

**Committee on Research**  
**James L. Sorensen, PhD, Chair**

## ANNUAL REPORT 2009-2010

**Total Individual Investigator Grants Awarded: 19**  
**Total Shared Equipment Grants Awarded: 8**  
**Total Grant Money Awarded: \$872,715.00**

**Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee included:**

- Awarding of the 2009 Distinguished Clinical Research Lecturer
- Review and award of two cycles of Individual Investigator grants
- Review and award of Shared Equipment grants
- Selection of the 2010 Faculty Research Lecturer in Basic Science
- Selection of the 2010-2011 Faculty Research Lecturers in Clinical and Translational Science
- Committee on Research Affiliation with the Research Allocation Program (RAP)
- Communication to Systemwide on the CCGA White Paper: "UC as a Graduate Institution"

**Task Forces, Special Committees, and Sub-Committees:**

- Indirect Cost Recovery Task Force – David Saloner
- RAP Executive Steering Committee – Roland Henry
- Subcommittee Reviewing Research Allocation Program (RAP) Affiliation – Kevin Delucchi
- UC Commission on the Future Task Force to Review Initial Recommendations – Kirby Lee

**Issues for Next Year (2010-2011)**

- Examination of Research Policies at UCSF and the Impact on Faculty
- Launch of the RAP/COR Merger

---

**2009-2010 Members**

James Sorensen Chair	Kirby Lee
Roland Henry, Vice Chair	Wu Li
Laurence Baskin	Mahesh Mankani
Mary Blegen	Ralph Marcucio
Dejana Braithwaite	Teri Melese
DorAnne Cuenco	Janet Myers
Kevin DeLucchi	David Saloner
McLeod "Mac" Griffiss	Ram Vaderhobli
Tomoki Hashimoto	Davide Verotta
Gary Humfleet	Girish Vyas
Wen-Chi Hsueh	Michael West
Mallory Johnson	Mary White

---

**Number of Meetings: 10**

**Senate Analyst:** Alison Cleaver

---

## Systemwide Business

### **Compendium Review**

Members reviewed the proposed changes to the systemwide Compendium, developed to provide guidelines for the review processes for academic programs, academic units, and research units. Committee members Gary Humfleet and Wen-Chi Hsueh reviewed on behalf of the committee. Changes proposed include additional steps to follow for the creation of MRUs in particular. Further responsibilities requested of the Graduate Division in regards to their review of programs raised questions for members as to the staffing of that division and ability to fulfill new accountabilities, although the committee did support these and all proposed changes. ([Appendix 1](#))

### **University Committee on Research Policy**

Vice Chair Roland Henry sat on this systemwide committee and on its subcommittee focused on Indirect Cost Recovery.

### **UC Commission on the Future**

In January 2010, members of the Committee heard a report from Mary Croughan, Co-Chair, Research Strategies Working Group, and Member, UC Commission on the Future. Dr. Croughan provided an overview of the Working Group, which is tasked with examining how research can be improved at each campus and systemwide. The Working Group explored the following topics:

- Internal UC-research Funds: Cross-Campus Collaborations
- Research Policies & Practices
- Opportunities & Threats to Research Strategies at UC
- Industry Engagement: Strategies & Policies/Practices to Enhance

Committee members questioned if these proposed changes were being viewed from a business-model point-of-view, accountability was being built into the new systems. Members expressed concern that implemented changes would have little support to insure their success and the success of impacted students at the undergraduate level, which would feed into the graduate and professional school studies.

## Divisional Business

### **Affiliation with the Research Allocation Program (RAP)**

In fall 2009, the Coordinating Committee approved the Committee on Research joining the UCSF funding mechanism, Research Allocation Program (RAP). Exiting Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Washington initiated a RAP Executive Steering Committee to further develop the program as a free-standing entity separate from the Clinical and Translational Science Institute (CTSI) in which it is currently housed. Vice Chair Roland Henry sits on that committee.

In winter and spring 2010, COR Analyst Alison Cleaver worked with RAP Administrator, Emy Volpe, and CTSI Director, Zeanid Noor, to implement the logistics of the union. Committee on Research will officially join RAP in the Fall 2010 funding cycle. Each COR member will also sit on a RAP Review Committee. COR Analyst Alison Cleaver will staff the Molecular and Medical Specialties Review Committee.

COR members have reserved the right to terminate affiliation with RAP at any point, if the process isn't working.

### **Individual Investigator Grant**

In 2009-2010, the Committee received fifty-three (53) applications in total for Individual Investigator Grants. The Committee reviewed the applications for Individual Investigator Grants and ranked each application using secret ballots and a scoring system similar to that of the NIH, where 1.0 = strongly recommend for full funding through 3.0 = not fundable. Additionally, as instituted in 2004-05, the

Committee did not review any applications ranked 2.0 or higher by the initial reviewers unless either or both of the Committee's assigned reviewers requested discussion. The Committee approved and recommended that nineteen (19) grants totaling \$630,772.00 be considered for funding.

