

HANDBOOK FOR **THE CREATION OF CSU/UC JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS**

This **Handbook** sets forth the information needed to plan and implement a joint CSU/UC doctoral degree. The administrative elements that need to be decided, the criteria for granting permission to negotiate, and the steps required for program reviews are outlined.

By mutual agreement, program proposals use the forms and criteria developed by the UC Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), which conducts a phase of the academic review. Therefore, the relevant appendices from the *CCGA Handbook* are attached.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Getting Started
3. Permission to Negotiate
4. Planning
5. Program Proposal
6. Program Review Criteria
7. Program Review Process
8. Financial Support

Attachments - *CCGA Handbook*:

- I. Appendix U: Criteria for Reviewing Proposed Joint UC/CSU Doctoral Programs
- II. Appendix B: Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal
- III. Appendix H: Information about Degree Proposals of Interest to State Authorities

HANDBOOK FOR **THE CREATION OF CSU/UC JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS**

1. INTRODUCTION

The State of California Education Code (section 66010.4) defines the functions of the segments of higher education and states that:

The University of California shall have the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctor's degree in all fields of learning except that it may agree with the California State University to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields.

Joint doctoral programs are partnerships between UC and CSU that build on the strengths of the participating campuses to generate specialized programs that could not otherwise be realized. Joint Doctoral programs benefit both systems, the students, and the State. The program strengths and research interests of the proposing UC and CSU departments complement and reinforce each other to create programs of high quality. The combination broadens the base upon which the program is being developed and provides a wider range of curricula options. The first joint doctoral degree was established in 1965, a doctoral program in Chemistry between San Diego State University and UC San Diego. As of March 2022, a total of 22 are in operation, and more are in the planning stages.

Joint doctoral programs necessarily involve institutions with different organizational cultures, perspectives, and priorities. These differences can yield a program richer in academic opportunities than any single institution could create, but they require program developers to be especially ingenious, persistent, and respectful. Certain basic principles underlie all joint doctoral programs:

- Joint doctoral degrees are awarded jointly by the Trustees of the California State University and the Regents of the University of California.
- In the development and operation of joint doctoral programs the CSU and UC partners have equal status.
- All program decisions are made jointly and by mutual agreement between participating UC and CSU campuses.
- The programs respond to a societal need that is best met by members of the faculties from both systems, calls on the expertise of both, and cannot be met by existing programs.
- By combining the intellectual and physical resources of the two systems, the joint degree programs can provide opportunities for research collaboration and sharing of equipment.

2. GETTING STARTED

Joint Programs often begin with informal conversations between faculty members in complementary disciplines at UC and CSU. In some cases, there may already be some cooperative activities between the two campuses and/or departments. One or both departments may recognize a need that cannot be met internally without an infusion of new resources but that might be met with less resource enhancement through joint effort. When conversations progress to a point where a preliminary plan outline can be written, the partners seek approval for that outline from the appropriate campus administrative and/or academic offices. The campus administrations then take the next step -- seeking "permission to negotiate."

3. PERMISSION TO NEGOTIATE

When the joint degree program has been approved in principle by the campus administrations, each participating campus makes a formal request to its system office for "permission to negotiate." An expression of interest in and the rationale for a joint doctoral program is submitted by the CSU campus to the Office of Academic Programs, Innovation and Faculty Development at the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and by the UC campus to the Academic Affairs Department at the UC Office of the President. The initial expression of interest contains an indication of program need and supporting evidence of the requesting department's ability to offer the appropriate instruction. In granting permission to negotiate, the systems may use a number of criteria, some of which are spelled out in *Appendix U* of the *Handbook* of UC's Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) ¹ and some of which are internal to the CSU system. Criteria for granting permission to negotiate may include:

- demonstrated interest by faculty members from the proposing departments/campuses in participating in the program, and the potential benefits to be derived, including a brief description of the societal needs that the program would meet.
- the availability of faculty with expertise in the discipline of the proposed joint doctoral program, and their qualifications including degrees, honors, grants, professional and other experience, publications and other matters pertinent to judging qualifications to guide advanced graduate work;
- the adequacy of existing staff and facilities for support of the program with only minimal additional resources;
- experience of the academic unit with graduate study, degrees offered, number of degrees awarded, year in which each graduate program was authorized;
- the existence of a parallel or closely related doctoral program at the UC campus in the discipline in which the joint doctoral program is being proposed. (If there is no existing program, the proposers must show that the degree is appropriate for the field in which the joint doctoral program is being proposed.)

