



Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units

December 2024

Table of Contents

Preface.....	4
Introduction	7
I. Campus Five-Year Planning Perspectives for Academic Programs and Academic Units.....	9
II. Academic Degree Programs	12
II.A. Undergraduate Degree Programs.....	12
II.A.1. Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Degree Programs.....	12
II.B. Graduate Degree Programs	13
II.B.1. Establishment of New Graduate Degree Programs.....	13
II.B.2. Name Changes of Graduate Degree Programs	15
II.B.3. Joint and Dual Degree Graduate Degree Programs.....	16
II.B.3.a. Establishment of New Joint Graduate Degree Programs.....	16
II.B.3.b. Establishment of New Dual Degree Graduate Programs	16
II.B.4. Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs and Programs with Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition.....	17
II.C. Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs with Unique Titles	17
II.D. Interdepartmental Graduate Programs.....	20
II.E. Graduate Academic Certificate Programs.....	20
III. Academic Units.....	21
III.A. Departments.....	21
III.B. Schools and Colleges.....	21
III.B.1. Establishment of New Schools and Colleges	21
III.B.2 Name Changes of Schools and Colleges	25
IV. Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Academic Units.....	27
IV.A. Transfer, Consolidation, or Discontinuance of Undergraduate Programs	27
IV.B. Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuance, or Disestablishment of Graduate Degree Programs	28
IV.C. Transfer, Consolidation, or Disestablishment of Academic Units.....	29
V. Research Units.....	32
V.A. Organized Research Units (ORUs)	32
V.B. Multicampus Research Units (MRUs).....	33
V.B.1. Establishment of New Multicampus Research Units	33
V.B.2. Multicampus Research Unit Leadership & Appointments, Administrative Operations, and Annual Reports	36
V.B.3. Procedure for Five-Year Reviews	37

V.B.4. Name Changes of Multicampus Research Units	38
V.B.5. Sunset Reviews of Multicampus Research Units.....	39
V.B.6. Disestablishment of Multicampus Research Units	40
VI. Systemwide Academic Units	41
VI.A. Systemwide Schools	41
VII. Accelerated Review Schedule for any Action.....	42
VIII. Role of the Academic Planning Council.....	44
IX. List of Appendices.....	45
Appendix A: Glossary of Terms	46
Appendix B: State Program Review Principles	53
Appendix C.1: Review Process Flow Chart – New Graduate Degree Programs.....	55
Appendix C.2: Review Process Flow Chart – Name Changes for Graduate Degree Programs	56
Appendix C.3: Review Process Flow Chart - Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuance, or Disestablishment (TCDD) of Graduate Degree Programs.....	57
Appendix C.4: Review Process Flow Chart – New Schools and Colleges.....	58
Appendix C.5: Review Process Flow Chart – Reconstitutions of Academic Units.....	59
Appendix D: Systemwide Professional School Planning: Recommended Guidelines and Model, 2004	60
Appendix E: UCOP Policy on Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuance, and Disestablishment of Academic Programs and Units, 1979.....	64
Appendix F: Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Multicampus Research Units	67

Preface

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 systemwide review processes and, to the extent possible within the established review framework, instituted changes to increase efficiency without reducing effectiveness. Subcommittee members strove to conform to, rather than change, existing rules, regulations, and policies. The APC Subcommittee adopted practices such as: conducting concurrent reviews; directly distributing proposals to reviewing agencies; increasing accountability of reviewing agencies; assigning a coordinator for multiple reviewing agencies; providing feedback on campuses' preliminary plans; requiring pre-approvals; separating extraordinary cases from routine handling; reducing reporting; and leveraging electronic communications. In addition to streamlining established systemwide review processes, the Compendium formalized other review processes, most notably those for transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance actions.

In 1997-98, APC established the APC Ad Hoc Compendium Review Subcommittee to learn how the campuses and the system-level office had received the Compendium. This effort addressed problems identified in the preceding years and improved efficiencies without reducing the effectiveness of the document. The most significant changes included: elimination of systemwide review and approval processes for actions involving undergraduate degree programs, departments, and organized research units (ORUs); simplification of the Five-Year Plans (renamed the "Five-Year Perspectives"); and clarification of "simple" name changes for graduate degree programs and multi-campus research units (MRUs).

The 2009-10 review paid renewed attention to large academic planning issues (new Schools and *Five-Year Planning Perspective*) and budget issues. This focus arose from the Senate's review of four proposals for new schools during 2007-08 (public health and nursing at UC Davis as well as public policy and medicine at UC Riverside). Another theme in this review was reinvigoration—and renaming—of the *Five-Year Planning Perspective*. A 14-member task force of faculty, Senate Directors, Senate staff, campus administrators, and system-level administrators undertook the most recent review. The group acknowledged processes in the Compendium that have worked well over the past ten years, including rigorous reviews of proposed new graduate programs. The review protocol developed by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs for this purpose was formalized in this edition of the Compendium.

2014 revisions to the Compendium include requiring biennial instead of annual submission of *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* and eliminating research unit reporting in the *Perspectives*; clarifying when changes to undergraduate programs require system-level review; eliminating references to the California Postsecondary Education Commission which was defunded in 2011; modifying the trigger for Joint Graduate Board review of joint degree programs; and clarifying and updating the Research sections.

Committees Responsible for Compendium Preparation and Revision

1993-94 APC Subcommittee for Expediting Systemwide Review Processes

Chair: Aimée Dorr, UCLA, CCGA Chair
Arnold Binder, UCI, Academic Council Chair
Karen Merritt, UCOP, Director, Academic Planning and Program Review
Daniel Simmons, UCD, Academic Council Vice Chair
Mohan Sitlani, UCOP, Coordinator, Program Review
Neil Smelser, UCB, Special Adviser to the UC Office of the President

1997-98 APC Ad Hoc Compendium Review Subcommittee

Chair: Aimée Dorr, UCLA, Academic Council Vice Chair
Carroll Cross, UCD, UCORP Chair
Michael Hanemann, UCB, CCGA Chair
Rulon Linford, UCOP, Associate Vice Provost for Research and Laboratory Programs
Janice Plastino, UCI, UCEP Chair
Dwight Read, UCLA, University Committee on Planning and Budget Vice Chair
Carol Tomlinson-Keasey, UCOP, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives
Julius Zelmanowitz, UCSB, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel

1997-98 Subcommittee of Staff Involved in System-Level Reviews

Chair: Aimée Dorr, UCLA, Academic Council Vice Chair
Jennifer Lynch, UCOP, Office of Research Assistant Analyst
Carol McClain, UCOP, Director of Multicampus Research Planning and Programs
Karen Merritt, UCOP, Director of Academic Program Review
Mohan Sitlani, UCOP, Principal Policy Analyst for Academic Initiatives
Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Academic Senate Analyst
Jeannene Whalen, UC Academic Senate, CCGA Analyst

