsed the proposal's recommendations. ([Appendix 3](#))

Discussion of Forthcoming Proposal for Global Health Degree with Designated Emphasis (DE)

The Council heard an informal presentation on a forthcoming proposal to create a designated emphasis option for Global Health students in a variety of areas: Women's Health, Migration & Health, and One Health. The UCSF Global Health Services Department would like to follow the UCSF model that allows for a DE on the transcript and on the diploma. A formal proposal will be submitted to the Graduate Council in the next academic term for more review.

Fellowship Sub-Committee

The Fellowship Sub-Committee consisting of Farid Chehab, Sarah Nelson, Robert Raffai, Colin Studholme, Elizabeth Watkins, and Ed Yelin reviewed application files and ranked students for one of fourteen different fellowship awards (Achievement Rewards for College Scientists (ARCS), Eugene Cota-Robles Fellowship, UC Cancer Research Coordinating Committee (CRCC) Fellowships, UCSF Chancellor's Graduate Research Fellowships, UCSF Dissertation-Year Fellowship, Graduate Dean's Health Science Fellowship, Matilda Edlund Fellowship, Fletcher Jones Fellowship, Julius R. and Patricia A. Krevans Fellowship, Julius R. and Patricia A. Krevans Distinguished Dissertation Award, Lloyd M. Kozloff Fellowship, UCSF Graduate Research Mentorship Fellowship, UCSF NIGMS IMSD Maximizing Opportunities for Research Excellence (MORE) Fellowship, Zaffaroni Family Fellowship)

Graduate Dean Report

The Dean of the Graduate Division, Patricia Calarco, updated the Council on the following matters throughout the year:

- New policy for the support of graduate students
- Proposal to Senator Jackie Speier's office to fund ten fellowships annually, to address falling enrollment and give focus to topical research areas in basic science; this would be an earmark in the federal budget.
- Inaugural Symposium for the Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences program
- Graduate Research Day in Sacramento was May 12, 2010; UCSF brought two students
- Post-doc Boot Camp

Library

CLE

The Council heard a presentation from Karen Butter, University Librarian, who reported that The Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE) has replaced the WebCT platform on campus. CLE is a virtual environment used by faculty and students in the professional schools. Faculty use CLE to share content with students and ask them to study prior to class, and to administer exams, for example. At present there are 800 CLE courses as of September 2009.

Teaching and Learning Centers

The second floor of the library has closed, and construction has begun to install the clinical simulation space as well as small group classroom and the student computing lab.

Subscription Cuts

In 2009-2010, the Library has had to cut online journal subscriptions. In this academic term, the cuts have focused on five packages: InformalHealthCare; Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; Mary Ann Liebert; and Taylor & Francis publications.

Program Review of the Nursing Program

The Council reviewed the report, and—after receiving a response from the program---voted to close the review of the program.

Review of the Medical Students Option

The Council reviewed and voted to remove the Medical Student's Option of obtaining a separate Master's Degree concurrently. In discussion with Medical School leadership it was a theoretical option that was rarely if ever used and the application of which created confusion with assignment of double course-work and accountability.

Review of the Designated Emphasis in Computational Biology & Bioinformatics

The Council reviewed and approved this solid proposal. As the BMI program has two parts (Computational Biology and Bioinformatics and Medical Informatics), and in lieu of creating two separate graduate programs, this emphasis is a solution to a reasonable problem.

Review of the Graduate Program in Bioengineering

The Council agreed that the response from the Directors of the Bioengineering program successfully addressed the concerns raised in the external Academic Review. The program review is now considered closed.

Review of the Graduate Program in Biomedical Sciences

The Council reviewed the program response, which addressed concerns, and now considers this review closed.

Review of the Graduate Program in Physical Therapy

The Council reviewed the program response, which included several suggestions. Council will draft a letter to the Program encouraging their input for how to resolve.

Review of GRE Waiver Request

The Graduate Division granted a waiver to Global Health Sciences on the GRE requirement. Given that the pool of students who pursue a GHS degree often apply from other graduate programs, the requirement of the GRE exam is deemed unnecessary and is not a meaningful indicator of how students will perform within the program.

Review of the Proposed Graduate Program in Biomedical Imaging Sciences

The Council reviewed three successive revisions of this new proposal. The final proposal was reviewed and approved by council members. This proposal will be forwarded to the UCSF Academic Senate Coordinating Committee for review followed by a campus-wide vote.

Review of the Reinstatement of the Joint UCB/UCSF Bioengineering Graduate Program

The Council heard a proposal to reinstate the Masters in Bioengineering as a joint program between UCSF and UC Berkeley. Many years ago both the Masters and Ph.D. were approved, but the Masters was never initiated. However due to industry need and the potential economic benefit to graduates, this program is being reconsidered. The Council looks forward to hearing more in the upcoming academic term on this process, and withholds a vote pending delineation between this degree and the newly proposed Graduate Program in Biomedical Imaging Science.

Review of the Pharmaceutical Sciences & Pharmacogenomics (PSPG) Program

The Council reviewed the program response, which adequately answered all concerns raised. Council members accepted the response and consider the PSPG review closed.

Review of a Name Change Request: Development Biology to Development & Stem Cell Biology

The Council reviewed and approved the request. It now goes onto CCGA for informational purposes and potential review, if needed.

Review of the Tetrad Program

The Graduate Council reviewed Tetrad program, which provides graduate training in Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, Cell Biology, Developmental Biology and Genetics. The program had not been reviewed in a decade. The results of review were largely positive; a number of suggestions were made regarding organization of the program and its association with Developmental Biology and changes/improvements in core curriculum courses. The program review is now considered closed.

UAW Representation of Postdoctoral Scholars

The Council heard ongoing updates throughout the year on the contract negotiations with UAW.

Proposal for a UCSF-UCI Collaboration: HRSA Training Grant (School of Nursing)

The Council approved the proposal for a joint UCSF-UCI specialty program within the nursing master's program focused on "Children in Transition," pending a note of endorsement from the UCSF registrar and an MOU signed by both School of Nursing and Graduate Division Deans. The program is funded through the HRSA Training Grant. A curriculum has been developed to allow the first year to be done in Southern California and the second year, largely, being transmitted via video teleconferencing or online courses.

WASC

The Council heard updates on the status of the WASC Accreditation process and the outcome of the initial WASC visits to UCSF. One request was to address global learning outcomes for graduate students, so as to measure and guarantee they are meeting the same level as that of professional students. UCSF has determined that the two global learning outcomes are: Knowledge and Professionalism. Between now and the final WASC visit in November 2010, the Campus will be determining metrics and measurements for those two outcomes for all graduate students.

Task Forces and Other Committee Service

Task Forces, Special Committees, and Sub-Committees:

- Academic Program Review of Biomedical Sciences (Robert Raffai)
- Academic Program Review of Nursing Doctoral Program (Ed Yelin)
- Task Force to Review the Initial Recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future (Ed Yelin)
- (WASC) Steering Committee (Elizabeth Watkins & Pat Calarco)
- Fellowship Sub-Committee (Farid Chehab, Sarah Nelson, Robert Raffai, Colin Studholme, Elizabeth Watkins, and Ed Yelin)

Going Forward

Ongoing issues under review or actions that the Committee will continue into 2010-2011:

- Establishment of guidelines for payment by affiliated institutes, research units and academic departments for the costs of administration of interdepartmental graduate programs
- Continuation of discussion regarding access to courses in self-supporting degree programs by UCSF graduate students and appropriate costs for these courses
- Review of university-wide course access issues in an effort to develop and strengthen teaching efficiencies across schools at UCSF

- Improve relationship between the Council and program directors to insure Council is seen as advocates for, not adversaries of, programs
- Academic Review of Physical Therapy Program
- Academic Review of BMI Program

Appendices

[Appendix 1:](#) Proposed Changes to the Compendium: Universitywide Review Process for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units

[Appendix 2:](#) Response from the Task Force to Review the Initial Recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future

[Appendix 3:](#) Response from the Graduate Council to the Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (COLASC) on Mission Bay Library space

Graduate Council Secretary:
Peter Taylor, Assistant Dean, Graduate Division
peter.taylor@ucsf.edu 502-3224

Academic Senate Liaison:
Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst
alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu 476-3808



Final Report of the Joint Senate- Administrative Task Force on the Compendium

March 2010

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 4 |
| Task Force Structure and Organization | 5 |
| Five-Year Perspectives | 9 |
| Recommendations..... | 10 |
| Academic Degree Programs (Graduate Degree Programs) | 12 |
| Recommendations:..... | 12 |
| Academic Units (New Schools and Colleges) and Programs..... | 15 |
| Recommendations..... | 19 |
| Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Academic Units | 23 |
| Recommendations..... | 27 |
| Research Units (ORUs/MRUs)..... | 28 |
| Recommendations..... | 30 |
| Systemwide Academic Entities..... | 32 |
| Recommendations..... | 32 |

Executive Summary

The 2009-10 review was characterized by renewed attention to large academic planning issues (e.g., new Schools and the Five-Year Planning Perspectives) and budget issues, as well as an acute need to update this important manual that had not been revised in over ten years. This was precipitated by the Senate's review of four proposals for new schools in the 2007-08 academic year—a new School of Public Health at UC Davis, a new School of Public Policy at UC Riverside, a new School of Nursing at UC Davis, and a new School of Medicine at UC Riverside. Another theme that emerged from the review was the importance of reinvigorating the renamed *Five-Year Planning Perspectives*. This project was undertaken by a Task Force of 14 members that included faculty, Senate Directors, campus administrators and systemwide administrators and systemwide Senate staff (see below). The Task Force also acknowledged the parts of the Compendium that have worked well over the past ten years, such as the rigorous reviews of new graduate programs. The review protocol that had been developed by CCGA for this purpose was also formalized into this edition of the Compendium.

The following bullets provide a succinct list of the significant changes made to the Compendium in this review:

Five-Year Planning Perspectives

- The number of years that these anticipated creations have been on the list should be indicated next to each item in parentheses.
- If a proposed action has remained on a list for more than three years with no discernible activity or development, and it is not removed (see above), then a one-page rationale must be enclosed documenting the reason(s) why it is still on the list.
- Changes were made to the timeline.

Academic Degree Programs

- Addition of a review process for undergraduate/graduate hybrid degree program proposals.
- It is now prescribed that all proposed name changes for graduate academic degree programs be forwarded to CCGA for review.
- With respect to the review of new graduate degree programs, the following sections were incorporated from the CCGA Handbook:
 - Section II.B.2.a. Establishment of New Joint Graduate Degree Programs
 - Section II.B.2.b. Review/Re-Review of Joint Graduate Degree Programs
 - Section II.D. Interdepartmental Graduate Programs
 - Section II.E. Graduate Academic Certificate Programs

Academic Units

- Under Section III.B.1. Establishment of New Schools and Colleges, the following four categories of review are explicitly noted: academic rigor, financial viability, need for the program, and fit within the UC system and within the segments.

- Requirement of a pre-proposal at least one year before the full proposal for the review of new schools and colleges.
- Addition of a post-proposal if the original campus proposal to establish a new school or college was approved by The Regents, but was not established within seven years of the date of that Regental approval.

Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Academic Units

- Inclusion of reconstitutions of academic programs into this section, and thereby differentiation between reconstitutions of academic programs and academic units.
- Clear definitions of transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance.