¹ Attachment I contains the full text of the *CCGA Handbook - Appendix U*, "Criteria for Reviewing Joint UC/CSU Doctoral programs" which sets forth the criteria for evaluating the request for permission to negotiate and for review of the proposal itself.

Receipt of the preliminary proposal is acknowledged, and comments on the initial proposal with respect to desirability, appropriateness, evidence of need, and feasibility may be sent back to the campuses by the system offices. When all queries have been satisfactorily answered, permission to negotiate is granted.

Formal permission to negotiate is granted by the system offices. Each system office also notifies the other when permission to negotiate has been granted, and this information too is passed on to the partnering campuses. Every effort is made to ensure that the systems work in tandem and that permission to negotiate is granted by each at approximately the same time so as not to delay the planning process. At this time, campuses may officially project the proposed program on their ten-year overview, completed during the annual academic master plan process, which is subject to Trustee approval.

4. PLANNING

Once permission to negotiate is granted by both systems, the planning phase begins in earnest and the campuses involved must then work out the specific details of the program. The academic plan is fundamental, and must include the program objectives, the admissions requirements, curriculum, examinations, and dissertation or thesis requirements. An implementation timeline, enrollment projections, and resource needs are also required. Joint doctorates have special needs, above and beyond those of graduate programs on a single campus. Given the complexities of working within two systems, such matters as division of labor and appropriate procedures cannot simply be taken for granted. Careful attention must be paid to these issues if a successful and effective program is to be created. While all details do not need to be worked out at the time the formal proposal is submitted, at some point in the planning process, the partners need to consider and reach agreement on, the issues described below.

Decision-Making: An agreement should make clear which entities have responsibility for making what types of decisions for the program and should indicate how differences may be resolved. Committees that make decisions for the program as a whole (e.g., admissions, curricular coordination and modification, administrative coordination, and procedural modification) should include representation from at least one CSU partner institution and at least one UC partner institution.

Co-Directors: Ordinarily, there will be one co-director whose primary affiliation is with the CSU and one co-director whose primary affiliation is with UC. If more than two institutions are in partnership, the program may have additional co-directors or a small group advising the co-directors on administration of the program. It is desirable for each co-director to have extensive knowledge of his or her own institution's policies and procedures and critical for the co-directors to be in frequent communication.

Faculty Participation: The program needs to have a jointly developed set of criteria for faculty members to participate in the program, and the process of applying the criteria should be conducted jointly. The criteria may differ for different levels of participation (e.g., teaching a required or elective course in the program, providing academic support, participating in the development of qualifying examinations, serving as a member of a dissertation committee, chairing a dissertation committee). The program may wish to consider faculty members participating only at certain levels to be the “joint doctoral program faculty.” The criteria apply equally to faculty members at all participating institutions. (A CSU or UC faculty member who has an appropriate specialization and meets the applicable criteria is understood to be qualified to teach a particular course in the program or chair a particular dissertation committee.) Provisions may be made for some degree of participation by faculty members in institutions other than the partner institutions.

Deans and Chairs: The roles of deans and chairs in joint doctoral programs should be delineated explicitly.

Admissions: Just as the criteria for admission are to be established jointly by the partner institutions, the admission decisions should be made jointly. From the student’s perspective, there should be a single, unitary process for admission to the joint doctoral program. The student should apply just once to the joint doctoral program—the application should include all the information needed by any partner institution—and receive just one confirmation of admission decision (e.g., admission, conditional admission, wait-listing, or rejection). Any faculty admissions committee should include representation from the CSU and from UC. The partnering institutions should establish a procedure for deciding how many students are to be admitted annually and the target “rolling average” of students in the program at any particular time. Once admitted, the student should be considered to be matriculated at a minimum of one CSU partner institution and a minimum of one UC partner institution.