2009-10 Compendium Task Force

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

2012-13 Academic Planning Council

Chair: Aimée Dorr, UC Provost and Executive Vice President

Vice Chair: Robert Powell, Academic Council, Chair

Susan Carlson, UCOP, Vice Provost – Academic Personnel

Joseph Childers, UCR, Graduate Dean

Robin Garrell, UCLA, Graduate Dean

Harry W. Green, UCAP, Chair

Ralph J. Hexter, UCD, Provost and EVC

William Jacob, Academic Council, Vice Chair

Michael Kleeman, UCORP, Chair

Joseph Konopelski, UCSC, Division Chair

Jane Fiori Lawrence, UCM, Undergraduate Dean

Christina Maslach, UCB, Division Chair

Meredith Michaels, UCI, VCPB

Jean-Bernard Minster, UCPB, Chair

Ruth Mulnard, CCGA, Chair

Debora Obley, UCOP, Associate Vice President – Budget Operations

Barbara Sawrey, UCSD, Undergraduate Dean

John Yoder, UCEP, Chair

2013-14 Academic Planning Council

Chair: Aimée Dorr, UC Provost and Executive Vice President

Vice Chair: William Jacob, Academic Council, Chair

Susan Carlson, UCOP, Vice Provost – Academic Personnel

Robert Clare, UCORP, Chair

Alison Galloway, UCSC, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Robin Garrell, UCLA, Graduate Dean

Mary Gilly, Academic Council, Vice Chair

Harry W. Green, UCAP, Chair

Ralph J. Hexter, UCD, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Joseph Konopelski, UCSC, Division Chair

Tim Labor, UCEP, Chair

Jane Fiori Lawrence, UCM, Undergraduate Dean

Donald Mastronarde, CCGA, Chair

Meredith Michaels, UCI, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget

Debora Obley, UCOP, Associate Vice President – Budget Operations

Janice Reiff, UCLA, Division Chair

Barbara Sawrey, UCSD, Undergraduate Dean

Donald Senear, UCPB, Chair

Introduction

The Compendium presents system-level review processes for creating and modifying academic degree programs, academic units, and research units. It is designed to serve as a manual for the wide range of administrators, faculty, and staff who participate in these processes. Specifically, the Compendium articulates review processes for proposals to establish, transfer, consolidate, change the name of, discontinue, or disestablish graduate degree programs, schools, colleges, and research units. In addition, it sets forth the *Five-Year Planning Perspective* process in which each campus biennially prepares a list of anticipated academic program actions which it submits to the Office of the President. The Compendium also covers a variety of minor topics that sometimes arise with respect to systemwide review processes (e.g., accelerated reviews, disagreements between Senate and the Administration).

Chief among the Compendium's guiding principles is that *academic programs, academic units, and research units work best when both faculty and administrators support them*. All review and approval processes should promote mutual endorsement of any proposed action. At the same time, the Regents explicitly delegated to the faculty responsibility for courses and curricula. Through the [Bylaws of the Academic Senate](#), the faculty have placed authority for review of graduate programs with a systemwide Senate committee (Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs) and authority for review of undergraduate programs with Divisional committees responsible for undergraduate education (including the approval of new courses). Administrators at the campus and system levels retain authority for academic units and research units. The Compendium processes reflect the delegation and distribution of faculty and administrative powers on the campuses and systemwide shared governance.

Compendium processes, most notably the *Five-Year Planning Perspective*, are also intended to promote the coordination, synergy, and trade-offs possible when UC operates as a system of campuses in one university while simultaneously recognizing the vigor and individuality of the campuses. Intercampus communication and systemwide perspectives are most valuable early in the campus process of developing a proposal. Compendium processes strive to frame each anticipated proposal in the context of UC as a whole and to do so early in the proposal development process.

The Compendium refers to several individuals, committees, and agencies who participate in systemwide reviews. Their roles vary according to their mission, the proposed action, and the type of academic program, academic unit, or research unit involved. In almost all cases, individuals named may act through a designee to carry out routine responsibilities related to Compendium reviews and processes. A glossary of titles and acronyms used in the Compendium can be found at the end of the text. The Compendium is divided into five principal parts:

1. Section I covers processes for preparing and distributing information on campus academic program actions anticipated over the next five years.

2. Sections II through VI cover systemwide review processes for academic programs, academic units, and research units.
3. Sections VII through VIII cover accelerated reviews and the role of the Academic Planning Council.
4. The Compendium Glossary (included among the appendices) provides explanations about the various people, committees, organizations, and terms involved in systemwide review processes.
5. Other appendices provide flow charts, details of some review processes, and background documents.

The heart of the Compendium is Sections II through VI and their associated appendices: Section II covers *undergraduate and graduate degree programs*; Section III covers *Academic Units* (including departments, schools, and colleges); Section IV covers *Reconstitutions* (combinations and/or eliminations of two or more major actions as part of a unified plan by campus proponents); Section V covers *Organized and Multicampus Research Units* (MRUs); and Section VI covers *Systemwide Entities*.

The three major types of actions described in these sections are: 1) establishing a new program or unit, 2) changing the name of an existing program or unit, and 3) transferring, consolidating, discontinuing, and disestablishing an existing program or unit. (Note that campuses are responsible for actions related to departments.) Each part of Sections II through VI generally follow the same format: introduction followed by details of the process presented in rough chronological order. The processes outlined reflect efficiencies adopted in the original Compendium and extend them wherever possible (e.g., through use of email and web sites rather than via paper transmission).

I. Campus *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* for Academic Programs and Academic Units

Every other year campuses submit *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* to the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) that list the anticipated actions to create and/or transfer, consolidate, disestablish, or discontinue (TCDD) undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, schools, and colleges. With the *Perspectives*, campuses have the opportunity to gather information useful to their own long-range planning efforts. In addition, integrating lists from all ten campuses allows for systemwide analysis of academic plans and creates an opportunity to promote coordination, synergy, and specialization. The preliminary picture offered by the *Perspectives* is especially useful because this systemwide context can prompt valuable discussion in the early stages of proposal development.

UCOP collects and analyzes *Perspectives* data, distributes it to select groups, and posts it on the UCOP website. The Academic Planning Council, select administrators, the Senate Divisions, and three systemwide Senate committees—the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB)—are the primary groups that provide commentary on the *Perspectives*. The University formerly submitted campus *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). While *Perspectives* reports are no longer sent directly to the state, information from these reports has the potential to be used in other reports to a wide range of stakeholder groups, including the Governor’s Office, the Department of Finance, and the UC Regents.¹

Details of the Process

1. **Two-Year Reporting Cycle** - *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* are submitted and reviewed biennially in even-numbered years.
2. **Content** - Each *Five-Year Planning Perspective* contains:
 - A list of undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, departments, schools, and colleges for which the campus anticipates any action (establish or TCDD) within the next five years.
 1. This includes proposals at all stages, whether nascent plans under discussion or fully formed proposals undergoing campus review. The intent is to provide information about proposals as early as possible in their development.
 2. The number of years each proposal has been listed on the *Perspective* should be cited. No entry should remain longer than three years, or two reporting cycles, without discernible activity or development.

¹ Although *Perspectives* reports are no longer sent directly to the state, the rules governing CPEC remain active and, thus, there is the possibility that these reports will once again be sent to the state.

- Disposition of items on previous *Perspectives* (e.g., items that were approved, rejected, postponed, withdrawn, etc.). If a proposed action is listed for more than three years—or two reporting cycles—with no discernible activity or development, then a one-page rationale must be enclosed explaining why the proposal remains under consideration.