Research Units

- Addition of a set of definitions of terms associated with various research units.
- A detailed section on proposal development for a MRU, which suggests areas that proposers should focus on when drafting such a proposal.
- Inclusion of the procedure for five-year reviews of MRUs.

Other Changes

- *Systemwide academic units:* A section on systemwide academic units was added with the note that the Academic Planning Council (APC) is responsible for formulating the review process for new systemwide academic entities, based on existing guidelines for similar entities. The Task Force also mandated that any systemwide school must be piloted as a joint academic degree program/research institute prior to undergoing review to become a school.
- *Appendices:* This section was modified significantly. A number of background and primary source material was added, which provides documentation for the guidelines in the Compendium. The distribution lists, which were generally considered superfluous by the Task Force were removed.

Introduction

The Compendium presents universitywide review processes for creating and changing academic degree programs, academic units, and research units, and is designed to serve as a manual to the wide range of administrators, faculty, and staff who participate in these processes. The Compendium is central to the processes of establishment, review, reconstitution, and disestablishment of academic units and programs at the University. Both the Divisional and systemwide Senate and the Administration (on the campus and at systemwide) use and “own” the Compendium, and are responsible for its maintenance and periodic review. However, it has long been recognized that the Compendium is out-of-date, and in need of significant revisions. Last revised in 1999, the intervening years have brought significant change to the University’s structure, academic units and programs, and perhaps most importantly, the State’s fiscal and political climate.

Besides simply being out-dated, the Compendium is also facing a number of challenges that this document needs to address. These include issues concerning new academic units (both the type and number of units); the dire fiscal environment that threatens the existence of some academic programs and units; and an erosion of the University’s Multiple Research Unit (MRU) review process. The first of these is the relatively large number of new school proposals that the Academic Council has been asked to review. In the 2007-08 academic year, the systemwide Senate reviewed four proposals for new schools—a new School of Public Health at UC Davis, a new School of Public Policy at UC Riverside, a new School of Nursing at UC Davis, and a new School of Medicine at UC Riverside. Besides sheer numbers of academic units, the University must find a way to review new types of schools, which span several campuses, or are even systemwide in nature. As a case in point, in 2007-08, UCSF proposed a systemwide School of Global Health. Although this school was never formally reviewed by the Academic Senate, the very idea of it elicited much controversy on exactly how review these types of entities. The current draft of the Compendium relies on the traditional review process to review such academic units.

In addition, the University has come under recent criticism and scrutiny for their review policies and procedures for new academic units and programs. Particularly, the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) has recently published one critique, entitled “[*The Master Plan at 50: Improving State Oversight of Academic Expansions*¹](#),” which looked at the not only looked at the review practices of UC and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), but also examined four case studies—the approvals of the UC Irvine School of Law in 2006, the UC Riverside Schools of Medicine and Public Policy in 2008, and the UC Davis School of Nursing in 2009.

Another issue that cannot be overlooked is the State’s dire fiscal situation. Given the current environment, these conditions will affect the University’s academic units and programs, and there is an increased probability that reconstitutions of academic units and

¹ The full LAO report is available at:
http://www.lao.ca.gov/2009/edu/academic_expansions/academic_expansions_120209.pdf.

programs will increase in the future. Indeed, other universities, such as the University of Iowa, are already considering cutting some of their graduate programs.² Therefore, solid and thorough review processes are a necessity in these times. With that in mind, the Compendium Task Force paid special attention to this area, which is contained in Section IV, *Reconstitutions of Academic Units and Programs*.

Task Force Structure and Organization

The Academic Council, at its September 24, 2008 meeting, subsequently approved the following charge and formally established the Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force to Revise the Compendium. At the same time, the Administration was asked to provide a slate of members. The Task Force is charged with the review of each section of the Compendium to determine whether: (1) the kind of program or unit it describes still exists; (2) all review procedures and reviewing bodies contained in the prescribed review process are described accurately; (3) the kind of program or unit it describes requires Universitywide review; (4) the prescribed review process addresses the elements needed to ensure that the proposed program or unit meets UC standards; and 5) the proposed program or unit is compatible with existing academic priorities on the campus and throughout the University. Based on this review, the Task Force shall recommend changes to specific sections of the Compendium to ensure that the reviews are thorough and efficient in order to improve the quality of the review process.

The Task Force met in March, June, and October 2009, and divided the work on the Compendium into a number of sections: five-year perspectives; MRUs, MRPIs, and Cal ISIs; new systemwide entities—particularly the proposed Systemwide School of Global Health; new school (and college) proposals, as well as the transfer, consolidation, and disestablishment (TCD actions) of those schools; and graduate program issues. Acknowledging that its work could be done better with a series of subcommittees, the Task Force established the following subcommittees to address the issues mentioned above: Five-Year Perspectives, Academic Degree Programs, Academic Units (e.g., new schools), Reconstitutions, Research Units (MRUs, MRPIs, ORUs, and Cal ISIs), New Systemwide Entities (e.g., the School of Global Health).

² See “U. of Iowa Lists 14 Graduate Programs at Risk for Cuts or Elimination” by Audrey Williams June, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 17, 2010; and “In Cutting Programs, Universities Try to Swing the Ax Gently” by Audrey Williams June, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 31, 2010.

The membership of the Task Force is as follows:

Anthony Norman, UCR Divisional Chair, Task Force Chair
Hilary Baxter, UCOP
Joseph Bristow, UCB Member/UCLA
Carol Copperud, UCOP, retired
Sellyna Ehlers, UCR Senate Director
Alison Galloway, UCSC Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Todd Giedt, Senate Associate Director
Michael Goldstein, UCLA Divisional Chair
Kimberly Hammond, UCORP Member/UCR
Mary-Beth Harhen, UCSC Senate Director
Suzanne Klausner, UCOP
Stephen McLean, UCEP Member/UCS
Joel Michaelsen, UCSB Divisional Chair
Ken Rose, CCGA Member/UCSB
Clare Sheridan, Senate Senior Committee Analyst
Eric Zarate, Senate Senior Committee Analyst

Overview of the Review Process

The Compendium currently operates in a complex environment of internal and external actors, which include campus interests, the Divisional and systemwide Academic Senates, the systemwide administration, philanthropic organizations, state entities (e.g., CPEC), and even the state Legislature. The Compendium resulted from a need to consolidate a number of disparate University policies and Standing Orders of the Regents (SORs) in a kind of manual for end-users of these policies—UCOP administrators, Senate members, staff, and officers, and campus administrators and staff. Although the Compendium can be extremely detailed and technical, there are also a number of common principles that run through most of its processes:

- Academic programs, academic units, and research units work best when both faculty and administrators are supportive of them
- Senate's Role: Through [SOR 105.2](#), the Regents have delegate authority to the Senate over the University's curricula, which the Compendium stipulates.
- Strategic Planning: The *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* retain their central role in most of the Compendium's review processes. The University's obligations to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) are also detailed in the Compendium.
- Systems of Checks and Balances: By retaining a significant role for the Senate, the Compendium maintains a system of checks and balances that preserve and facilitate rigorous academic programs at the University.
- Campus-based Program Development: Whether it concerns the establishment, reconstitution, or disestablishment of a new school, program, or multiple research units (MRUs), the Compendium is written in such a way to foster the creative development of new academic programs and units by the faculty who will be teaching and conducting research in these programs/units. In other words, these academic

programs and units almost always germinate within academic departments. Very rarely do these actions, even disestablishments, originate at the systemwide level.³ The Compendium fosters this creative development while balancing it with the state and societal needs for these programs.

³ One recent exception is the recent competition to fund UC Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPIs). The results of this competition were recently announced and are available at http://www.ucop.edu/research/mru_rfp.html. It also conceivable that in the current budgetary environment, proposals to disestablish certain academic programs may come from systemwide.

Background Information

The Compendium was first prepared in 1993-94, under the auspices of the Academic Planning Council (APC). The APC Subcommittee for Expediting Systemwide Review Processes brought together and formalized a variety of Universitywide review processes and, to the extent possible within the established review framework, instituted changes to increase efficiency without reducing effectiveness. Although the Compendium was supposed to be revised every three years; this only happened once, in 1999. That revision included feedback from the campuses and systemwide, which resulted in further efficiencies without reducing effectiveness, but also incorporated changes that moved outside the established review framework as well as changes that remained within it. Revisions of note to that edition were the elimination of systemwide review and approval processes for actions involving undergraduate degree programs, departments, and organized research units (ORUs); as well as simplifying the Five-Year Plans (renamed the '*Five-Year Perspectives*') and the processes for uncomplicated name changes for graduate degree programs and multicampus research units (MRUs).

The Compendium is divided into ten sections: campus five-year perspectives, academic degree programs, academic units, reconstitution of academic programs and academic units, research units, accelerated review schedule, role of the Academic Planning Council, note on terminology, disagreements between divisional, on-line reports on academic programs, academic units, and research units. Among the appendices, there is also a glossary of terms, distribution lists, and flow charts. The Compendium is intended as a manual; therefore, many of the same steps are repeated in each section. This is intentional, as each section is written as a set of all-inclusive steps for individual actions.

Five-Year Perspectives

Current Process

The five-year perspectives are technically required by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), and occupy a central place in the Compendium procedures. CPEC's Program Review Advisory Committee, to which UC appoints members to, also review the five-year perspectives. However, beyond appearing in CPEC's annual reports on *Program Planning and Review*⁴, it is unclear how they are really being used or even if they offer any real utility. The *Five-Year Perspectives* provide a five-year campus projection of anticipated actions to create, transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, schools and colleges, ORUs, and MRUs. Along with these lists, UCOP analysts were supposed to be providing summaries of these actions. The timeline outlined in the Compendium is as follows:

- February 1: Submission of five-year perspective lists by the campuses;
- April 1: Combined *Five-Year Perspectives*, UCOP summaries are distributed to the to the systemwide Academic Senate, administrative, and joint Senate-administration committees concerned with academic degree programs, academic units, and research units;
- April 30: The *Five-Year Perspectives* are due at CPEC;
- April, May, June, and July: Discussion of the *Five-Year Perspectives* and summaries by the the systemwide Academic Senate, administrative, and joint Senate-administration committees concerned with academic degree programs, academic units, and research units.

Problems with the current process

As it stands now, the process outlined above has fallen out of practice. However, beyond adherence to the schedule, the five-year perspectives need to be taken more seriously if the stated goals of systemwide perspective and planning are to be realized. The following are a list of problems and shortcomings. First, UCOP has not provided an analysis of these *Five-Year Perspectives* for a number of years. Given current University resources, it is unlikely that such summaries will be available in the near term either. In addition, and without casting blame, strict adherence to the timeline has not been maintained by either the Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs) or UCOP. While the lists are forwarded to the Senate, they do not come with clear instructions on what to do with them (nor are they forwarded at the same time every year). As a result, the systemwide Senate committees and Council rarely send comments to the Provost regarding the five-year perspectives, thereby depriving campuses of an important source of faculty input on academic curriculum. Certainly, the aforementioned summaries would be helpful in this regard, but they are not essential. On the Senate side, it would be useful for the systemwide committees to anticipate their arrival at the same time every year; incoming

⁴ In this report, CPEC reviews not only UC program plans for the next five years, but also those of CSU and the community colleges.

systemwide committee chairs could be given instructions by the Council Chair on their importance.

