

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

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

### **Procedures for Proposals for New Graduate Degree Programs**

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

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

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

### **Adding a Master's Degree to an Approved Doctoral Program**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Degree Programs**

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

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

### **Joint Programs**

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

### **Proposal Submission**

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

### **Steps in the CCGA Review Process**

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

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

---

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

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

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

#### Listing of Steps

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

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

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

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

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

### **Procedures for Proposals to Change Academic Programs and Units**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Policies Affecting Graduate Degree Programs**

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

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

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

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

### **Procedures for Proposals for New ORUs and MRUs**

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>3</sup> CCGA Annual Report, 1999-2000

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

<sup>5</sup> CCGA Annual Report, 2005-06