3. **Timeline** - In even-numbered years:

- Month One: Each Chancellor submits a campus *Perspective* to the Divisional Senate Chair for review.
- Month Three: Chancellors submit their *Perspectives* to the UC Provost. The UC Provost transmits the *Perspectives* to Academic Affairs staff for review, analysis, and updates to any relevant databases.
- Month Four: The UC Provost distributes campuses' *Perspectives* and analysis of systemwide trends to the Academic Council Chair (for CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB), the Chancellors (for EVCs, Graduate Deans, and Vice Provosts/Deans of Undergraduate Education), the Academic Planning Council, and others as appropriate.
- Months Four to Seven: Recipients may review, discuss, and provide feedback on the *Perspectives*. Systemwide issues of interest may include:
 1. Potential for cooperative planning;
 2. Similarities among anticipated actions as well as relationships between these actions and extant programs and units (both within and across campuses);
 3. Need for new resources or redirection of existing resources;
 4. Financial sustainability over time;
 5. Potential to enhance UC system or campus character or reputation;
 6. Convergence with state and national needs;
 7. Senate and administration involvement in proposal development and review.
- Month Eight: If forthcoming, comments on the *Perspectives* should be sent to the UC Provost. Senate committee comments (i.e., CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB) should be sent via the Academic Council Chair to the UC Provost.
- Month Nine: The Provost or his/her designee posts on a UCOP website the final *Perspectives* report, to include components such as summaries, analyses, and comments.
- Months Nine to Twelve: At the discretion of the APC Chair and Vice Chair, the *Perspectives* report and comments may be placed on the APC agenda. APC may recommend approaches to address issues of interest, refer issues to other parties for further examination, gather expert advice, and/or create an ad hoc study group. If APC pursues such options, the Chair and Vice Chair send

the Chancellors and other relevant groups a joint letter identifying issues that may affect campus planning.

4. Follow-up on the previous cycle of *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* as well as preparations for the next cycle occur in odd-numbered years.

II. Academic Degree Programs

Undergraduate and graduate degree programs are identified both by the title of the degree conferred and by the disciplinary area in which the degree is awarded. As one example, a B.S. in Mathematics is an undergraduate degree program with the Bachelor of Science degree title in the disciplinary area of mathematics. As another example, an M.F.A. in Theater is a graduate degree program with the Master of Fine Arts degree title in the disciplinary area of theater.

II.A. Undergraduate Degree Programs

With the exception of the four scenarios described below, **all actions involving undergraduate degree programs are administered by the individual campuses and do not undergo system-level review.** Examples of campus-only action include creating a new undergraduate degree program, changing the name of an existing undergraduate degree program, and consolidating, transferring, or discontinuing an existing undergraduate degree program. All undergraduate degree programs must be offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, or other appropriate academic units of the University. Implementation of any of these actions is subject to approval by the respective Divisional Academic Senate and endorsement by the campus administration. Anticipated actions involving undergraduate degree programs should be identified in the *Five-Year Planning Perspective*.

The scenarios that are the exception to campus-only action in connection with undergraduate degree programs and that trigger system-level review are as follows:

- 1) establishment of a hybrid undergraduate/graduate degree program (Section II.A.1);
- 2) creation of an undergraduate degree title unique to the campus (e.g., the first-ever B.F.A. program on the campus) (Section II.C.);
- 3) discontinuance of an undergraduate degree title that is the last of its kind on a campus; (Section II.C.) and
- 4) discontinuance of an undergraduate degree program that is the last of its kind in the UC system (Section IV.A).

In a few cases, undergraduate degree programs may be subject to a Substantive Change Review by UC's accrediting agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). WSCUC defines a 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 where 50% or more of instruction will be offered online or at a degree level for which the campus does not have general authority. Please consult WSCUC resources online for updated information.

II.A.1. Undergraduate/Graduate Hybrid Degree Programs

Undergraduate/Graduate hybrid degree programs are programs that allow undergraduate students to complete undergraduate and graduate programs simultaneously. Approval of such hybrid degree programs requires particular attention to double-counting of units.

Proposals for hybrid programs must be sent simultaneously to the respective campus Divisional Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and Graduate Council. Upon receipt of the proposal, a joint subcommittee of these two standing committees reviews the proposed hybrid program. If approved, the hybrid program proposal is forwarded to CCGA per the guidelines laid out in Section II.B.1., *Establishment of New Graduate Degree Programs*.

Details of the Process

1. A campus should include the anticipated action for the undergraduate/graduate hybrid degree program in its *Five-Year Planning Perspective* as early as possible in the proposal development stage.
2. Both the Divisional Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the campus Graduate Council review the proposal.
3. If approved at the campus, the proposal is forwarded to CCGA and follows the approval process for new graduate degree programs.

II.B. Graduate Degree Programs

II.B.1. Establishment of New Graduate Degree Programs

Campuses should include in their *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* new graduate degree program proposals as early as possible in the proposal development process. UCOP and CCGA review proposals for all new graduate degree programs, including self-supporting and professional degree programs, programs with Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition, multi-campus programs, programs offered jointly with other higher education institutions (e.g., CSU), and dual degree programs.²³

The elements required in a proposal for a new graduate degree are found in the [CCGA Handbook](#) in the section titled *Procedures for Proposals for New Graduate Degree Programs* and the format for graduate degree proposals is in Appendix B. Once submitted for system-level review, proposals are simultaneously considered by the Provost and by CCGA.⁴ **From submission to final approval by the President, system-level review typically takes up to six months. Depending on the strength of the proposal and the responsiveness of the proposers, the review period may extend beyond six months.**

New graduate programs may also be subject to a substantive change review from WSCUC. WSCUC defines a substantive change as “one that may significantly affect an

² Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program proposals must adhere to the same UC academic standards as other graduate degree programs.

³ For the review and re-review of joint UC-CSU programs, see Section II.B.3.

⁴ Until CPEC closed in November 2011, UC submitted for Commission review responses to a specialized questionnaire with information on graduate program proposals. The state is not currently requesting this information, though it may reinstate program review at a future time. Such action could require the University to resume additional data collection.

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 where 50% or more of instruction offered online or at a degree level for which the campus does not have general authority. Please consult WSCUC's *Manual for Programs, Instructional Locations, and Substantive Change and Degree-Level Approval Policy* for updated information.

Details of the Process

1. A campus should include in its *Five-Year Planning Perspective* each new graduate degree proposal as early as possible in the proposal development process.
2. Upon approval by the Divisional Senate and campus administration of the graduate degree program proposal, the Chancellor sends all required materials to the Provost, the Academic Council Chair, CCGA Chair, CCGA staff, and the Senate's email box for program review materials.
3. CCGA carries out its review which includes a full committee discussion; dialogue with program proponents to clarify issues and modify the proposal; conversation with campus administration if applicable; and proposal review by disciplinary experts (typically two external and two internal to UC). **From submission to final approval by the President, system-level review typically takes up to six months. Depending on the strength of the proposal and the responsiveness of the proposers, the review period may extend beyond six months.**
4. If CCGA recommends approval of the proposed graduate degree program, the CCGA Chair transmits the committee's approval and final report to the Provost, with copies to the Senate Chair, Senate Vice Chair, Senate Executive Director, Senate Assistant Director, CCGA, the IRAP Analyst, Divisional Graduate Dean, the Divisional Senate Director, and the Divisional Senate Analyst.

NOTE: If the proposed graduate degree program uses a degree title that has never been used before on the campus, additional reviews and approvals are required following CCGA's recommended approval of the degree program (see Section II.C. *Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs with Unique Titles*). In such cases, the CCGA Chair transmits the approval letter to the Academic Council Chair who places authorization of campus use of the new degree title on the agenda of the next meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. If there is no scheduled meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate within 30 days of CCGA approval of the graduate degree program, then, and in accord with Senate Bylaws, the matter is placed on the agenda of the Academic Council. If approved by the Academic Council, Council Chair forwards the program approval letter to the campus.