Program Advisement: At least one person at each partnering institution who is thoroughly familiar with all operational aspects of the joint doctoral program (academic and logistic) should be designated as a person from whom any student in the program can seek advice. The individuals serving in this capacity at the different institutions should maintain regular communication.

Residency: Joint doctoral programs usually have agreements on minimum “residency” at CSU or UC. Being “in residence” or earning “residence credit” needs to be defined carefully. The definition may or may not involve physical presence at a partnering institution. It must be coordinated with the fee payment and enrollment policies.

Fees: Partnering institutions must have a clear understanding of how to determine to which institution(s) the students should pay tuition/fees and what charges apply. If for the duration of a single academic term a joint doctoral student will be enrolled in courses at just one partner institution, it is usually expected that the student will register and pay tuition/fees at the institution in which he or she is enrolled that term. The understanding, however, should also cover the case in which a student is enrolled in courses at more than one partner institution simultaneously for all or part of an academic term. The inter-institutional agreement needs to be consistent with all applicable laws and policies, including policies on minimum “residence credit” at partner institutions.

Courses and Course Requirements: Curricular requirements need to be established jointly, and the partners should attend to the patterns of course offerings (which institution offers which courses; when courses are offered—what time of year, which days of the week, what time of day, how frequently; what modes of instruction—possibly including synchronous or asynchronous distance learning—are appropriate for which courses). CSU and UC partner institutions will offer post-master’s-level courses in the joint doctoral program. Procedures for adding courses or changing requirements need to be specified.

Examinations: The partners should spell out the nature and consequences of qualifying examinations, including how their development is shared and what happens to students who fail all or part of an examination.

Dissertations: Dissertation standards and procedures should be jointly established and administered. They should be specific enough to indicate the types of research deemed acceptable (e.g., quantitative, laboratory-based, ethnographic). Dissertation committees (or other student-specific committees) will ordinarily include at least two faculty member from a CSU partner institution and at least two faculty member from UC. Exceptions should be approved by a group that includes representation from both CSU and UC.

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) covering the agreed-upon elements should guide the administration of joint doctoral programs. The MOU may be different for newly established programs and mature programs, and the agreement should be reviewed and updated periodically.

5. PROGRAM PROPOSAL

An ad hoc joint committee of the cooperating units prepares a final proposal. The formal proposal, by mutual agreement, follows the guidelines set forth in the *CCGA Handbook - Appendix B*.² (This is the same information that is requested by CCGA for a graduate degree program proposal from a single UC campus.) A joint degree proposal should include the additional information needed to demonstrate that the proposed program meets all the criteria for approval of a joint degree as outlined in the *CCGA Handbook - Appendix U* (see Section 6. below and Attachment I). The proposal must indicate that the program has support from the faculty and departments involved. It need not contain all of the information contained in the MOU as long as clear understandings have been reached. There is some overlap, however, and information on e.g. examinations, registration, fees, etc. should be included in the proposal. For a detailed explanation of what should be included in the proposal, see the *CCGA Handbook – Appendix B* (Attachment I).

The completed proposal is submitted through local university administrative channels to the President of the University of California and the Chancellor of the California State University.

² Attachment II contains the full text of the *CCGA Handbook - Appendix B*, “Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal.

6. PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA

Criteria used by the CCGA in reviewing proposals, as outlined in the *CCGA Handbook - Appendix U*, include the following:

- that the proposed program has clear and valuable benefits for the participating departments or programs involved, e.g., because of special facilities or program strengths that each brings, or because of the unique expertise of particular faculty in the discipline which would enhance the academic quality of the program;
- that there is adequate student demand for the program by estimating student demand and providing related data and considering enrollment in relation to available spaces for similar programs, at its own campus and at other campuses, as the one being proposed; and that demand cannot be met by programs elsewhere;
- that there is a favorable job market for the program's graduates in both academic and/or non-academic arenas;
- that the existing or closely related doctoral program has the capacity to accommodate the additional students or such capacity is planned for; the additional burden of the proposed joint program can readily be accommodated on the campuses without substantial additional resources being required;
- that each participating campus has a faculty member (graduate advisor) responsible for and knowledgeable about the program and a staff member to support the faculty member and assist students;
- that a student's examination and doctoral committees will have at least four members of which at least two must come from a CSU campus and two from a UC campus;
- that the proposal is explicit about the location of registration and payment of fees throughout the program, and about the location of student support services, including assistance in securing financial support;
- that additional expenses that may be required (beyond those required by any new program at start-up) because of the need for joint activities be included in the budget submitted with the proposal.