Another issue with these lists is that they do not always provide the most accurate information regarding active campus plans for the development of new programs, schools, and other academic units. They are also not ranked, so it is impossible to discern if any one proposed program or academic would be prioritized over others, especially in tight budgetary times. The number of years that a proposed action has remained on these lists presents another problem as well. For example, proposed programs have been remained on the *Five-Year Perspectives* for years and years; some may have been placed on these lists for purely political reasons as well. Alternatively, establishing a basic threshold for proposals is also important, as all that is needed now is a “concept”. This has resulted in a lack of real knowledge about what any one particular campus is doing, and a corresponding lack of transparency. The existence of the *Five-Year Perspectives* is also complicated by other strategic documents. As one example, President Yudof has recently asked the Chancellors to submit “two-year strategic plans”. It is unclear how these will interface with the existing *Five-Year Perspectives*.

Recommendations

Towards the end of reinvigorating the use of the *Five-Year Perspectives*, the Compendium Task Force recommends the following:

1. Rename the *Five-Year Perspectives* the “*Five-Year Planning Perspectives*.”
2. By August 1, Academic Affairs will post each *Five-Year Planning Perspectives*, its respective summary, and the comments received from the Senate and other units on a UCOP website in order to increase transparency. If summaries from Academic Affairs are not drafted, then the five-year lists and comments will suffice. New additions/changes could be added in real time to this website, as they are reviewed at the Divisional and systemwide levels. A RSS feed could also be used so that campuses are updated when there are changes.
3. Require that a program must reach a certain point in its development before adding it to the list, i.e., establish a threshold of development for inclusion, rather than using a timeframe. For example, requiring a draft of a proposal, or pre-proposal, which would include the curriculum and a resource map, thereby demonstrating an understanding of the resources that will be required. A real proposal would also involve a larger group of faculty and discussion and buy-in from colleagues at the departmental level.
4. Implement a three-year time limit on actions residing on the list, thereby encouraging campuses not to include any program unless it is actively under development.
5. Require Divisional Senates to review the list and proposals before submitting the list to UCOP. Distribute systemwide plans and the Academic Affairs’ overview to the EVCs and Divisional Senate chairs.

Optional Recommendations

The Task Force also discussed ways to reinvigorate the systemwide planning process beyond the implementation of the recommendations above. Although the time limits and thresholds will be useful to keep the *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* to a manageable size, these limits may also stifle some creativity on the campuses. They would also not allow other campuses, or even UCOP, to anticipate the emergence programs or schools several years out, when they are germinating in the minds of key faculty. One way to encourage cross-campus dialogue and cooperation on new programs and schools would be the implementation of program development blog that would be maintained by centrally by UCOP. This would be a seemingly low cost way to increase transparency on programs and schools that may be years out.

Academic Degree Programs (Graduate Degree Programs)

While the establishment of undergraduate degree programs has been delegated to the local Divisions, the review and approval of new graduate degree programs remains under the delegated authority of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). These review processes are codified in the Compendium and included in the [CCGA Handbook](#), which is updated annually and lays-out in a step-by-step fashion, the details of this iterative process. Over the years, changes related to graduate degree programs have been incrementally added to the CCGA Handbook, but not to the Compendium. For the most part, the current Compendium processes work quite well for the review of new graduate degree programs. The fluid nature of graduate education, however, continues to raise issues unforeseen by the framers of the Compendium.

Overview of the Review Process for new Graduate Program Proposals

The proposal for a new graduate program is initially developed by a number of key faculty members on a campus. The idea for a new program may emerge from a core group of faculty within a single department, or from faculty spanning a number of similar departments (e.g., an inter-departmental program). The timeline for developing a proposal can be multiple years in length, depending on the complexity, nature, and governance of the program, available resources, demand, and campus and systemwide support for the program. Once the program proposal is complete and has received local support from the campus administration, it undergoes a review by the Divisional Graduate Council, which is a standing committee of that campus's Academic Senate. If the proposal passes the muster of the Divisional Senate, it is forwarded to the systemwide Academic Senate, where it undergoes a rigorous review by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). This Senate standing committee looks not only at the program's academic rigor, its resources and support of the home campus, the demand and need for the program, and its governance structure. For each review, CCGA appoints a "lead reviewer" for the program, who is responsible for facilitating and coordinating the review. CCGA is a unique committee within the systemwide Senate in that it has the authority to communicate directly with both the systemwide and campus administration, as well as with the proposers themselves. This produces a dialogue that consistently produces solid and rigorous graduate programs. Although it is true that few program proposals are not approved in the end, all proposals do receive substantial criticism during the course of a CCGA review, which can last between four months and one year.

Recommendations:

The task force makes the general recommendation to allow for more frequent revisions to the Compendium to accommodate policy changes the University's graduate policy.

1. Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Programs

Background: The growth of new hybrid programs (e.g., dual undergraduate-graduate degree programs) has raised concerns over the current review process. Proposals for new hybrid programs tend to focus on graduate degree aspects with not much thought given to the undergraduate components of these degree programs or to related issues such as the double counting of credits.

Recommendation: Establish a joint CCGA/UCEP subcommittee (chaired by CCGA) charged with establishing a review process for these programs.

2. Re-Review of Joint UC/CSU Graduate Degree Programs (JDPs)

Background: 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 intent to withdraw or substantially reduce their involvement in JDPs. To ensure the integrity of joint programs after a CSU withdrawal (or a withdrawal of any partner), CCGA has instituted a re-review process (see the CCGA Handbook).

Recommendation: Amend the Compendium to include the CCGA process for re-review of joint graduate degree programs, which is triggered whenever the last partner has dropped out.

3. Interdepartmental Programs (IDPs)

Background: Proposals for Interdepartmental Programs (IDPs) are current reviewed and approved by CCGA. The specificity of budget resources, faculty FTE, and governance structures are often lacking in these proposals.

Recommendation: Amend the Compendium to include the CCGA requirement that all new IDP proposals include a set of governing bylaws (see CCGA Handbook).

4. Review of Certificate Programs

Background: The impetus behind this amendment is the development/establishment of a number of graduate-level certificate programs without much in the way of Senate oversight. At times these certificates came into being under the guidance of the Divisional Graduate Council; other times they were put together by a couple of faculty without local Divisional approval or knowledge. In addition, they were sometimes confused with certificates offered by University Extension, over which the Senate does not have oversight. CCGA recently defined graduate academic certificates (GACs) as programs that: 1) Do not require its students to be enrolled in another graduate program; 2) Are not offered solely through a UC Extension Program; 3) Have an independent admissions process, which requires at least a Bachelor's degree for admission; and 4) Carry a minimum of 3 quarters (or 2 semesters) full-time resident study. Accordingly, CCGA has ruled that 1) new GAC program proposals will be submitted to CCGA for review as full proposals similar to those for the Master's and Ph.D. programs; 2) the review of a new GAC program at

CCGA will involve at least one expert reviewer; 3) currently active GAC programs will submit to their local Graduate Council by October 1, 2009, a 2-3 page summary briefly describing the Program, admission requirements, curriculum, completion requirements, student assessment, faculty expertise, number of students admitted and graduated and normative time.

Recommendation: Amend the Compendium to reflect the review processes associated with Graduate Academic Certificates (GACs).

Name Changes of Graduate Degree Programs

Background: While a process currently exists for name changes, it is unclear whether a campus needs to report all name changes to CCGA. A “simple” name change is only granted if there are not any changes to either to the curriculum or the resources required for the program; if a name change is not simple, then CCGA usually requires an expedited review of the program. The Compendium does not specify that proposals for name changes need to go to CCGA; at present they are only required to the local graduate council. Although many divisions do send such name change proposals forward, it is unclear how many do. The current language also does reference the Regents’ policy related to name changes, which states that when a facility or program is named in honor of an individual, the complete name of that individual will be used as the official name of the facility or program; the last name of the individual so honored may be used in referring informally to the facility and may be used on the name plaque affixed to the facility or in statements made regarding the facility or program.

Recommendations:

- a) **Mandate that all proposed name changes must be forwarded to CCGA for information and possible review.**
- b) **Amend the Compendium to include the Regents’ *Policy on Naming Facilities to Include Full Name of Individual* (approved February 18, 1966 and updated September 22, 2005).**

Academic Units (New Schools and Colleges) and Programs

The Compendium plays an integral role in the review of proposals for new schools and colleges, as well as academic programs. While outright disestablishment of schools is historically exceedingly rare, consolidation is more common. However, in recent years, new school proposals have dwarfed proposals to consolidate schools and colleges. This Task Force was formed, in part, to address the drawbacks in the 1999 version of the Compendium, as it relates to proposals for new schools and colleges.

Recent Activity in New School Proposals

In recent years, Academic Council approved a number of new school proposals; these included the following:

- 2005-06: UC Irvine School of Law
- 2007-08: UC Davis School of Public Health, UC Riverside School of Public Policy, and a UC Riverside School of Medicine
- 2008-09: UC Davis School of Nursing

UC Merced is in various stages of planning for a new School of Medicine. UC San Francisco had been preparing a proposal for a new type of school—a systemwide School of Public Health.⁵ While California’s changing needs and demographics show a need for new school proposals for the foreseeable future, current budget realities suggest that for the near-term, at least, campuses may be more restrained in their submissions of such proposals. As a result of critically examining so many proposals in financially unstable times, Council began looking more closely at their long-term financial viability, apart from their academic merit alone. The following recommendations proceed from this experience and the insights gained from it.

In the review of new schools, it is important to note that there are basically two different kinds of proposals: (A) new schools that are purely administrative structures built around existing programs; and (B) an entirely new school that envisions the creation of a new curriculum, usually in response to a state need (e.g., the UCD School of Nursing). Naturally, the latter category takes the most work and requires the most thorough review process. That said, all proposals must include some type of basic campus commitment of resources and FTEs. There also should be some relationship between the Five-Year Planning Perspective, the pre-proposal, and the final proposal.

Role of the California Postsecondary Education Commission

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) was established in 1974 as the State planning and coordinating body for higher education by Assembly Bill 770 (Chapter 1187 of the Statutes of 1973), Education Code Section Education Code 66900-66906. CPEC serves as a state body that tries to integrate educational policy concerning the three segments of higher education, as well as performing fiscal and programmatic analyses on California's postsecondary education system. As such, CPEC’s primary

⁵ UCSF never formally submitted this School for formal Senate review.

responsibilities include: (A) reviewing and commenting on the long-range plans developed by the public higher education governing boards and the need for new academic, vocational, and certificate programs proposed by the public higher education systems. In addition, CPEC makes recommendations to the Legislature and Governor. (B) Evaluating and commenting on the program review process of the public higher education systems. (C) Identifying societal educational needs and encouraging institutional adaptability to change. And (B) Reviewing periodically the availability of continuing education programs for adults and make appropriate recommendations about them.