### **Faculty Research Lectures**

With the creation and implementation of the third lectureship honoring researchers conducting translational science, members unanimously voted to rename the lectureships to include all under the umbrella title of "Faculty Research Lectures." Annually, two out of the three lectures will be awarded; the arena of science that they honor will distinguish each lectureship:

- Faculty Research Lecture in Basic Science (formerly the Faculty Research Lecture)
- Faculty Research Lecture in Clinical Science (formerly the Distinguished Clinical Faculty Lecturer)
- Faculty Research Lecture in Translational Science

Members also instituted a three-year nomination packet limit. Nominators may use the same packet, providing annual updates as needed, to the Committee on Research committee for Faculty Research Lecture consideration. For the fourth year of nomination, a new packet must be provided.

### **Launch of a Translational Lectureship**

Vice Chair Roland Henry presented the criteria for the Faculty Research Lecture (FRL) in Translational Science to the Coordinating Committee in Fall 2009. He distinguished the differences between this lectureship and the already existing FRL in Basic Science and in Distinguished Clinical Science Lecturer. Coordinating Committee members approved the creation of the new lectureship. ([Appendix 2](#))

The call for nominations went out March 29, 2010, for all three of the Faculty Research Lectures. The committee received a total of nine nominations across the three categories.

By anonymous vote, members opted to award the Translational Lecture to Dr. Michael Harrison, for his pioneering and visionary work in fetal surgery. The Lecture will be held in Spring 2011, in place of the FRL in Basic Science, which was not awarded in 2010-2011.

### **Shared Equipment Grant**

The Committee received nineteen (19) applications for shared equipment grants during 2009-2019. Committee members ranked each application using a secret ballot and approved eight (8) grants totaling \$241,943.00 for funding.

### **Selection of the 2010 Faculty Research Lecturer in Clinical Science**

Formerly known as the Distinguished Clinical Research Lecture, since 2001, this award has been bestowed on an individual member or members of the UCSF faculty with outstanding achievements in clinical research. Nominations are made by UCSF faculty, who consider the clinical research contributions of their colleagues and submit nominations for this prestigious award to the Academic Senate Committee on Research. Each year, the Committee on Research selects the recipient of this award.

This year the committee received six nominations. Following extensive discussion and multiple rounds of voting, members voted by secret ballot to select Dr. Stephen Hulley, M.D., Ph.D., as the recipient of the 2010 Faculty Research Lectureship in Clinical Science. Dr. Hulley is a leader in clinical epidemiology whose landmark clinical research in the Heart and Estrogen/progestin Replacement Study (HERS) was republished in 2010 by *JAMA* as a "classic" and cited for creating a "sea change" in how hormone replacement programs were prescribed for women.

Dr. Hulley's lecture will be given in October 2010. At this date, title and logistics are still being determined.

### **Selection of the 2010 Faculty Research Lecturer in Basic Science**

The Committee received several nominations for the 52<sup>nd</sup> Faculty Research Lecture in Basic Science. Each year, the Faculty Research Lecture proudly acknowledges the outstanding scientific achievements made by a member of the UCSF Academic Senate. Academic Senate members are asked to consider the contributions of their colleagues when they make nominations for this prestigious award so that the University community may recognize their scientific achievements.

After lengthy discussion, members voted by secret ballot to select Ken Dill, Ph.D., as the recipient of the 2010 Faculty Research Lecturer in Basic Science. Dr. Dill has advanced the understanding of the physical properties of proteins, and in particular, helped to explain the folding code, the folding problem, addressed protein stability, and protein sequence space. His research findings in these areas have impacted biomedical science in far-reaching ways.

Dr. Dill's lecture, "Pathways and the Goofgoos Fairy Godmother" was given on April 19, 2010, at 3:30pm in Genentech Hall on the Mission Bay Campus. To view the lecture, please follow this link:  
<http://senate.ucsf.edu/0-awards/facultyresearchlecture.html#video>

### **Travel Grants**

The Academic Senate office, under the auspices of the Committee of Research, granted thirty-six travel grants during the 2009-2010 academic term. These grants are funded from Opportunity Funds. Of the \$20,000 available for travel grants during the past academic term, the Senate office awarded grants in the amount of \$14,496.95.