5. If the program is approved by the Senate (see 4. above), the Provost recommends the President approve the proposed graduate degree program for implementation.
6. After the President approves the proposed graduate degree program, the Provost

notifies the campus and CCGA by e-mail and an electronic record is kept at UCOP.⁵

II.B.2. Name Changes of Graduate Degree Programs

All proposed name changes for graduate degree programs must be forwarded to CCGA for system-level review. CCGA has the authority to deem a proposal either a “simple name change” or one that requires review of the program. The faculty member responsible for the degree program should consult with the Divisional Graduate Council Chair before formal submission to CCGA. If CCGA finds that the name change constitutes a fundamental modification of the program, or a change in degree requirements, or that substantial new resources are implicated, CCGA will conduct a review. This review will consist of an evaluation by two reviewers, one internal and one external, and submission of a full program proposal (as if the degree program is being proposed for the first time).

Details of the Process

When requesting a name change of a graduate degree program, the responsible faculty member(s) should consult with the Divisional Graduate Council Chair to determine whether or not the request constitutes a “simple” name change. A “simple” name change applies only when the name change does not also involve a fundamental modification of the program, a change in degree requirements or a need for substantial new resources.⁶ If any of these conditions exist, CCGA may request a review. In the case of a joint degree program, the other participating campuses or higher education institutions must also approve the name change and confirm that it does not signal a change in program fundamentals, requirements, or resources. Proposed name changes must conform to the Regents’ [*Policy on Naming Facilities to Include Full Name of Individual*](#).

The responsible faculty member prepares a brief proposal describing the rationale for a new name for the graduate degree program and certifying that there is no associated change in degree requirements of the program and/or any need for substantial new resources; the proposal is submitted to the Divisional Graduate Council.

1. The Divisional Graduate Council informs the Chancellor of the approval of the name change. If Graduate Council determines that the action does not involve a fundamental modification to the program, a change in the degree requirements, or a need for substantial new resources, the Chancellor favorably reviews the name change. If the Graduate Council determines that the action implicates substantive changes, the Divisional Graduate Council will ask CCGA to conduct a review of the program.
2. The campus transmits all materials from the responsible faculty members, Divisional Graduate Council, and Chancellor to CCGA for review. If CCGA concurs with the

⁵ The Provost sends notification of the outcome of the review to the Chancellor, with copies to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Academic Senate Divisional Chair, Graduate Dean, Graduate Council Analyst, Council Chair, CCGA Chair, CCGA Analyst, appropriate UCOP Academic Senate staff, and appropriate UCOP Academic Affairs staff.

⁶ Note that if the simple name change includes a change to the degree title (e.g., Master of Advanced Study to Master of Science) then the requirements for the new degree title must be met.

campus that the action is a “simple” name change, then systemwide review is complete and the campus decision is final. If CCGA concludes that the name change implicates substantive changes to the program, it will conduct a review. For such reviews, the campus must submit a full program proposal (as if the degree program is being proposed for the first time). The new program proposal must be approved by the Divisional Graduate Council before being submitted to CCGA for review.

3. After approval by the Divisional Graduate Council, CCGA will conduct a review with two reviewers, one external to UC and one internal to UC. Elements required for new graduate degree proposals are listed in the [CCGA Handbook](#), *Procedures for Proposals for New Graduate Degree Programs*, Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal.⁷

II.B.3. Joint and Dual Degree Graduate Degree Programs

II.B.3.a. Establishment of New Joint Graduate Degree Programs

The establishment of new joint graduate degree programs with other higher education institutions (usually CSU) mirrors the process laid out in Section II.B.1. *Establishment of New Graduate Degree Programs*. System-level review is required and all sponsoring parties must approve the proposal whether the joint degree involves only UC campuses or UC campuses in partnership with CSU. With regard to the latter, the Joint Graduate Board reviews and approves degree proposals only when there are differences in system recommendations regarding a proposed program.⁸

Over time, a basic philosophy of joint programs has emerged within the University. In particular, joint doctoral programs (JDPs) are designed to combine intellectual and physical resources for the benefit of campuses in both institutions and to meet a need not currently addressed within the University. Students enrolled in such programs take advantage of combined resources and disciplinary expertise. It is expected that research interests and program strengths of the proposing academic departments complement one another in synergistic fashion rather than duplicate existing offerings. These partnerships broaden the base for program development and provide greater depth of curricular and faculty resources.

II.B.3.b. Establishment of New Dual Degree Graduate Programs

A dual degree program is a program of study offered collaboratively by two institutions that leads to the award of two separate degrees from each of the participating institutions. This is in contrast to a joint degree program, which is a program that is offered collaboratively by two or more institutions and leads to the award of a single degree issued jointly by participating institutions. The establishment of new dual degree graduate degree program mirrors the process laid out in Section II.B.1. *Establishment of New Graduate Degree Programs*.

Typically, the partnering institution in a dual degree programs is accredited by WSCUC.

⁷ The President has delegated approval for formal name changes to the Provost in cases where it is necessary.

⁸ The Joint Graduate Board currently does not meet but the group could be assembled if needed.

As such, proposers of dual degree programs should consult the WSCUC guidance on this matter and, if necessary, explore the options for international non-accredited institutions for dual degree programs.⁹

II.B.4. Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs and Programs with Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition

Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) are programs that primarily serve professionals seeking to advance their careers. All program costs for SSGPDPs, both direct and indirect, are covered by revenues generated by the program such as student charges or other alternative revenues that are not disallowed funds. All SSGPDPs shall be fully self-supporting within three years of inception. Proposals to establish a SSGPDP and proposals to convert a state-supported graduate professional degree program to a SSGPDP should consult the [SSGPDP policy](#) prior to submission of the proposal for systemwide review.

Programs with Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) are those in which students are charged supplemental tuition in order to achieve and maintain excellence in the preparation of students for professional careers and effectively advance the mission and strategic academic plan of the given graduate professional degree program. Proposals to establish a program with PDST and proposals to convert non-PDST programs into ones with PDST should consult the [Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition](#) prior to submission of the proposal for systemwide review.

II.C. Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs with Unique Titles

After completing procedures described in Sections II.A and II.B, most proposed actions involving undergraduate and graduate degree programs are final. However, proposals to create a new degree title on a given campus or to eliminate an existing degree title from a campus require additional review and approval. These include amendments to Regents' Bylaws and Policies, namely those that specify degree titles each campus is authorized to confer. Note that, once a degree title is discontinued and is removed from the Regents' Bylaws and Policies, a campus must go through the entire review process to re-establish the degree title.

Details of the Process to Create a New Undergraduate Degree Title

1. The responsible Divisional Academic Senate committee approves the undergraduate degree program and sends the approved proposal to the Divisional Chair who places authorization of campus use of the new degree title on the agenda of the appropriate systemwide Senate body (ordinarily a legislative assembly or a governing board).
2. Campus use of the new degree title is approved by the appropriate Divisional Senate

⁹ WSCUC's Dual Degree Policy states: "Institutions seeking to partner with an international institution that is not accredited by a USDOE recognized accrediting agency must take steps to ensure that the partnering entity is appropriately licensed, approved or otherwise recognized by an appropriate governmental entity. Institutions should also exercise due diligence in investigating such entities to assure themselves of the quality of their offerings and the integrity of their operations."

body.