In order to facilitate reviews of new programs and new academic units, CPEC has established the following review guidelines⁶ for its own use:

- 1) *Student Demand*: Within reasonable limits, students should have the opportunity to enroll in programs of study in which they are interested and for which they are qualified. Therefore, student demand for programs, indicated primarily by current and projected enrollments, is an important consideration in determining the need for a program.
- 2) *Societal Needs*: Postsecondary education institutions bear a responsibility for preparing students to meet the State's workforce and knowledge needs. Work force 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 nearly impossible, it is important nevertheless that the number of persons trained in a field and the number of job openings in that field remain in reasonable balance.
- 3) *Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission*: Programs offered by 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.
- 4) *The Number of Existing and Proposed Programs in the Field*: An inventory of existing and proposed programs, compiled by the Commission staff from the plans of all systems of postsecondary education, provides the initial indication of apparent duplication or undue proliferation of programs, both within and among the 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 may be needed for an institution to achieve academic comparability within a given system.

⁶ These guidelines are referred to as CPEC's "Program Review Guidelines and Procedures;" they were last updated in 2006; they can be found at: <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2006reports/06-17.pdf>. A summary of these guidelines can be found at: <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2006reports/06-12.pdf>.

- 5) *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.
- 6) *The Maintenance and Improvement of Quality*: Protecting the public interest and trust requires that educational programs at all levels be of high quality. Although the primary responsibility for the quality of programs rests with the institution and its system, the Commission, for its part, considers pertinent information to verify that high standards have been established for the operation and evaluation of the program.
- 7) *The 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.

Recommended Guidelines for Professional School Planning

In 2004, Academic Council approved the “[*Systemwide Professional School Planning: Recommended Guidelines and Model*](#)”. This document also informed the Compendium Task Force’s deliberations. Although these guidelines are specifically written for professional schools, the principles can also be applied to other types of new schools. In brief, these guidelines distilled the review of new schools into three major areas. Three major issues dominate: (A) the local and system-wide academic rationale; (B) the student and societal need for the school and its graduates; and (C) the feasibility from a resource standpoint. These guidelines also emphasized that resource planning must necessarily align itself with a well-formulated academic plan, which must be clearly defined.

- *Academic System Rationale*: Key questions in this area should include: How will this new school fit with the overall academic profile of the campus, including how existing programs will be enhanced by the new school and, likewise, how these existing programs will enhance the quality and development of the new school? How will the new school develop into a top-ranked school with an academic program consistent with a research university of UC quality? The planning for the school should also include a clear vision of the faculty of the new school and indicate their number during the different phases of development, and the balance of full-time faculty at various ranks with lecturers and other temporary or part-time instructors. Finally, facilities and space need to be adequate for the enterprise. Before considering their costs, academic rationale needs to be clearly defined.

- *Student and Societal Need for the School:* This guideline mirrors that of CPEC's. In short, there needs to be clear societal need⁷ for professionals in the field; a demand that is not being fully met by existing academic programs. Projections of employment opportunities for the graduates must also be defined.
- *Financial Planning for the New School:* As a new school must develop over several years, it is useful to define the timeline of its development and some of its critical landmarks. This document provides a general guideline for modeling this timeline.

LAO's Analysis of State Oversight of new Academic Programs and Schools

In December 2009, the California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), which provides fiscal and policy advice to the State Legislature, released its analysis of the state's recent oversight of academic programs and units, "[*The Master Plan at 50: Improving State Oversight of Academic Expansions.*](#)" On the surface, this report is critical of not only the state's oversight in this area⁸, but also more specifically of some of the University of California's new schools in law, public policy, medicine, and nursing. In short, the LAO report assumes that in order for the review process for a new academic unit of program to be successful, it must achieve the following state goals⁹: 1) Proposals should align themselves with the state's social and economic needs; 2) proposals should focus on state priorities (e.g., address the state's most critical needs); and 3) proposals should emphasize cost-effectiveness¹⁰. In line with these main goals, the report also makes some additional recommendations:

- Periodically measuring supply and demand in major fields to provide a framework for planning new programs and to signal to the universities which programs should be developed.
- Revising the review criteria for proposals so that they focus on how proposals fit within California's priorities and resources.
- Making state-level review of proposals more meaningful by allowing for earlier input from stakeholders and requiring CPEC's approval for proposals to move forward.
- Increasing oversight from the State Legislature through such mechanisms as requiring the Legislature's approval for larger proposals or separate budget items for new schools and programs.

⁷ This unmet need may be regional, national or international, or relate to particular social or demographic factors that the new school will address.

⁸ The LAO report primarily criticizes CPEC's programmatic review guidelines (see above) on the grounds that 1) it does not consider the state's priorities; and 2) it does not consider alternatives (see p. 26 of the LAO report).

⁹ See p. 9 of the LAO report.

¹⁰ "Proposals should accurately identify estimated costs and then be compared with potentially more cost-effective alternatives, such as increasing the enrollment in existing programs at another campus." Taken from the LAO report, p. 9.

Recommendations

1. **The Compendium should require a high level of rigor in the review of new school and college proposals.** While traditionally, the Senate's reviews of new schools reflected its delegated authority over curriculum, the Compendium Task Force felt strongly that Senate reviews should place equal weight on both curricular issues and fiscal/budgetary issues.
2. **Every proposal and corresponding Senate review should address each of the following categories of review:**
 - a) ***Academic Rigor:*** The academic rigor of the proposed academic unit continues to be of utmost importance. Compendium Task force members felt that it is important to place equal weight on the academic merits of the program as well as its financial aspects. [This category corresponds to #6, *The Maintenance and Improvement in Quality*, and #7, *The Advancement in Knowledge*, in the CPEC Review Guidelines.]
 - b) ***Financial Viability:*** The proposal should stress the financial stability of the proposed school or college and provide multi-year budget and contingency plans. Financial stability has come to the fore in light of the State's declining General Fund revenues and a volatile budgetary climate. A detailed budget should be provided with the proposal that shows anticipated revenue sources, start-up costs, build-out costs, steady-state costs, personnel costs, capital/space needs and costs; all of these must all be analyzed critically. A lack of detail in this area will be cause for rejection of the proposal. [This category corresponds to #5, *Total Costs of the Program*, in the CPEC Review Guidelines; to the principle of "*Financial Planning for the Proposed School*" in the Recommended Guidelines for Professional School Planning; and to the principle of cost-effectiveness in the LAO report.]
 - i. ***FTE Requirements:*** The proposal should include a clear plan for faculty FTE requirements for each stage of development. Recent new school proposals have sometimes lacked clarity with respect to not only the number of FTEs required at each stage of development, but also from where they would come (either in terms of resources or FTEs from other departments/units). There has also been a general underestimation of the amount of time and resources needed to hire new faculty FTEs. The proposal should clearly list the number of faculty FTEs needed at start-up, the various stages of the school's build-out, and steady-state; the balance of full-time faculty at various ranks with lecturers and other temporary or part-time instructors should also be detailed. The school's financial plan should describe in detail how FTEs will be funded, including whether any faculty will be shared with other departments or schools. The proposal should pay particular attention to both the amount of time and resources needed to hire

new FTEs as well. Finally, the need for particular specialties and sub-specialties should also be articulated and should be matched with the curriculum.

- ii. **Capital Requirements:** All capital requirements must be carefully detailed and analyzed.
 - iii. **Sources of Revenue:** All sources of revenue, including state-support and philanthropic revenue must be detailed. It is also expected that a development plan will be submitted with the proposal.
- c) **Need for the Program:** The proposal should clearly state and make the case for a distinct need for the new school. Compendium Task Force members largely agreed that the following should be clearly documented in the proposal: (A) a clear societal need for professionals, researchers, faculty, or academics in the field; (B) a description of how the demand is not being fully met by existing facilities; and (C) an articulation of student demand for the new school. Additionally, the proposal should 1) define how the school will address this unmet need; 2) lay-out how the school would attract qualified, fully-competitive students; and 3) show projections of employment opportunities for the school's graduates. If there are other schools of the same type in the UC system, planning should include a clear analysis of how this new facility would assume a needed, and perhaps even unique place, in the University's portfolio. In this and in other respects, comparisons with existing UC or other schools of the desired rank should be included. [This category corresponds to #2, *Societal Needs*, in the CPEC Review Guidelines; to the principle of "*Student and Societal Need for the School*" in the Recommended Guidelines for Professional School Planning; and to both the principles of the "*state's social and economic needs*" and "*state priorities*" in the LAO report.]
- i. **Student Demand:** In addition to societal and workforce needs, the task force agrees with CPEC that the student demand for programs that will be situated in a proposed school should be noted. Demand can be documented in a proposal by citing current and projected enrollments in other similar programs..
- d) **Fit within the UC system and within the segments:** The proposal should clearly articulate the school's or college's fit within the UC system and the other educational segments in California. Members agreed that more attention needs to be paid to the school's place in the campus's strategic plan, as well as in the strategic plan of the University as a whole. The proposal should stress how the school will fit in with the overall academic profile of the campus, including how existing programs will be enhanced by the new school and, likewise, how these existing programs will enhance the quality and development of the new school. The capital plan should also show how it fits with academic and strategic plans. [This category aligns with #3, *Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission*, and #4, *The Number of Existing and Proposed Programs in the Field*,

among the CPEC Guidelines; and with the principle of *Academic System Rationale* in the Recommended Guidelines for Professional School Planning.]

3. **The Compendium should require a ‘Pre-Proposal’ at least one year before the full proposal.** Although more cursory than the full proposal, the pre-proposal¹¹ should address all of the categories of review noted above. The pre-proposal is also separate from any other documents that accompany the *Five-Year Planning Perspectives*. Even though the pre-proposal will be shorter than the full proposal. It must have enough critical mass and/or be long enough to allow the Divisional and systemwide Senates to perform a review and provide formal comments to the proposers on the campus. In particular, the pre-proposal should answer the following: Why does the state need the school? Where will the students come from? How does it fit within the priorities of the campus, as well as the UC system, as a whole? What resources are currently available to fund the development of the new school? Is a school the most appropriate curricular form to meet the proposed need? What is the impact on other schools, departments, and programs on the local campus? The pre-proposal gives serious notice of the intent of the campus to develop a school or college to the Divisional and systemwide Senates and UCOP.
4. **The Compendium should require an independent administrative analysis of the proposal before the systemwide Senate review begins.** The 2007-08 Council generally agreed that it would be advisable for the UCOP Administration to conduct an *independent* analysis of any new school proposal.¹² *Such an analysis should include a financial analysis.* It is also important that this analysis does not simply agree with the proposal, minimize its drawbacks, or try to justify it.
5. **Each new school proposal should include two internal UC reviews.** Internal reviewers are UC faculty members on other campuses who can speak to the need for the new school, its fit within the UC system, and the proposed curriculum. If Academic Council feels that the number of internal reviews is insufficient or if they are lacking appropriate rigor, it can require additional internal reviews as necessary. Compendium Task Force members did not think that external reviews would add value to the process, as external reviewers may not have sufficient knowledge to write effective reviews.
6. **The Compendium should eliminate concurrent new school reviews.** Experience shows that a concurrent review only works when the campus presents a very strong proposal. With such a proposal, a sequential review will not take much longer than a concurrent review, but avoid many of the pitfalls. Sequential review does require considerable communication between the campus administration, the Division, the

¹¹ There is a precedent for the pre-proposal. In 2007-08, then-Provost Rory Hume forwarded three pre-proposals to the systemwide Senate for review, which included a proposed School of Nursing Science at Irvine, a proposed School of Medicine at Merced, and a School of Global Health at San Francisco.