## **Appendices**

[Appendix 1:](#) Proposed Revisions to the Compendium

[Appendix 2:](#) Revised and Approved Committee on Research Lectureship Criteria

Senate Staff:  
Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst  
alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu; 415/476-3808



# **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\*<sup>1</sup>](#),” 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

---

<sup>1</sup> The full LAO report is available at:  
[http://www.lao.ca.gov/2009/edu/academic\\_expansions/academic\\_expansions\\_120209.pdf](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.<sup>2</sup> 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).

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> The Compendium fosters this creative development while balancing it with the state and societal needs for these programs.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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](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*<sup>4</sup>, 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

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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 guidelines<sup>6</sup> 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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 need<sup>7</sup> 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 area<sup>8</sup>, 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 goals<sup>9</sup>: 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-effectiveness<sup>10</sup>. 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.

---

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

<sup>8</sup> 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).

<sup>9</sup> See p. 9 of the LAO report.

<sup>10</sup> “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-proposal<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> *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

---

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

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.<sup>14</sup> 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.

---

<sup>13</sup> 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.

<sup>14</sup> 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 of<sup>15</sup> 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

---

<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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

---

<sup>16</sup> 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”*<sup>17</sup>, 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.”<sup>18</sup>

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.<sup>19</sup> CCGA should also receive a report on every transfer,

---

<sup>17</sup> Currently Appendix P in the CCGA Handbook.

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

<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup> 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).

<sup>20</sup> 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)<sup>21</sup>. In particular, both the *Compendium* and the *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units*<sup>22</sup> 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 ORUs<sup>23</sup> and MRUs<sup>24</sup>. 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

---

<sup>21</sup> 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.

<sup>22</sup> 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>).

<sup>23</sup> 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.

<sup>24</sup> 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.

### **Distinguished Research Lectures**

The Academic Senate Committee on Research is now accepting three-way nominations for the Distinguished Research Lectures (DRL). Twice per year this distinction proudly acknowledges the Basic, Translational, or Clinical Research achievements made by a member of the Faculty of UCSF. Faculty members are asked to consider the contributions of their colleagues so that the University community may recognize their achievements.

This marks a change from prior years, when the Committee on Research awarded just two lectures, calls for which went out separately—once in the fall, another in the spring. With the addition of the Translational category, the Committee has opted to do this one annual call for all three categories.

**How to Submit a Nomination:** An original of the following information must be emailed, in one document (.JPG format) to Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst, UCSF Academic Senate office, no later than Noon, May 10, 2010:

- A letter of nomination.
- A one-page summary of the most outstanding achievements of the candidate's scientific/clinical research career.
- A current curriculum vita for nominee.
- Three letters of support from individual UCSF faculty only.
- Four representative reprints of the candidate's publications.
- One of the nominating faculty must be available to present the candidate to the Committee on Research at the selection meeting <<give date, time and location>>

**DATE OF LECTURE:** <<add date here – usually it is Spring>> on Parnassus Campus

**NOTE:** Please confirm in your letter that the nominee will be available to give his/her lecture on the date and time for this event. The date, time and location cannot be changed.

Nominations must fulfill the following general criteria **and** one of the specific Distinguished Lecture categories.

**General Criteria for Nomination/Selection:** A distinguished UCSF Faculty member who:

1. Has had a substantial scholarly record and an international reputation
2. Has had a marked impact on the UCSF community (e.g. mentorship of others, leadership of research units, etc.) - is an exceptional or even inspirational individual
3. Has not been honored with another Academic Senate research lectureship
4. Is a member of any UCSF school/department

### **Category Criteria for Nomination/Selection**

#### **1. Distinguished Lecture in Basic Science Research**

- A distinguished UCSF Faculty member who has conducted Basic (laboratory or bench) science research at UCSF

#### **2. Distinguished Lecture in Translational Research**

- A distinguished UCSF Faculty member who has conducted translational research at UCSF, which may include laboratory-based research aimed at clarifying mechanisms of disease; developing measures or markers of disease presence, severity, or improvement; and developing drugs, devices, or interventions to treat disease or to improve health.

OR

- Has conducted translational research that generally identifies community, patient, clinician, and organizational factors that serve as barriers and facilitators to translation; develops novel intervention and implementation strategies to increase translation, such as quality improvement programs or policies; and evaluates the impact of strategies to increase translation of relevant healthy behaviors and processes of care.
- Translational which addresses translation from “bench to bedside” or “bedside to community” or “evidence to practice”.

#### **3. Distinguished Lecture in Clinical Research**

- A distinguished UCSF Faculty member who has conducted patient-oriented research at UCSF, including studies in human subjects including surveys, cross-sectional studies, case series, case-control studies, cohort studies, first-in-human, proof of principle, and all phases of clinical trials.
- Patient oriented research may include behavioral science, policy research, global health sciences research, which has had a major impact on patient care or public health.