3. The Divisional Chair notifies the Chancellor of approval of both the degree title and the proposed undergraduate degree program. The Chancellor in turn notifies the Provost of the approvals and the campus administration's favorable review of these actions.
4. The Provost prepares a recommendation that the President authorize the campus' use of the new degree title (per delegation stated in Regents' Bylaws and Policies).
5. The President authorizes campus use of the new degree title and the Provost notifies the campus Chancellor with a copy to the Divisional Chair.
6. The Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents adds the degree title for the campus to the Regents' Bylaws and Policies.

Details of the Process to Discontinue a Unique Undergraduate Degree Title

1. The responsible Divisional Academic Senate committee approves discontinuance of the undergraduate degree program and notifies the Divisional Chair, Chancellor, Academic Council Chair, and Provost that there are no longer any undergraduate degree programs using the particular degree title on that campus.
2. If the degree title is still not being used on campus five years after the program discontinuance becomes effective, the Provost notifies the Chancellor with copies to the Academic Council Chair and Divisional Chair that in three months the President intends to remove the degree title from those the campus is authorized to confer under Regents' Bylaws and Policies.
3. If the Chancellor concurs or does not respond, then at the designated time, the President approves removal of the degree title from the Regents' Bylaws and Policies, and the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents removes it. The Academic Council Chair and the Divisional Chair are copied on this correspondence.
4. If the Chancellor does not concur, then the Chancellor, Divisional Chair, Academic Council Chair, and Provost confer to determine a (short) timetable for the campus to establish a new undergraduate degree program utilizing that title or to agree that the title should be retired from those the campus is authorized to use.

Details of the Process to Create a New Graduate Degree Title

1. CCGA approves the graduate degree program and sends the approved proposal to the Academic Council Chair who places authorization of campus use of the new degree title on the agenda of the next meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. If there is no scheduled meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate within 30 days of CCGA approval of the graduate degree program, then in accord with Senate Bylaws, the matter is placed on the agenda of the Academic Council.

2. Campus use of the new degree title is approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate or by the Academic Council acting on behalf of the Assembly of the Academic Senate.
3. The Academic Council Chair notifies the Provost of CCGA's approval of the graduate degree program and of Assembly's (or Academic Council's) approval of the degree title and copies the CCGA Chair, CCGA analyst, and the Divisional Chair.
4. The Provost prepares the recommendation (including the approvals from CCGA and the Assembly or Academic Council) to the President.
5. The President authorizes campus use of the new degree title and the Provost notifies the campus Chancellor, with copies to the Academic Council Chair, CCGA Chair, and Divisional Chair.
6. The Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents adds the degree title for the campus to the Regents' Bylaws and Policies.

Details of the Process to Discontinue a Unique Graduate Degree Title

1. The Divisional Graduate Council (and the appropriate Divisional Senate body) must approve all discontinuances of all unique graduate degree titles.
1. CCGA receives notice from the campus of the discontinuance of the graduate degree program or CCGA initiates the process to approve the discontinuance of the graduate degree program.¹⁰ CCGA notifies the Divisional Chair, Chancellor, Academic Council Chair, and Provost that there are no longer any graduate degree programs using the particular degree title on that campus.
2. If the degree title still is not being used on the campus five years after the program discontinuance becomes effective, the Provost notifies the Chancellor, with copies to the Academic Council Chair and Divisional Chair, that in three months the President intends to authorize removal of the degree title from those the campus is authorized to confer under Regents' Bylaws and Policies.
3. If the Chancellor concurs or does not respond, then at the designated time the President approves removal of the degree title from the Regents' Bylaws and Policies, and the Secretary and Chief of Staff removes it. The Academic Council Chair, CCGA Chair, and Divisional Council Chair are copied on this correspondence.
4. If the Chancellor does not concur, then the Chancellor, Divisional Chair, Academic Council Chair, and Provost confer to determine a (short) timetable for the campus to

¹⁰ CCGA may initiate the process to approve the discontinuance of the graduate degree program if it learns that the degree program has essentially been dormant for ten years or more (e.g., no students), or if it learns that a campus has plans to restart a dormant degree program with the same name but a different curriculum, thereby potentially bypassing a Divisional and CCGA review.

establish a new graduate degree program utilizing that title or to agree that the title should be retired from those the campus is authorized to use.

II.D. Interdepartmental Graduate Programs

CCGA requires that all proposals for interdepartmental graduate programs (IDP) or graduate groups include a set of governance bylaws as well as other information about campus commitment to the proposed program (e.g., teaching-assistantships, library resources, courses planned, etc.). For more information, please refer to the [CCGA Handbook](#).

II.E. Graduate Academic Certificate Programs

[Senate Regulation \(SR\) 735](#) authorizes Graduate Divisions to grant certificates of completion of graduate curriculum, also known as Graduate Academic Certificates (GACs). SR 735 requires that certificate programs, *except those offered by University Extension*, be approved by both the Divisional Graduate Council and CCGA. A GAC is defined as a certificate program that:

- a) does not require its students to be enrolled in another graduate program;
- b) is not offered solely through a UC Extension Program;
- c) has an independent admissions process that requires at least a baccalaureate degree for admission; and
- d) carries a minimum of 3 quarters (or 2 semesters) of full-time resident study.

Certificate program proposals that meet the above criteria and are approved by CCGA according to SR 735 will be recognized as the only GACs that bear the official seal of the University of California. UC campuses may offer certificates without the official seal that do not conform to SR 735 requirements (e.g., are offered in conjunction with other types of professional or academic degrees, and are not considered stand-alone programs). These certificates should be critically reviewed on the local campus.

Details of the Process

New GACs should be reviewed/approved first at the local campuses by the Divisional Graduate Council before being submitted for systemwide Senate review by CCGA. The systemwide review of GACs typically includes the following elements:

1. New GAC program proposals will be submitted to CCGA for review as full proposals similar to those for the Master and Ph.D. degree programs.
2. The review of a new GAC program at CCGA will involve at least one external expert reviewer.

III. Academic Units

Any aggregation of academic programs organized as a school, college, division, or another title, that appoints faculty members who are members of the Academic Senate and who vote as a unit under Academic Senate [Bylaw 55](#) shall be treated as an academic unit.

III.A. Departments

Actions involving departments are carried out on the ten established campuses and do not involve review by the system-level office. Such actions include creating a new department, changing the name of an existing department, and consolidating, transferring, or disestablishing an existing department. If approved by the appropriate agencies of the Divisional Academic Senate and by the campus administration, an action involving an academic program that appoints faculty who are members of the Academic Senate and who vote as a unit under Academic Senate [Bylaw 55](#) shall be reviewed as an action involving a department. Any proposed actions involving undergraduate or graduate degree programs associated with affected department(s) should be handled according to the procedures described for the proposed action for either undergraduate or graduate degree programs. All final campus actions involving departments should be reported by the Chancellor to system-level offices within a month of the action.

III.B. Schools and Colleges

III.B.1. Establishment of New Schools and Colleges

The establishment of new schools or colleges represents a significant outlay of resources, and should be given careful consideration by campus administration, Divisional and systemwide Academic Senates, system-level administration and, ultimately, the Regents. In the face of limited state support for new endeavors, rigor in the reviews of proposed new schools and colleges is very important.

Establishing a new school or college is a two-step process and takes at least two years to complete. At least one year before submitting a full proposal, proponents of the new school must submit a pre-proposal first to the Divisional Academic Senate and, if approved, subsequently to the systemwide Academic Senate and to system-level Administration.¹¹ Upon receipt by the systemwide Senate, the pre-proposal is reviewed by CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB as well as by any other systemwide standing committee selected by the Academic Council Chair. After campus proponents receive comments from both the systemwide Senate and system-level administration, the campus may prepare a full proposal. A full proposal is reviewed first by the Divisional Academic Senate and next (simultaneously) by systemwide Senate committees (CCGA, UCEP, UCPB, and any other chosen by the Academic Council Chair).