¹² This issue came to a head during Council’s review of the proposal for a UC Davis School of Nursing, and culminated in UCOP’s ‘*Administrative Review of the Proposed UC Davis School of Nursing*,’ which was the first time this was ever done.

systemwide Senate, and UCOP with early engagement with the Divisional Senate, the systemwide Senate, and the Academic Planning Council (APC) early on is important.¹³

7. **The Compendium should explicitly state that ‘rejection’ of a proposal is a possibility; procedures for resubmission should be articulated.** The Compendium’s 1994 language seems predicated upon the assumption that all new schools will ultimately be approved, as implied in the wording of steps 11 and 12 in the approval process for new schools and colleges.¹⁴ Such language provides the Senate with very little room to ultimately reject a proposal for either academic or budgetary reasons.
8. **The Compendium should delegate the responsibility of double-checking Regents’ items regarding the approval of new schools to the Academic Council Chair.** Regental approval of a new school is intended as an approval of a framework that will either immediately hold academic degree programs or hold them one day in the future. Such approval can include in state funding requests, state-funded capital projects, approval/ability to hire a dean, and eligibility for start-up funds from UCOP (provided any are available). The Academic Council Chair has the responsibility to double-check Regents’ items approving new schools to ascertain that they do not also provide for the establishment of new graduate degree programs without CCGA approval.
9. **If a new school is not implemented seven years after the date of the Regental approval, then the Compendium should require the submission of a post-proposal prior to any further steps toward implementation.** Task Force members acknowledged that significant changes can take place in the economic, budgetary, and academic environment in which the original proposal was approved. If the new school is not approved within seven years, which coincides with most departmental review cycles on the campuses, it is reasonable that the school’s proponents be asked to submit a post-proposal, which would be reviewed expeditiously.
10. **Templates and/or examples of strong new school proposals should be added to the appendices as warranted.** Given the fact that the quality of new school proposals vary widely, there is a need to develop templates for these proposals, which could be used by other campuses. Towards that end, the proposal for a new School of Medicine at UC Riverside will be included as an appendix to this edition of the Compendium. Future additions of such proposals must only be approved by the Academic Council to be added to the Compendium.

¹³ Submissions of pre-proposals to the Provost/Senate have been helpful in this regard. One successful example of such an iterative process was UC Riverside’s proposed School of Medicine. The administration on that campus provided numerous updates to the systemwide Senate early on in the process, thereby facilitating the ultimate approval of this school.

¹⁴ These steps are: #11. If needed, the Provost & Senior Vice President works with the Chancellor to resolve any issues raised by reviews up to this point. And #12. The Provost & Senior Vice President recommends approval to the President.

Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Academic Units

A reconstitution refers to any combination of actions treated as a unified plan and intended to transfer, consolidate, discontinue, disestablish (TCDD), change the name of¹⁵ an academic program or academic unit. Although the establishment of a new academic unit or program may result from a reconstitution, the process for establishments of programs and academic units are addressed in sections II and III respectively. The reason for a reconstitution often includes improved administrative efficiencies, name clarity, image, and fund-raising opportunities. However, in difficult budgetary times it is anticipated that some reconstitutions may result from deep and unforeseen budget cuts.

A reconstitution will include one or more TCDD actions (transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance), which are defined below:

- Transfer: Moving a program or unit into another one that subsumes it.
- Consolidation: Combining two or more programs or units to form a new unified program or unit.
- Disestablishment: Eliminating an academic unit or research unit.
- Discontinuance: Eliminating an academic program.

Disestablishments and discontinuances are two actions that are usually inter-related. For example, the reconstitution of an academic unit more often than not results from (or may result in) the discontinuance of one or more academic programs. Recent reconstitutions have included the reconstitution of UC Riverside's Anderson Graduate School of Management (2009), the UC Davis reconstitution of the Division of Biological Sciences as the College of Biological Sciences (2005), and a proposal to reconstitute the UC Irvine College of Medicine as the College of Health Sciences (2004). This does not include the numerous reconstitutions of graduate groups and/or graduate departments, which are predominantly considered within CCGA.

Current Practice

Any proposal to reconstitute an academic program or unit *should* have been included in that campus's *Five-Year Planning Perspective*. If not, the Chancellor should send the item, which would have been included (in the Five-Year Planning Perspective), to the Provost and Academic Council Chair. The reconstitution proposal for an academic unit (such as a school), will first be reviewed by the Divisional Senate and other campus bodies and then be forwarded to the Academic Council and the Provost for systemwide review. Normally, CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB would review such a proposal (with CCGA being the lead and coordinating committee), but other committees may do so as well, at the request of the Council Chair. The current practice also allows for an analysis from Academic Affairs (most likely 'Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination' under the new structure), and CPEC if appropriate. Under the guidance of CCGA, Senate

¹⁵ A simple name change does not involve a reconstitution. A simple name change refers to a situation in which the field has moved on, and refers to itself by a different name that is currently used by a program.

committees provide their comments to the Council Chair.¹⁶ The Council Chair then sends the recommendations to the Provost, who makes a subsequent recommendation to the President, who authorizes the implementation of the recommendations; the Provost notifies the campus. A proposal for a reconstitution of an academic program or academic unit is only sent to the Regents if any part of the proposal requires Regental approval.

Reconstitutions of undergraduate degree programs are a Divisional matter, and systemwide involvement is not necessary. As noted in Section II.a., “*Academic Degree Programs*”, all actions involving undergraduate degree programs are administered by the individual campuses without systemwide review. The only exception to this rule is if the program being eliminated is the last one of its kind in the UC system. However, CCGA is responsible for the review of reconstitutions of graduate degree programs and graduate groups at the systemwide level. If the Divisional Senate is appropriately involved in campus process, and if any Universitywide implications are satisfactorily being addressed, then the campus’s decision is final and there is not a need for systemwide review. However, either CCGA and/or Academic Affairs can request systemwide review if there are concerns that the Divisional Senate has not been appropriately involved and/or that Universitywide implications are not being addressed satisfactorily (both more likely if there is late announcement of the proposed TCD action). Once the proposal is submitted for systemwide review, it is simultaneously considered by the Provost (or designee), CPEC (if it requests it), UCEP (if CCGA requests it), and CCGA. If systemwide review has been requested, then CCGA must approve the final plan for a TCD action and the President must approve implementation of it.

Background

The most prominent University document relating to reconstitutions is the September 1979 UCOP “[*Policy on Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs*](#).” This document most likely informed the initial drafting of the Compendium in 1993. Perhaps most important, it reaffirms the Senate’s role to “judge program quality and academic value”; it delineates the responsibility of “administrative organization” and the “allocation and use of resources” to the administration. In making decisions about reconstitutions, it notes that the same considerations that are relevant and important in the establishment of new schools, colleges, departments, and other units are also equally important in reconstitutions or disestablishments. This document also suggests that 1) each campus should have written procedures for reconstitutions; and 2) these written procedures should be based on the following policy considerations—prior review, consultation, phase-out, and final decisions:

- **Prior Review:** Any decision to reconstitute an academic unit or program should normally be preceded by a regular or *ad-hoc* review conducted by a campus academic planning board.
- **Consultation:** This should include the relevant Academic Senate committees (Educational Policy, Academic Personnel, Planning and Budget, and Graduate Council/Graduate Affairs); faculty and students affected by the proposed change; and

¹⁶ The Compendium currently worded in such a way as to suggest approval is always given. For example, the section states that “The Senate committees participating in the review report their comments, recommendations, and -- if usually given -- approvals to the Academic Council.”

the President (if the program or unit is unique and/or its termination would have systemwide or inter-segmental effects. This document also recommends that an external review should take place whenever possible.

- Phase-out: Arrangements shall be in place for students enrolled in the targeted program to complete their degrees; and for academic and staff employees to transfer to another campus or combine with another program or programs on another campus.
- Final Decisions: The policy documents lays out the process for the final decisions regarding reconstitutions (e.g., who makes these decisions): 1) the final decision on the disestablishment of schools, colleges, and degrees is made by the Regents on the recommendation of the President; 2) final decisions regarding intercampus transfer/consolidation and/or the disestablishment of other academic units shall be made by the President after consultation with the Academic Senate [and students as appropriate]; 3) the final decision on intercampus transfers, consolidations, or discontinuances of academic programs shall be made by the Academic Senate and/or the Chancellor(s); and 4) campuses shall report such transfers, consolidations, and discontinuances in their “Academic Program Inventory”.

In its 1993 *“Role of CCGA in the Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units”*¹⁷, CCGA envisioned a role for both itself and the Senate as a whole. The 1979 systemwide policy statement suggests that procedures for the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and/or discontinuance of academic units and degree programs should be similar to those for their establishment, thereby requiring systemwide Senate review. CCGA also observed that in bad times, the decision to disestablish units would be more akin to triage. In order to minimize the occurrence of such situations, CCGA also stated that “it [CCGA] 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.”¹⁸

Towards the aim of developing an “early warning system”, CCGA recommended in 1993 that CCGA should review transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and/or 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.¹⁹ CCGA should also receive a report on every transfer,

¹⁷ Currently Appendix P in the CCGA Handbook.

¹⁸ CCGA Handbook, Appendix P: Role of CCGA in the Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units, pp. 53-57.

¹⁹ At that time, the committee felt that it was important for Divisional representatives to report on, and for the committee to discuss as a group, any upcoming reconstitutions of academic units. As 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 does not need to be involved. If there are systemwide issues and/or the local Graduate Council is not involved, a CCGA subcommittee should be convened, which is composed of the Chair or Vice Chair, along with two CCGA representatives from campuses other than that (or those) considering the proposed action. If the subcommittee finds that the local Graduate Council is not involved, the CCGA Chair formally sends correspondence to those parties

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 Council Chair and the Provost that the proposed action be accepted or rejected.²⁰ Finally, CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB agreed that their respective chairs should regularly correspond with each other regarding such actions in order to ensure adequate Senate participation on the campus level, and to consider any systemwide issues raised by the proposed divisional actions. These committees also recommended that in difficult times, such conferences should occur monthly.

Common Issues

Given that each reconstitution is different, it is difficult to point to common issues that emerge in most reconstitutions. Key issues often include differences between graduate and undergraduate curricula (e.g., when a graduate academic unit is incorporating an undergraduate degree program); faculty FTEs; resource issues, and adherence to Divisional bylaws and regulations. In short, the same issues that often derail new school and college proposals will cause problems for reconstitutions as well. It goes without saying that poorly written reconstitution proposals will be roundly criticized by both Divisional and systemwide Senate committees for a basic lack of clarity. Subsequently, it is recommended that the campus administration(s) consult early with such Divisional Senate committees as Educational Policy, Graduate Council, and Planning and Budget when the reconstitution is still in its planning stages.

Another related issue is information sharing between the campus administration, Divisional Senate committees, and systemwide Senate committees. Per the intent of CCGA's 1993 document, it is important that campus administrators 1) inform Divisional Senate chairs and standing committees (e.g., Graduate Council) of their intent to reconstitute academic programs and units as soon as possible; and 2) that CCGA members (generally the chairs of their respective Graduate Councils) raise reconstitution issues in CCGA meetings as soon as they are known on their campuses. Subsequently, campus administrators are encouraged to use the *Five-Year Planning Perspectives*, adhering to both Compendium guidelines for this document, but also respecting Divisional and systemwide review cycles for this document. The development of a

responsible to appropriate include the Division. If the subcommittee finds that the reconstitution raises systemwide issues, then the CCGA Chair informs 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 Provost, the Vice Provost of for Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination, and the Chair of the Academic Planning Council).