When approved at the campus level, the proposal is submitted to UC Office of the President for transmittal to CCGA. The submission must be accompanied by an outline that includes information specific to the interests of state authorities.

The state interest requirements are spelled out in the *CCGA Handbook, Appendix H*.³

³ Attachment III contains the full text of *CCGA Handbook - Appendix D* "Information about Degree Proposals of Interest to State Authorities"

The summary should include basic information about the program: name, campuses, degree, date of initiation, purposes, type of students to be served, all new courses and other required courses, and special features such as internships, lab requirements, etc.

7. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The following steps comprise the review process for joint doctoral degrees:

Step 1 - Transmittal to UC and CSU system offices

The final proposal is sent to the Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs at the UC Office of the President and to the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs at the

CSU Office of the Chancellor. The UC Office of the President, Academic Affairs Division is responsible for making sure the proposal is complete and for forwarding it to CCGA for review.

Step 2 - Review by CCGA

CCGA conducts a preliminary review to determine whether or not to move forward with a full review of the proposal, or whether the Committee wishes to obtain additional information.

If CCGA or the CSU Office of the Chancellor requires more information, the proposal is sent back to the campuses for revision.

In the interest of moving the proposal along as expeditiously as possible, the reviews by these two bodies take place simultaneously. During this process, CCGA may request additional information or answers to specific questions. Such requests are transmitted through the system offices to the program participants, and the responses are transmitted through the same channels. CCGA has agreed to complete its review of program proposals within 60 days of receipt of the document.

CSU partners will also need to request approval for a new program at the doctoral level from the regional accrediting agency, the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The campus Accreditation Liaison Office should submit the appropriate Substantive Change request to WSCUC as soon as the program proposal is submitted to the CSU Office of the Chancellor and the CCGA.

In the event that there are differences in CSU and UC system recommendations regarding a proposed program, the CSU/UC Joint Graduate Board reviews and approves the degree proposal.

Step 3 - Final Approval

After approval by the CCGA, and/or Joint Graduate Board, if necessary, the recommendation to implement the program goes to the Chancellor of the CSU and the President of UC who, in turn, notify the campuses.

8. FINANCIAL SUPPORT

It has long been recognized that joint programs generate expenses over and above those associated with single campus programs. The system offices *may* provide some additional support to assist joint programs during the planning phase to cover costs of travel, materials, mailings, or staff release-time in order to facilitate meetings between the participants and move the planning process forward. Campuses should be aware that joint programs continue to generate additional costs, even when enrollments have reached target levels, because of the need for coordination between two or more institutions.

ATTACHMENT I

CCGA Handbook: Appendix U Criteria for Reviewing Proposed Joint UC/CSU Doctoral Programs

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

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

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

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

CCGA Handbook: Appendix U

Criteria for Reviewing Proposed Joint UC/CSU Doctoral Programs

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

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

Title

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

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

Date of Preparation

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

Contact Information Sheet

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

Executive Summary

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

Section 1. Introduction

A statement setting forth the following:

- 1) Aims and objectives of the program. Any distinctive features of the program should also be

noted. Include a description of the expected profile of the target audience (e.g., educational background; work experience; proportion of in-state, out-of-state, and international students).