¹¹ A pre-proposal is required in all cases except when a substantial philanthropic gift is offered, deemed necessary for establishment, and contingent on the school's approval. In such cases, this requirement may be waived, and the campus will proceed directly to submission of a full proposal.

Approval of a new school or college requires favorable review by the systemwide Senate, approval recommendation by the President to the Board of Regents, and approval by the Board of Regents. If a campus fails to establish a new school or college within seven years of the date of Regental approval, it must submit a post-proposal. The post-proposal updates the original proposal and must provide a clear, compelling justification for the school or college in the context of a budgetary and curricular environment that may have changed since initial Regental approval.

Categories of Review

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 is of utmost importance. Equal weight should be placed on the academic merits of the program as on its financial aspects.
- B. **Financial Viability:** The proposal should stress the financial stability of the new school or college and should provide multi-year budgets with contingency plans in the event that proposed funding falls through. A detailed budget, including revenue sources, start-up costs, build-out costs, steady-state funding expectations, personnel costs, and capital costs/space needs must be provided. Failure to provide a detailed presentation and discussion of the budget will constitute cause for proposal rejection.
 - i. **FTE Requirements:** The proposal should clearly indicate the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty for each stage of development. This information should include the number of faculty FTEs needed at start-up, various stages of build-out, and steady-state. The balance between full-time faculty at various ranks and lecturers/other temporary or part-time teaching help also should be provided. The school's financial plan should detail how FTEs will be funded, including whether any faculty will be shared with other units. The need for FTEs in particular specialties should be articulated. The proposal should highlight both the amount of time and the resources needed to hire new FTEs.
 - ii. **Capital Requirements:** All capital requirements must be carefully detailed and analyzed.
 - iii. **Sources of Revenue:** All sources of revenue must be detailed, including state and philanthropic support. A development plan should be submitted as well.
- C. **Need for the Program:** The proposal must clearly state and make the case for a distinct need for the new school or college within the UC system. Specifically, it should demonstrate: 1) a clear societal need for professionals, researchers, faculty, or academics in the field; 2) student demand for the new school or college; and 3) why societal need and student demand are not fully met by existing UC units and programs. In addition, the proposal should: i) define how the school or college will address this unmet need/demand; ii) articulate how it would attract qualified, fully-

competitive students; and iii) provide projections of employment opportunities for graduates of the new school or college. If UC already has a school or college of the same type as proposed, the proposal should include clear analysis of how the new entity would assume a necessary and perhaps even unique role in the University's systemwide academic program. Comparisons with existing UC units or other schools/colleges of the desired rank/academic distinction should be included.

- D. *Fit within the UC system and within the segments:*** The proposal should clearly articulate the fit of the school or college within the UC system as well as other public and private higher education segments in California. The proposal should stress how the new entity will fit within the overall academic profile of the campus—how it will enhance existing programs and how those programs will enhance the quality and development of the new school or college. The capital plan also should demonstrate how the proposal fits with the campus academic and strategic plans.

Overview of the Pre-Proposal

The Compendium requires a pre-proposal at least one year before the full proposal. The pre-proposal is separate from any documents that accompany the *Five-Year Planning Perspective* and should address the categories of review noted above. Even though it will be shorter than the full proposal, it must contain sufficient detail to allow the Divisional and systemwide Senates to complete an initial evaluation of the proposed academic unit.

Details of the Pre-Proposal Process

1. If the proposed new school or college has not been listed on the *Five-Year Planning Perspective*, it should be added to the planning lists and a description drafted and transmitted to the Provost at the time the campus begins to review the pre-proposal.
2. At least one year before a proposal for a new school or college is approved on the campus, a pre-proposal is submitted to the local Divisional Academic Senate. If the Divisional Senate approves the pre-proposal, the Chancellor submits it to the Provost, who forwards it to both Academic Affairs and the systemwide Academic Senate.
3. CCGA, UCEP, UCPB, and any other relevant committees selected by the Council Chair provide to the Academic Council formal comments on the pre-proposal.
4. UCOP Academic Affairs provides comments to the proponents of the new school or college with a copy to the Academic Council Chair and to the Chairs and Analysts of CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB.
5. Academic Council's comments along with a cover letter from the Academic Council Chair will be sent to the proponents of the school or college with copies to the Provost and the Divisional Senate Chair.

Overview of the Process for Submission of the Full Proposal

After incorporating comments on the pre-proposal, campus proponents of the new school or college forward the full proposal to the Divisional Senate. If the Divisional Senate approves the full proposal, the Chancellor forwards it to the Provost and the Academic Council Chair for review.

Details of the Full-Proposal Process

1. After incorporating comments on the pre-proposal, campus proponents of the new school or college submit the full proposal to the Chair of the Divisional Academic Senate for review and comment.
2. If the Divisional Senate approves the full proposal, the Chancellor forwards it to the Provost and the Academic Council Chair for review. A concurrent review (i.e., simultaneous review of the proposal by the Divisional Senate, the systemwide Senate, and Academic Affairs) is not permitted.¹²
3. Designated staff from Academic Affairs complete an independent financial and budgetary analysis of the proposal which is sent to the Academic Council Chair and the Chairs and Analysts of CCGA, UCPB, and UCEP. The Council Chair is responsible for distributing the UCOP analysis to any other Senate committees reviewing the proposal.
4. The CCGA Chair convenes a Senate subcommittee with the chairs of UCEP, UCPB, and any other participating Senate committees to coordinate these reviews. All reviews should comment on the *categories of review* noted above. Ordinarily, the Senate committees will be expected to complete their reviews within 60 days of receipt of the proposal.
5. The proposal should include at least two internal reviews from experts within the UC system. If there are less than two internal reviews, or if the internal reviews are not rigorous enough, the CCGA Chair may request additional internal reviews.
6. CCGA will request two external discipline expert reviews and will incorporate these comments in its overall report.
7. Senate review committees report their recommendations to the Academic Council. If review committees do not concur in their final recommendations, then the Academic Council Chair acts as an arbiter.
8. The Academic Council Chair reports the Senate recommendations to the Provost with copies to the Divisional Chair, the Chairs, and Analysts of the committees that reviewed the proposal, and Academic Affairs.

¹² The Chancellor should send the proposal to the Provost, systemwide Senate/Council Chair, CCGA Chair, UCEP Chair, and UCPB Chair.

9. If the proposal is rejected by Academic Council, the Provost informs the Chancellor. The Chancellor decides whether to resubmit a revised proposal to the Divisional Senate or withdraw the proposal completely. If Academic Council makes its approval contingent on the resolution of key issues raised by the reviews, the Provost works with the Chancellor to resolve these issues. The Provost recommends approval or rejection of the proposal to the President.
10. If Academic Council approves the proposal, the President prepares a Regents' Item for the next Board meeting recommending approval of the school or college to the Regents. The Academic Council Chair checks the Regents' item for accuracy.
11. If the Regents approve the proposal, the Provost reports the approval to the Chancellor and other stakeholders.¹³

Process for Submission of the Post-Proposal

If a campus proposal to establish a new school or college is approved by the Regents, but not established within *seven* years of the date of that approval, the campus must resubmit the original proposal along with a post-proposal to its Divisional Senate. If the Divisional Senate approves the post-proposal, steps #2-11 are followed above. The post-proposal addresses the changes in the budgetary environment, the academic field(s) and related curriculum, as well as the need for and fit of the proposed school or college since the submission of the original proposal.