²⁰ If CCGA determines that the local Graduate Council was appropriately involved and systemwide issues were considered, then the campus report need be no more than a one-page statement with a supporting letter from the Chair of the Graduate Council (a longer report is needed if this is not the case. If, however, CCGA rejects or expresses serious concerns about the proposal, the action cannot proceed, and UCOP and the originating campus(es) would be responsible for addressing CCGA's concerns prior to the President approving the proposed action.

central website designed to track such activities (to be maintained by the Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination unit at UCOP) is highly encouraged.

Recommendations

- 11.** Revitalize the *Five-Year Planning Perspective*; which will increase transparent information sharing between campus administrators, Divisional Senates, and the systemwide Senate. A related recommendation is the development of a central website designed to track such activities (to be maintained by the Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination unit at UCOP) is highly encouraged.
- 12.** Individual TCDD actions should be defined and included in the Compendium documentation.
- 13.** Move the section on the “*Transfer, Consolidation, or Discontinuance of Graduate Degree Programs and Graduate Groups*,” which was previously located in Section II, “*Academic Degree Programs*”.
- 14.** Maintain the current corporate system database of new degree programs, new academic units, and reconstitutions. Optimally, this database should be developed further, but the task force is cognizant of fiscal realities that prevent such development at this time. Ideally, such a database would include the type of action, the proposal, all associated correspondence and reports, and the final outcome of the proposal. The existence of a more robust database would allow Senate and administrative bodies to periodically review reconstitutions and the Compendium procedures associated with them.

Research Units (ORUs/MRUs)

Compendium and administrative processes regarding organized research units (ORUs) and multiple research units (MRUs) are based on the Regents' [Policy on Organized Research Units](#) (1993)²¹. In particular, both the *Compendium* and the *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units*²² from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS), which was approved by the by the Council of Vice Chancellors for Research in April 1999, are delineated from this 1993 Regents policy. Per this Regents' policy, ORUs are defined as consisting primarily of an interdepartmental group of faculty members and students on a single campus or on several campuses engaged in research. If the faculty members engaged in the research unit are spread out over several campuses, then the research unit is referred to as a multiple research unit (MRU); the Regents' policy applies to both ORUs and MRUs. The President has the authority to establish or disestablish organized research units, but the President will seek the advice of the Chancellors and the Academic Senate in making establishments and disestablishments. The Regents' policy also clearly states that no unit may be established until a review, as prescribed by the President, has been completed, nor may a unit be continued without periodic review.

University administrative policy is very explicit that a proposal from concerned faculty members is required to establish an ORU or MRU, per the ORGS' [Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units](#). Such a proposal should state the proposed unit's goals and objectives, describe what value and capabilities will be added by the new unit, and explain why they cannot be achieved within the existing campus structure. Similarly, this policy also sets up clear guidelines for the five-year reviews of ORUs²³ and MRUs²⁴. Most importantly, the "Vice Provost" (now "Vice President" in the new ORGS structure) for Research should assure that the quinquennial review of each MRU takes place at regular five year intervals. The disestablishment of an ORU may follow a five-year review of the unit or other process of review established by

²¹ See Regents' *Policy on Organized Research Units* (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/6075.html>). This policy was first adopted by the Regents on September 17, 1971.

²² See the *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units* (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/12-07-99att.pdf>). Other background documentation includes the Research Administration Office's Memo on Operating Guidance (#93-4) regarding [University Policy and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units—Reissuance](#), from March 12, 1993 (<http://www.ucop.edu/raohome/cgmemos/93-04.html>).

²³ Each ORU should be reviewed at intervals of five years or less by an ad hoc review committee. It is the responsibility of the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee to initiate five-year (quinquennial) reviews for ORUs.

²⁴ 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. 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.

the Chancellor of the host campus of the MRU or by the Vice Provost for Research. Again, the policy is clear and explicit that 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.

Problems with the Current Process and Background

Although both the *Compendium* and the ORGS' *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units* clearly sets out rules for the establishment, review, and disestablishment of ORUs and MRUs, in practice many of these programs were rarely, if ever, disestablished. Reviews of MRUs, when they were done at all, generally were more positive than negative, which provided a further disincentive to eliminate MRUs. Central funding was indefinite, and did not allow for the development and support of new programs. Subsequently, the Academic Council had long called for the circulation of centralized funds by treating the funding as seed money and opening it to competition (see the [July 2005 letter](#) from then Senate Chair Blumenthal), and the Academic Council reaffirmed its support of a competitive process in its [December 2006 response](#) to the report of a Joint Senate/UCOP Workgroup on Multicampus Research Units.

In January 2009 a [request for proposals \(RFP\) for Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives](#) (MRPIs) was issued by the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS), opening to competition all central funding for multi-campus research. However, this was issued without formal Senate review, and it introduced confusion regarding the definitions of MRUs versus MRPIs. The MRPI RFP allocates approximately \$12M/year for these newly envisioned MRPIs. The Senate remains concerned that the RFP appeared to circumvent the Compendium's MRU process in that the competition resulted in the creation of newly-funded proto-MRUs and eliminated funding for some existing MRUs.

In early April 2009, Academic Council Chair Croughan sent a [letter](#) to Vice President Beckwith regarding the MRPI vis-à-vis the established Compendium MRU review process, noting that that Senate procedures for establishment and disestablishment of MRUs will need to be followed in the event of the disestablishment of some MRUs (resulting from a lack of UCOP funding) or the establishment of a new MRU, which would emerge out of the MRPI process. Chair Croughan's letter also re-emphasized the following principles that the Senate has repeatedly espoused with respect to MRUs: 1) MRU money is intended to be seed money to establish new, innovative, collaborative, and cross-campus research initiatives; (2) each MRU is to be reviewed every five years through the Compendium process; and (3) MRU policies indicate a 15-year sunset clause for MRUs. Finally, Chair Croughan requested Vice President Beckwith to do the following:

- Issue a formal announcement to the Chancellors and the Academic Senate that decisions to fund or deny funding to proposals submitted in response to the RFP do not constitute decisions to establish or disestablish any formal MRU, and these

decisions are independent of the Compendium review process for establishing or disestablishing an MRU.

- Include in the announcement an explanation that formal reviews will be carried out as prescribed by the shared governance procedures codified in the Compendium and in ORGS' *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units* for: 1) any existing MRU whose loss of funding puts its future in jeopardy; and (2) any new MRU that will be established. Clarify that the requirement for reviews may extend the timeline on which funds are awarded.
- In consultation with the Academic Senate, develop a process for determining which proposals will confer formal MRU status, as defined in the *Administrative Policies and Procedures*. For these proposals, a PI who is selected to receive the competitive funds must receive approval through the Compendium review process prior to receiving funds. The *Administrative Policies and Procedures* distinguish between formally established MRUs and less formal Multicampus Research Groups and Programs, while the Compendium applies to formally established MRUs.

In his April 7 response to Chair Croughan, Vice President Beckwith agreed to all three points, and subsequently sent out an April 14 letter to the Chancellors that incorporated these stipulations. While Academic Council acknowledged Vice President Beckwith's compliance with its request in Chair Croughan's June 26 letter to Vice President Beckwith, it repeated its outstanding concern that some MRUs will suffer a negative result in the MRPI competition, which will likely result in their de facto disestablishment prior to a full Compendium review. To obviate such occurrences, Chair Croughan urged Vice President Beckwith to schedule Compendium reviews for any MRUs that are not selected for funding. If such reviews do not recommend disestablishment, alternative support should be offered. Similarly, new MRUs emerging out of this competition should not be established without a Compendium review. In addition, Council also urged Vice President Beckwith to initiate a process to ensure that future RFPs will distinguish MRUs from other multicampus research initiatives so that funding decisions follow Compendium reviews rather than vice versa. To date, Academic Council has not received a response to this letter.

Recommendations

The problems with the current process are multi-fold. *First, review processes defined in both the Compendium and the ORGS Administrative Policies and Procedures are out-of-date, both of which were last revised in 1999. Second, these policies need to be appropriately modified to ensure that MRU reviews are meaningful and not only self-serving; decisions on MRU disestablishments should be based on these reviews. Third, the MRPI/MRU controversy needs to be resolved, with a clear process that is articulated in both ORGS policy and the Compendium.*

With these issues in mind, the Compendium Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1. Establish a joint subcommittee to investigate and define MRPIs, and establish review processes for them. The subcommittee should explore a range of options, including incorporating MRPIs into the MRU review process, or establish a separate review process for MRPIs
2. Incorporate the definitions and terms regarding ORUs from the *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Research Units*, which is posted on the ORGS site.
3. Clarify and elaborate on the processes for establishment, review, and disestablishment of MRUs.
 - a. Incorporate language from ORGS' Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units into the Compendium when it more clearly specifies procedures governing the establishment and review of MRUs.
 - b. Delete the clause in Section V.B.1.1, which requires proposals to appear on the 5-Year Perspectives one year before the proposal is approved on campus. This requirement in effect creates a two-year process and is too slow. Section V.B.1.2 provides a more flexible starting point from which to begin consultation at the campus level.
 - c. Add Section V.B.2. "Procedure for Five-Year Review" from the ORGS' *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units*.
 - d. Require that campus Committees on Planning and Budget review establishments, as well as UCPB in order to ensure campus support for the proposal.
 - e. Add a statement requiring that any plan for establishment must demonstrate that external funding is committed, or have a specific plan for how to obtain external funding.

Recommendations on Cal ISIs

1. Since each ISI is unique, the generic review process for MRUs is not applicable.
2. An Appendix should be added to the Compendium addressing the Cal ISIs, including a skeleton of the process used for QB3 as a model for future ISI reviews.

Documentation

1. Regents' *Policy on Organized Research Units* (1993), <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/6075.html>.
2. Office of Research and Graduate Studies *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units*, <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/12-07-99att.pdf>.
3. Research Administration Office's Memo on Operating Guidance (#93-4) regarding *University Policy and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units—Reissuance*, from March 12, 1993 (<http://www.ucop.edu/raohome/cgmemos/93-04.html>).
4. *Guidelines for Five-Year ("Quinquennial for Five-Year Reviews of Multicampus Research Units")—Review Committee Guidelines*, <http://www.ucop.edu/research/policies/mrurev5com.html>.

Systemwide Academic Entities

The potential for cross-campus collaboration on academic programs has been raised in a number of contexts. While the subcommittee on systemwide entities did not feel it appropriate to write into the Compendium rules for entities that do not yet exist, it did wish to offer guidance on how to approach such entities. Recently, one such proposed entity was the Systemwide School of Global Health. UCDC and the Universitywide Education Abroad Program many also be considered such entities (albeit mostly undergraduate ones).

Recommendations

- 1) If new systemwide academic entities emerge that do not fit precisely into the existing categories in the Compendium, they should follow existing guidelines as much as possible. For instance, a systemwide school, such as the School of Global Health that is currently in the planning stages, should cleave to the guidelines for establishing new academic degree programs and schools. The possibility of systemwide degree programs has been raised as a potential way to control costs by consolidating small programs across campuses. Such systemwide degree programs should follow the procedures for single-campus degree programs as much as possible.
- 2) Specific proposals will not be reviewed until a) the campus review process has been specified; and b) the divisional Senates have been consulted about the review process.
- 3) The Academic Planning Council (APC) should be responsible for formulating the review process for new systemwide academic entities, based on existing guidelines for similar entities.
- 4) Any systemwide school should be piloted as a joint academic degree program/research institute prior to undergoing review to become a school.