- 2) Historical development of the field and historical development of departmental strength in the field.
- 3) Timetable for development of the program, including enrollment projects. Consistency of these projections with the campus enrollment plan. If the campus has enrollment quotas for its programs, state which program(s) will have their enrollments reduced in order to accommodate the proposed program.
- 4) Relation of the proposed program to existing programs on campus and to the Campus Academic Plan. If the program is not in the Campus Academic Plan, why is it important that it be begun now? Evidence of high campus priority. Effect of the proposed program on undergraduate programs offered by the sponsoring department(s). In the case of SSGPDP, explain clearly how any possible negative effects on existing graduate and undergraduate programs will be avoided or mitigated.
- 5) Contributions to diversity: All proposals must include (a) a vision for how the program will advance UC's goals for diversity and (b) a plan that details what steps the program will take in its first five years to move toward the identification, recruitment, and retention of underrepresented minority students and faculty. The proposal should clearly document the ways in which the program will evaluate its diversity goals. (Added August 2019.)
- 6) Interrelationship of the program with other University of California institutions, if applicable. The possibility of cooperation or competition with other programs within the University should be discussed. Proposers should make themselves aware of any similar proposals for new programs that may be in preparation on other campuses. Proponents are required to send copies of their proposal to the chairs (or program directors) of all departments (or programs) on other campuses offering similar degrees, with a cover letter such as the sample provided at the end of this Appendix. Any feedback received from these chairs should be included in the full submission. This solicitation is most useful if it occurs early enough to allow the proposers to take advantage of any feedback before local campus review.
- 7) Department or group which will administer the program.
- 8) Plan for evaluation of the program within the offering departments(s), by the Academic Senate and campus wide.

Section 2. Program

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

- 1) Undergraduate preparation for admission.
- 2) Foreign language. "CCGA recognizes that foreign language competence may be an important element of graduate education of doctoral programs. It is the responsibility of the Divisional Graduate Councils to insure that the proponents of new doctoral programs have carefully considered the value of a foreign language requirement. We shall assume that when a proposal for a new doctoral degree has been forwarded to CCGA, this issue has been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Division. Divisional Graduate Councils should apply the same standard adopted for new programs in reviewing existing doctoral programs." (CCGA Minutes, 5/14/85, p.6)
- 3) Program of study:

- a) Specific fields of emphasis
 - b) Plan(s): Master's I (with thesis) and/or II (with comprehensive exam or capstone); Doctor's A (5-member committee, mandatory oral defense) or B (3-member committee, optional oral defense)
 - c) Unit requirements
 - d) Required and recommended courses, including teaching requirement
 - e) (For Master's II only) Description of capstone element, either a comprehensive exam or an individual or group project (include details about supervision and evaluation)
 - f) When a degree program must have licensing or certification, the requirements of the agency or agencies involved should be listed in the proposal, especially the courses needed to satisfy such requirements (CCGA Minutes, 1/17/78, p.5)
- 4) Field examinations – written and/or oral.
 - 5) Qualifying examinations – written and/or oral.
 - 6) Thesis and/or dissertation.
 - 7) Final examination.
 - 8) Explanation of special requirements over and above Graduate Division minimum requirements.
 - 9) Relationship of master's and doctor's programs (if applicable).
 - 10) Special preparation for careers in teaching.
 - 11) Sample program.
 - 12) Normative time from matriculation to degree. (Assume student has no deficiencies and is full-time.) Also specify the normative lengths of time for pre-candidacy and for candidacy periods. (If normative time is subsequently lengthened to more than six years, prior approval of CCGA is required.) *Other incentives to support expeditious times-to-degree:* what policies or other incentives will assure that students make timely progress toward degree completion in the proposed program?

Section 3. Projected need

A statement setting forth the following:

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

- 6) Program Differentiation. How will the proposed program distinguish itself from existing UC and California independent university programs, from similar programs proposed by other UC campuses? Statistics or other detailed documentation of need should be provided.

Section 4. Faculty

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

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

SSGPDPs: please also refer to Appendix K for additional information required to be included.

Section 5. Courses

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

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

Section 6. Resource requirements

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

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

Indicate the intended method of funding these additional costs.

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

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

Section 7. Graduate Student Support

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

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

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

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

Section 8. Governance

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

Section 9. Changes in Senate Regulations

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

Optional Appendices

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

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

(to be sent to all appropriate chairs or

program directors)Dear Chair (or Program

Director),

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

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

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

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

CCGA Handbook: Appendix H Information about Degree Proposals of Interest to State Authorities

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

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

Student demand

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

Societal need

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

Appropriateness to the institutional and system mission

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

Number of existing and proposed programs in the field

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

Total Costs of the Program

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

and in the long run.

Maintenance and improvement of quality

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

Advancement of Knowledge

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

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