III.B.2 Name Changes of Schools and Colleges

Typically, simple name changes of schools and colleges are sought in order to accommodate popular and accepted changes in the nomenclature of an academic field or discipline (e.g., updated terminology used by current scholars in that area). A simple name change may not be used to accommodate substantial curricular changes or resource requirements of a school or college. (If substantive programmatic changes are associated with the name change, the campus should follow the procedures in Section IV.

Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Academic Units.) To initiate the process for a simple name change, the Dean of the school or college submits a rationale and justification of the name change to the Divisional Chair for approval. If the simple name change is approved by the Divisional Senate, it is forwarded to the Academic Council Chair.

Details of the Process

1. Upon approval by the campus administration and the Divisional Senate, the Chancellor sends the proposal to the Provost and the Council Chair. CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB assess whether the change is substantive and advise the Council Chair. If substantive programmatic/curricular changes or a substantial need for new resources

¹³ The Provost sends notice of the approval to the Chancellor with copies to the Senate/Council Chair, Divisional Chair, Divisional Director, CCGA Chair, UCEP Chair, UCPB Chair, Senate Executive Director, CCGA analyst, UCEP analyst, UCPB analyst, campus registrar, and campus contacts (include faculty proponents).

are associated with the name change, the campus must follow the procedures in Section IV. *Reconstitutions of Academic Programs and Academic Units*.

2. If the name change does not present substantive programmatic/curricular changes or a substantial need for new resources, the Academic Council Chair places the name change proposal directly on the Academic Council agenda and then notifies the Provost of Council's favorable review. The next step in this "simple name change" process is #6 below.
3. If there are substantive programmatic/curricular changes or substantial new resources are indicated, the Council Chair notifies the Provost that the Senate wishes to review the proposal. CCGA, UCEP, UCPB, and any other Senate committees designated by the Council Chair, conduct a full review of the proposal.
4. The CCGA Chair convenes a Senate subcommittee with the chairs of UCEP, UCPB, and any other participating Senate committees to coordinate these reviews.
5. Senate review committees report their recommendations to the Academic Council. If review committees do not concur in their final recommendations, then the Academic Council Chair acts as an arbiter. The Council Chair notifies the Provost of the outcome of the Senate review.
6. The Provost recommends approval or rejection of the proposal to the President.
7. If approved, the Provost notifies the campus and other stakeholders.¹⁴

¹⁴ The Provost sends notification of the outcome of the review to the Chancellor, with copies to the Council Chair, CCGA Chair, UCEP Chair, UCPB Chair, Senate Executive Director, CCGA analyst, UCEP analyst, UCPB analyst, campus registrar, and campus contacts (including faculty proposer).

IV. 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, or change the name of an academic program or academic unit.¹⁵¹⁶ TCDD actions are defined as:

- 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.

Ordinarily, a proposed TCDD is initiated in one of three ways: 1) it is included in a *Five-Year Planning Perspective*; 2) it results from a formal Senate review; or 3) it is initiated by the local campus administration. Although 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.

Reasons for reconstitutions vary, but may include administrative efficiencies, financial exigency, changes in the field, demand, and fund-raising opportunities.

Disestablishments and discontinuances are two actions that are usually interrelated. 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. CCGA is responsible for system-level review of reconstitutions of graduate degree programs and graduate groups.

Schools, colleges, departments, and programs are evaluated not only for their academic achievements but also for the adequacy of their support. The results of the evaluation should help determine whether more or fewer resources are appropriate and may even lead to a recommendation for program termination. The absence of proper funding can lead to the decline of existing programs and/or diminution in the quality of new programs. One central tenet of program review is that comparable programs should be comparably funded across the system.

IV.A. Transfer, Consolidation or Discontinuance of Undergraduate Programs

Generally reconstitutions of undergraduate degree programs are a Divisional matter, the campus' decision is final, and no system-level involvement is necessary. There are three exceptions to this rule: if a program proposed for discontinuance is the last one of its

¹⁵ A simple name change does not involve a reconstitution. Typically, a simple name change is sought to accommodate popular and accepted changes in the nomenclature of an academic field or discipline. It is a change that is not associated with any substantive modification to curricular offerings or resource needs of academic programs and units.

¹⁶ Any aggregation of academic programs organized as a school, college, division, or another title that appoints faculty members who are members of the Academic Senate and who vote as a unit under Academic Senate Bylaw 55 shall be treated as an academic unit.

kind in the UC system; if the program awards a degree title that is the last one of its kind (see II.C. Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs with Unique Titles); or if the Divisional Senate is not appropriately involved in campus review of the proposed action.¹⁷ In any of these cases, system-level review may be required.

Details of the Process

1. If the undergraduate program proposed for discontinuance is the last one of its kind in the UC system or if the Divisional Senate is not appropriately involved in campus review of the proposed action, then the Divisional Chair sends a letter regarding the proposed action to the Academic Council Chair with copies to the UCEP Chair, UCEP analyst, and Provost.
2. The UCEP Chair considers the proposed action and whether system-level review is necessary.
3. If system-level review is deemed necessary, UCEP reviews the proposal. The UCEP Chair transmits the results of this review to the Academic Council Chair.
4. The Academic Council Chair transmits UCEP's findings/recommendations to the Divisional Chair with a copy to the Provost.

IV.B. Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuance, or Disestablishment of Graduate Degree Programs and Graduate Groups

In most instances, campus decisions on TCDD actions for graduate degree programs are final. There are two cases in which they may be subject to system-level review: 1) if the Divisional Senate is not appropriately involved in the campus process; or 2) if any systemwide implications are not satisfactorily addressed. CCGA and/or the Provost can request system-level review in either circumstance.

Details of the Process

1. Whether discovered through the *Five-Year Planning Perspective* process or by other means, the Provost notifies the campus of any concerns regarding potential adverse systemwide implications of a TCDD proposal and may request system-level review after campus review is completed.
2. As soon as CCGA learns of the proposed action, it considers systemwide implications and/or involvement of the Divisional Senate. CCGA conveys any questions or concerns in writing to the Divisional Senate and/or campus administration, with copies to the Provost and the Academic Council Chair.

¹⁷ A program is understood to be *the last one of its kind* if its program of studies is not substantially reproduced by any other program or within any other academic unit in the UC system.

3. CCGA notifies the Provost, with a copy to the Academic Council Chair, as to whether or not it wishes to review the TCDD proposal.

Final Steps When System-Level Review Is Not Required

4. If neither CCGA nor the Provost requests system-level review, then on approval of the Divisional Senate and campus administration, the Chancellor notifies the Provost, CCGA Chair, and Academic Council Chair of the TCDD action with a copy to the Divisional Chair. The campus decision is final, no system-level review occurs, and the review process is complete.

Final Steps When System-Level Review Is Required

5. If either CCGA or the Provost requests system-level review, the Chancellor, upon approval of the Divisional Senate, forwards the TCDD proposal to the CCGA Chair and to the Provost with a copy to the Academic Council Chair.
6. When actions involving graduate degree programs are likely to affect the functioning of associated undergraduate degree programs, CCGA refers the proposal to UCEP for review and comment.
7. CCGA completes its review of the proposal and reports its findings to the Provost with a copy to the Academic Council Chair.
8. If needed, the Provost works with the campus to resolve any systemwide issues identified in reviews by Academic Affairs, CCGA, and UCEP. CCGA must approve the final resolution.
9. The Provost notifies the campus, CCGA, and the Divisional Chair of final approval.