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

Office of the Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 230
San Francisco, CA 94143-0764
Campus Box 0764
tel: 415/514-2696
fax: 415/514-3844

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH, Chair
Robert Newcomer, PhD, Vice Chair
Peter Loomer, DDS, PhD, Secretary
Jean Olson, MD, Parliamentarian

May 28, 2008

Henry C. Powell, MD
Professor and Chair
University of California Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Re: UCSF Review of the Commission on the Future Working Group
Recommendations

Dear Chair Powell:

In response to to your March 23, 2010 request for full formal review of the first recommendations of the Working Groups of the Commission on the Future, the UCSF Academic Senate convened a Task Force to conduct this review.

I transmit the Task Force's comments along with my endorsement for your consideration.

If you have any questions or if we can assist you in any way, please feel free to contact Shilpa Patel, Senior Analyst in the UCSF Office of the Academic Senate, at shilpa.patel@ucsf.edu or (415) 514-2696.
Thank you.

Sincerely,



Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

University of California
San Francisco



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

**Communication from the Task Force Reviewing the
Recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future**
Daniel Weiss, PhD, Chair

May 28, 2010

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, MD, MPH
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: UCSF Response to the Recommendations for the UC Commission on the Future

Dear Chair Fuentes-Afflick,

During the month of May 2010, the Task for Reviewing the Recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future reviewed the 29 recommendations set forth in the Commission's initial report. The Task Force focused on the recommendations particularly relevant to the UCSF campus.

After much deliberation, we submit to you the attached recommendations for your review and endorsement.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this important report.

Sincerely,

Task Force Reviewing the Recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future

Daniel Weiss, PhD, Chair (Psychiatry)
Diane Barber, PhD (Cell and Tissue Biology)
Pilar Bernal de Pheils, RN, MS, FAAN, FNP, (Family Health Care Nursing)
Elyse Foster, MD (Cardiology)
Amy Houtrow, MD, MPH (Pediatrics Rehabilitation)
Thomas James, PhD (Pharmaceutical Chemistry)
Kirby Lee, PharmD (Clinical Pharmacy)
Douglas Schmucker, PhD
Kimberly Topp, PhD, PT (Anatomy)
Ed Yelin, PhD (Rheumatology)

Preamble

In generating its responses to the first round of recommendations of the Working Groups of the UC Commission on the Future, our Task Force came to the conclusion that there are three overarching responses it wished to articulate. These are not tied to any particular recommendation from any particular Working Group. Instead, they apply to all the recommendations from all of the Working Groups, those on which we express a recommendation as well as those on which we did not.

1. Senate members are concerned that despite the recognition of the essential role the Senate must play in charting the future of UC, that academic excellence will take a back seat to fiscal exigencies in the name of systemwide planning. Such a policy will be extremely damaging to the *raison d'être* of the University of California.
2. Education of graduate and professional students is inextricably linked to the mission of the University of California to serve the people of the state by engaging in high quality teaching and research. Planning for undergraduate education must be undertaken in conjunction with and simultaneously with planning for graduate and professional education, and not separately or sequentially.
3. Public education is not a private good. Pursuit of recommendations deeply embedded in an economic model applicable to the private sector, not the public sector seriously undermines the need and rationale for public support of UC.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

Size and Shape

Recommendation 1: Increase the number and proportion of non-resident students at the undergraduate level. (pp. 14-18) (Similar to FUNDING STRATEGIES Rec. # 6, pp. 92-94)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 2: Improve the student transfer function by developing more complete lower-division transfer pathways in high-demand majors. (pp. 19-21)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 3: To improve the student transfer function, enhance the ASSIST website for greater user-friendliness and improved capabilities. (pp. 22-23)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 4: Examine the utility of practice doctorates for allied health professions in terms of national healthcare quality and costs, UC and CSU missions, and the future needs of California residents. (pp. 24-26)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree XXX | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

The nation wide study on the benefits of practice doctorates for "allied health professions" recommended is beneficial. The study should be conducted by recognized authorities of each of the allied professions to be studied, as well as by members of the organizations in the proposal. Professional regulations differ from state to state; they are not entirely dependent on education attainment, but determined by other regulatory bodies that in some cases restrict the practice of the profession. With health care reform there will probably be an increase in the use of these "health allied professions" (it should be clearly defined what health allied professions are), and hence a nation wide (federal) study with participation of all parties involved is preferable. The goals would be to determine on a more equitable basis the minimal education requirements needed to provide high quality care, based on evidence based practice and best outcomes. The findings will likely differ for each profession, and the study results should help clarify UC and CSU involvement, as well as UC financial commitments in the education of these professionals. The speed with which the study is conducted and analyzed is critical, as practice doctorates for some professions are already under development in the CSU system.

From Clinical Affairs:

Our general sense is that the 'ship has sailed' for practice doctorates. Regardless, it is important to know how these programs affect clinical outcomes, especially since there are external guidelines for training in these programs. Members of the CAC pointed to issues of quality, variability and cost. If outcomes are not improved, additional years of training without benefit are burdensome and costly to the system. The CAC would also like to point out the value of doctoral level training within the UCs given the contribution to research. Furthermore, there are major issues about the relationship of those with practice doctorates to physicians regarding independence and autonomy.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

UC may have an opportunity to shape parameters for practice doctorates that would improve the fields and benefit the communities we serve. This should be considered when discussing how UC moves forward, especially with respect to the CSU system.

Recommendation 5: Eliminate administrative redundancies across the UC system and promote efficiencies where possible. (pp. 27-28) (Similar to FUNDING STRATEGIES Rec. # 2, pp. 80-83)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree XXX | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

The rationale for conditional agreement rather than full agreement stems from three concerns expressed by faculty on the campus looking at campus and systemwide concerns. The first is the possibility that backfilling administrative activities that move from the campuses to a systemwide process will fall to faculty by default, thus increasing faculty administrative burden in the process. When combined with the Research Strategies Work Group Recommendation #4, there is a perception that part of the tough sell historically is that faculty are given increased administrative burden which sacrifices excellence. A second concern has to do with the delivery of patient care that occurs in the context of educational activities. There was concern that a systemwide process, such as medical billing, could be very detrimental to billing activities that are non-standard, e.g., dental or veterinary services. Thus, systems should contain sufficiently flexibility that local concerns can be accommodated. A third concern is that if part of the efficiencies are from outsourcing of some functions that the vendor would be unaware and unresponsive to the unique concerns of process in the institutional setting of a public research university with a model of shared governance as opposed to the institutional setting of a corporation. Emphasis on beta testing and user-friendly systems should guide systemwide efforts.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Response Template

Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 1: Manage educational resources more effectively and efficiently to (1) increase the proportion of undergraduate students graduating in four years, (2) create a pathway for undergraduate students to complete degrees in three years, (3) make more effective use of faculty resources, and (4) maintain or improve the undergraduate student experience. (pp. 29-35)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 2: Continue timely exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum, as well as in self-supporting graduate degrees and Extension programs. (pp. 36-39)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 3: Expand use of self-supporting and part-time programs to expand opportunities for a UC education to existing and potential students, working professionals, and underserved communities. (pp. 40-45)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree XXX | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

It is recommended that the financial rationale be elaborated. Though self-support programs enhance revenue for departments and programs, the funds pay faculty, staff, equipment, etc., bringing only administrative fees to the university. The programs impact campus resources, such as classrooms, scheduling, support staff, finance staff, Graduate Council faculty, external reviewers and UC Wide Council members required to approve and maintain program quality. There is strong support for a mandate that such programs accept all registered graduate students into their course offerings, space permitting.

The use of revenues generated from such programs need to be considered in the entirety of the revenue stream, at both the campus and systemwide levels, following the emphasis on increased transparency in budgeting.

Recommendation 4: Develop a systemwide academic planning framework that incorporates campus goals within the context of priorities identified for the University as a whole. (pp. 46-48)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree XXX | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

There is conditional agreement for the development of a UC wide system for academic planning. Conditional agreement reflects the inherent tension between campus goals and, to a lesser extent, goals of individual faculty members on a particular campus in pursuing their research where it takes them, and systemwide goals, as it is difficult to make choices in an equitable and transparent fashion. Strain between expansion of established programs (e.g. professional schools) as against initiation of new programs may pit campuses against each other with undesirable results. Senate members are concerned that despite the recognition of the essential role the Senate must play in such activities, that academic excellence will take a back seat to fiscal exigencies in the name of systemwide planning.

The goal of examining campus review processes in this effort is a valuable outcome.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

Preliminary Recommendation: The working group seeks UC input on its forthcoming recommendation on quality. (pp. 49-54)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

Access and Affordability

Recommendation 1: Reaffirm UC's commitment to access for California students. (pp. 55-57)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 2: Reaffirm the University's commitment to be financially accessible for all undergraduate students admitted to UC. (pp. 58-60)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 3: Reaffirm the University's commitment to fulfilling graduate education's role in serving UC's research enterprise, UC's teaching mission, and the diverse knowledge and workforce demands of the State and beyond. (pp. 61-63)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree XXX | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

The following points pertain especially to UCSF, but are applicable to graduate programs in the health sciences at other UC campuses.

- UCSF is hindered by the relatively small number of graduate students compared to the general campuses of the UC system since teaching is a major source of income for graduate students.
- Cost of living is high in San Francisco and immediate environs, while state and limited federal support for graduate programs are set based on average costs across all areas of the state and nation.
- Training grants from Federal agencies have capped the stipends available to students leaving an increasing gap between students' income sources and expenses including but not limited to tuition, in turn adversely affecting recruitment vis á vis our competitor universities throughout the country. This gap plays an important role in recruiting members of underserved minorities since many of our comparison institutions offer considerably more generous support. The UC system should address current impediments to exploring additional sources of funding for graduate and professional education such as private foundations and industry.

Recommendation 4: Re-establish UC financial aid eligibility for undocumented California high school graduates. (pp. 64-66)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 5: Adopt a multi-year fee schedule for each entering cohort of new undergraduate students. (pp. 67-69)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| | | | | | | | XXX |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|

Recommendation 6: Rename the Education Fee and the Professional Degree Fees (but not the Registration Fee) as “tuition.” (pp. 70-72)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

Funding Strategies

Recommendation 1: Develop a multiyear advocacy campaign aimed at grass roots opinion leaders throughout the State of California to foster public and political support for the University as a major priority for state funding. (pp. 75-79)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 2: Design and implement a system to identify, promote, and adopt the best administrative practices within the UC system. (pp. 80-83) (Similar to SIZE and SHAPE Rec. # 5, pp. 27-28)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 3: Revise practice and policy on charging indirect cost recovery for non-federally funded research. (pp. 84-85)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree XXX | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

The cost of actually administering all grants is about 35%; however, non-federally funded agencies provide on average only a 10% indirect cost recovery (ICR) rate. Although the University has absorbed the shortfall between grant administration and ICR in the past, we can no longer subsidize this difference with increasing reductions in state support for our public institution. We agree with the recommendation that the University of California should negotiate with non-federally funded agencies to request increases in ICR that more effectively cover true costs. Although it is unlikely that these agencies will agree to an ICR rate that completely offsets the financial shortfall, a reasoned discussion is imperative. As indicated in the commission report, revenues generated from increased ICR rates will shift the recovery of our financial burden away from student fees and will improve the quality of education by making more educational investments possible. However, an adamant and inflexible stance on increased ICR rates is not advised because we need to protect faculty who rely on non-federal agencies to support their research, including junior faculty and faculty in humanities and other disciplines that have lower overhead research costs compared with biomedical sciences. Negotiations should be tempered to avoid awards from non-federally funded agencies preferentially being made outside of California.

Recommendation 4: Improve indirect cost recovery rates with federal agencies. (pp. 86-87)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree XXX | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

There is strong agreement with this recommendation. The task force also recommends implementing a UC-wide team for negotiating ICR recovery rates from federal granting agencies. The 5-10% disparity of lower ICR rates for UC campuses compared with some of our comparator institutions equates to substantial lost revenue. Although increased rates achieved by new negotiations may be marginal, a mere 1-2% increase would generate millions of dollars in additional revenue. We need a system-wide dedicated team to negotiate for UC and for individual campuses. Institution-wide negotiating teams have proven to be effective at other universities and should be adopted as soon as possible for the University of California.

Recommendation 5: Adopt a multiyear strategy to replace student fees with tuition, generate new revenue to protect academic quality, and strengthen university planning. (pp.88-91)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 6: Increase enrollment of nonresident undergraduates. (pp. 92-94) (Similar to SIZE AND SHAPE Rec. #1, pp. 14-18)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 7: Advocate for a Pell Augmentation Grant to Institutions ("Pell PLUS"). (pp. 95-100)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 8: Examine alternate faculty compensation plans. (pp. 101-102)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 9: Allow for the possibility of charging differential tuition by campus, as a means of mitigating potential future enrollment impacts on some campuses. (pp. 103-106)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|-----------------|--|------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree XXX | | No Comment |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|-----------------|--|------------|

This recommendation strikes at the core value of the UC system, and if adopted would represent a distinct departure from the underlying philosophy of all other public education enterprises in the state, from K-12 on up. Public education is not a private good, and the recommendation to allow differential tuition by campus is deeply embedded in an economic model applicable to the private sector, not the public sector. Adopting such a policy undermines the need and rationale for public support of UC.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Response Template

The University of California has grown and prospered as a system of campuses, now comprising ten. All have a developmental trajectory, and established campuses were once newly established campuses with the same challenges that face newer campuses. As well, campuses have different characters and different educational goals; UCSF is the most obvious example of being different—it does not educate undergraduates. Nevertheless, the excellence of the system as a whole derives from a fundamental commitment to proceed as a system. To allow some campuses to charge higher fees and retain that differential overlooks the many benefits to faculty at those campuses that derive from the system—UCRS and health care benefits being two examples. There is a fundamental inequity in treating some aspects of costs and benefits as deriving from a systemwide process and others from a campus process. As well, the spirit of this recommendation is distinctly opposite many of the recommendations from the other Working Groups were the emphasis is on systemwide fixes.

UC as a system has obtained excellence as a system by carefully distributing resources where they are needed in the system, to allow the system to function optimally. Increased systemwide planning can facilitate this process, and initiatives need to be flexible enough for campuses not be disadvantaged.

Should the recommendation to allow differential tuition by campus be adopted, there needs to be a mechanism in place that allows all campuses—the system—to benefit. When one division of a company has an outstanding year, leadership makes sure the company as a whole benefits, not just that division.

UCPB has developed a paper on the topic, illuminating the risks to some campuses of allowing cost variation on others. The San Francisco Division endorses this report.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS

Response Template

Research Strategies

Recommendation 1: The University of California must recover a greater share of the costs of research sponsored by outside agencies and make its management of those funds more transparent to ensure accountability to its sponsors and its researchers. (pp. 111-116)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree XXX | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

Indirect costs do not directly map onto the overhead costs that an individual investigator incurs and currently limited information is available as to where those monies go and how they are utilized. The indirect needs differ across campuses and disciplines. Indirect rate goals should be based not only on standards at other institutions but based on recognized need. The indirects for one investigator may subsidize the needs of another investigator; this collective nature of indirects requires a systematic approach to recovery and allocation involving transparency and significant Senate Faculty input, for example through Planning and Budget.

In addition to increasing the amount recovered, UC should endeavor to utilize the funds effectively and efficiently to maximize the support of world class research endeavors; speedy acquisition of available funds is one example. This is in line with the Size and Shape Working Group’s Recommendation #5 regarding administrative redundancy.

Improved transparency should be pursued not only at the systemwide level but also at the campus level.

Recommendation 2: UC must ensure continued excellence across a broad spectrum of cutting-edge research. To aid in this effort, UC should (1) prioritize internal funds to support world-class research in disciplines where extramural funding options are limited; (2) motivate the development of large-scale, interdisciplinary, collaborative research projects to capture new funding streams; and (3) augment and enhance opportunities for graduate student research and support wherever possible. (pp. 117-121)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|

Recommendation 3: Create multicampus, interdisciplinary “UC Grand Challenge Research Initiatives” to realize the enormous potential of UC’s ten campuses and three national laboratories on behalf of the state and the nation. (pp. 122-125)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree XXX | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

- NIH and NSF in recent years have instituted relatively large-scale research funding programs (e.g., the NIH Roadmap) that are best addressed by harnessing the expertise of research labs in multiple institutions. Nevertheless, the culture of most UC campuses and funding agencies is still dominated by the model of the individual investigator in his/her laboratory, despite acknowledgment that capital and personnel requirements of state-of-the-art science are often too large for a single investigator or small group of investigators.
 - While there have been ad hoc responses to funding opportunities, it would be wise if UC proactively set up “Grand Challenge Coalitions” that would position UC to be a driver in addressing extant and incipient problems of the state, nation and world.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

- Incentives in academic promotion must reflect the new reality of these capital requirements.
- NIH- and NSF-funded investigators are stressed by the growing imbalance between the cost of research and the amount allowable in grants and by the relatively small percentage of high quality proposals that are being funded.
 - The development of new “Grand Challenge” initiatives must be balanced against assisting faculty with already funded grants in meeting their obligations to complete those grants by providing access to indirect costs and other central resources that would facilitate completion of the work.
 - There must also be a balance enabling the bright ideas of individual investigators to be funded and tested.

There is substantial similarity between this recommendation and Recommendation #4 of the Education and Curriculum Working Group—the development of a systemwide framework for academic planning. It would seem useful to have cross-talk between these two large scale enterprises and not have them work in separate and parallel silos.

Recommendation 4: Streamline risk management practices to increase the efficiency of the research enterprise, making optimal use of faculty researchers and administrative staff support. (pp. 126-129)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree XXX | | Disagree | | No Comment |
|--|-------|--|----------------------------|--|----------|--|------------|

The fundamental premise that UC should enhance administrative efficiencies is obviously supported. However, deciding what should be changed and how to implement changes will require real wisdom. An emphasis of the Working Group’s recommendation is to increase the administrative support to faculty members to enable the faculty to once again spend more time with research and teaching. Of course, this is distinct contradiction with UC’s response to the current fiscal crisis. It is certainly better, however, than the likely outcome we’ll have in two years that faculty have an even greater administrative burden.

While the recommendation as written seeks to streamline administrative practices – cover the current administrative load with less faculty burden and (unwritten) at lower cost, another major emphasis should be on lowering the total administrative load. This could be done by ameliorating the effects from the overly conservative interpretation of rules and policy by UC administrators at many different levels that are partially responsible for the ever-growing administrative burden experienced by faculty members: much of the current burden on faculty is generated by administrators’ self-protection strategies. We need an assessment of practices to eliminate or reduce certain steps in implementing policy. We need an assessment of policies to consider whether their burden is justified by the outcome. For those policies originating outside UC where the balance between burden and desired outcome is heavily weighted towards burden, UC should be prepared to push back: an unjustified burden on faculty is a tax on the citizens of California, as it robs them of the services (generally teaching and research) expected.

Related points follow:

- The decision to centralize research administration in the name of efficiency must be made on a function-by-function basis and backed by empirical data rather than managerial ideology that assumes centralization will save costs. In some instances, there are clear diseconomies of scale.
 - Certain functions that have been centralized have resulted in a large increase in work for faculty, although often these costs are not apparent to external observers.
 - Centralizing pre- and post-grant award administration has meant that the officials responsible often are not familiar with the kind of research being done and apply general rules that are inappropriate. Faculty members have to spend much time educating administrators about the issues.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Response Template

- Similarly, HR officials often do not understand the particulars of the research and send applicants who clearly do not have the requisite skill mix.
 - While reducing “layers” of review will no doubt save costs, centralizing functions entails risks that the “costs” that will be saved are visible, e.g., the number of offices that sign off on grant applications, while the costs that will be added, e.g., faculty time to educate the official with signing responsibility, are invisible.
- Regulations often conflict and there are no mechanisms to adjudicate the conflicts because each regulation is enforced by a different part of the administrative structure.
 - As an example: at UCSF, accounting rules with the laudable goal of increasing transparency conflict with rules to protect the privacy of research subjects, with the result that patient confidentiality has been breached in order to provide that transparency. Many faculty members have spent hundreds of hours trying to resolve this kind of conflict. Any move to centralize functions must include an ombudsman with the power to speedily resolve conflicts, with the higher principle, e.g., honoring patient confidentiality, taking precedence over others. e.g., reducing the risk of audit.
- The cost of compliance with increasing regulations is not an approved direct cost expense for NIH grants, and indirect cost recovery does not account for the amount of time to comply. Grants must be held “whole” for costs of compliance in order to allow research to be completed to fulfill the terms of the grants. This provides a conundrum for faculty members when we perform one more of our recently added tasks, parsing our time spent into modules convenient for bureaucrats.

Recommendation 5: Proactively demonstrate the significant and long-lasting benefits that UC research provides to California and the nation and advocate at the national level for increased and sustained investment in research. (pp. 130-131)

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|
| | Agree | | Conditionally Agree | | Disagree | | No Comment XXX |
|--|-------|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|-------------------|



**Communication from the Graduate Council
Elizabeth Watkins, PhD, Chair**

March 19, 2010

George Rutherford, MD
Chair
Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications
500 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0764

Re: Review of the *Recommendation on Mission Bay Library Space*

Dear Chair Rutherford,

The Graduate Council met on March 11, 2010, to discuss the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication's space recommendations for the Mission Bay Libraries. The Council agreed unanimously that providing safe places for students to study should be a planning priority for the University and therefore endorses these recommendations.

Sincerely,

Graduate Council

Elizabeth Watkins, PhD, Chair
Michael Beattie, PhD, Vice Chair
Patricia Babbitt, PhD
Daniel Fried, PhD
Joseph Gruydish, PhD
Mary Lynch, RN, MPH, MS, PNP
Sarah Nelson, PhD
Robert Raffai, PhD
Nancy Stotts, RN, EdD, FAAN
Pat Calarco, PhD
Peter Taylor, PhD
Christine Des Jarlais, EdD
Julie Hunkapillar, GSA Representative
Vuk Uskovic, PSA Representative