NOTE: If the graduate degree program proposed for discontinuance uses a degree title that is the only one of its kind on the campus, then additional reviews and approvals may be needed (see see II.C. *Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs with Unique Titles*).

IV.C. Transfer, Consolidation or Disestablishment of Academic Units

Any aggregation of academic programs organized as a school, college, division or other title that appoints faculty who are members of the Academic Senate and who vote as a unit under Academic Senate [Bylaw 55](#) shall be treated as an academic unit. All proposed TCDD actions for academic units should be included in the campus *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* as early as possible in the proposal development process. Appropriate steps should be taken to ensure that systemwide implications are considered. Proposed actions that CCGA would ordinarily review continue to require CCGA approval. All other proposed actions would be endorsed by the reviewing Senate committees/Academic Council and would be approved by the President as well as the Regents, if needed.

Details of the Process

1. The Chancellor transmits to the Divisional Chair, the Provost, and the Academic Council Chair a 1- to 2-page description of the proposal.
2. Based on the description provided, Senate committees (generally CCGA, UCEP, and/or UCPB) notify the Academic Council Chair of any concerns regarding potential systemwide impacts or Divisional Senate involvement. The Academic Council Chair is responsible for sending the Provost a recommendation on the proposed TCDD action. Subsequently, the Council Chair and Provost are responsible for investigating any concerns and determining how to address them.
3. Once the campus completes a reconstitution proposal, it is sent out for formal review by campus administration and by the Divisional Senate. If campus administration and the Divisional Senate approve the proposed reconstitution, the Chancellor submits the proposal to the Provost and to the Academic Council, CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB. Council Chair may distribute it to other Senate committees for review.
4. The Provost distributes the proposal to UCOP staff for analysis, which is then shared with the Academic Council and with CCGA, UCEP, and UCPB Chairs.
5. The CCGA Chair convenes a Senate subcommittee with the chairs of UCEP, UCPB, and any other participating Senate committees to coordinate/expedite Senate committee reviews as appropriate. CCGA is the lead committee for these reviews *unless* the proposed reconstitution affects only undergraduate programs, in which case UCEP functions as the lead committee.
6. For any proposed graduate degree program actions for which CCGA would ordinarily act on behalf of the Senate (e.g., reconstitutions of graduate groups), CCGA's approval continues to represent final Senate action, and should be sent to the Divisional Graduate Council Chair, the Graduate Dean, and the Council Chair, among other stakeholders.
7. Each Senate committee reports its recommendation on the proposal to the Academic Council. The Academic Council Chair serves as arbiter if there is not concurrence among final recommendations of the review committees.
8. The Academic Council Chair conveys the Senate's comments and recommendations to the Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President.
9. If the TCDD action concerns a school or college, the President recommends approval of the TCDD action to the Regents, as prescribed in accordance with Regents' governing documents.
10. Upon Regental approval, the Provost notifies the campus Chancellor with copies to the Council Chair, CCGA Chair, UCEP Chair, UCPB Chair, Senate Executive

Director, CCGA analyst, UCEP analyst, UCPB analyst, campus Registrar, and campus contacts (including faculty proposer).

V. Research Units

V.A. Organized Research Units

Actions involving ORUs (Organized Research Units) are carried out on the ten established campuses. That is, creating a new ORU, changing the name of an existing ORU, and consolidating, transferring, or disestablishing an existing ORU are campus decisions for which there is no system-level review. If favorably reviewed by the relevant Divisional Academic Senate committee(s) and approved by the campus administration, a proposed action involving an ORU is implemented.

Definitions and Terms

An ORU is an academic unit the University has established to provide a supportive infrastructure for interdisciplinary research complementary to the academic goals of departments of instruction and research. The functions of an ORU are to facilitate research and research collaborations; disseminate research results through research conferences, meetings, and other activities; strengthen graduate and undergraduate education by providing students with training opportunities and access to facilities; seek extramural research funds; and carry out university and public service programs related to the ORUs' research expertise. An ORU may not offer formal courses for credit for students of the University or for the public unless it has been specifically empowered to do so by the President after consultation with the Academic Senate and the appropriate Chancellors. The terms 'Institute,' 'Laboratory,' and 'Center' are used most often for ORUs, but other titles may be employed in particular situations:

- *Institute*: A major unit that coordinates and promotes faculty and student research on a continuing basis over an area so wide that it extends across department, school, or college, and even campus boundaries. The unit may also engage in public service activities stemming from its research program, within the limits of its stated objectives.
- *Laboratory*: A non-departmental organization that establishes and maintains facilities for research in several departments, sometimes with the help of a full-time research staff appointed in accordance with the guidelines of Section 6.a. below. (A laboratory in which substantially all participating faculty members are from the same academic department is a departmental laboratory and is not an ORU.)
- *Center*: A small unit, sometimes one of several forming an Institute, that furthers research in a designated field; or, a unit engaged primarily in providing research facilities for other units and departments.
- *Non-ORU Center*: The term Center may be used for research units not formally constituted as ORUs upon approval by the Chancellor after consultation with the divisional Academic Senate. Before approval is granted for a Center that is not an ORU, the campus may stipulate terms and conditions such as a process for appropriate periodic review, including administration, programs, and budget; appointment of a director and advisory committee; an appropriate campus reporting relationship; and progress reports.

V.B. Multicampus Research Units

A Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) is a research unit established by UC to provide a supportive infrastructure for long-term research and/or creative work being carried out on at least two campuses or at least one campus plus one national lab. Every MRU has one host campus that will host the administrative headquarters of the unit or program and will be responsible for overall administrative and reporting functions. The functions of an MRU may include the following: facilitating research and research collaborations; disseminating research results through research conferences, meetings, and other activities; strengthening graduate and undergraduate education by providing students with training opportunities and access to facilities; seeking extramural research funds; and carrying out University and public service programs related to the MRU's area of expertise. An MRU may be supported by one or more of the following sources: funding awarded to the MRU by UC as a result of a periodic competition, extramural funds sought for the purpose, and funds from a philanthropic institution or other sources. An MRU may participate in periodic competitions for funding administered by UCOP throughout its existence. However, actual or potential availability of extramural funds shall not serve as the sole basis for proposing, approving, or continuing an MRU. The initial term of an MRU is five years; the typical life span of a successful MRU is fifteen years with potential for extension based on positive review. An MRU must be complementary to the academic goals of the University, but it does not have jurisdiction over courses or curricula and cannot offer formal courses or make faculty appointments.

V.B.1. Establishment of New Multicampus Research Units

Overview of Process

The application to establish an MRU originates at the host campus; the other proposing campuses or national laboratories participate in development and review of the proposal. Once a full proposal is prepared, it must be reviewed by the Divisional Committee on Planning and Budget, the Divisional Committee on Research or the equivalent, the Graduate Council, and the Vice Chancellors for Research of proponent campuses prior to being sent for system-level review in order to ensure campus support for the proposal.

The host campus coordinates this process. Upon favorable review and approval by all the proponent campuses, the Chancellor of the host campus submits the proposal to the Vice President for Research and Innovation at UCOP. After receiving the proposal, the Vice President for Research and Innovation refers the proposal to the Chair of the Academic Council for review and comment by UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA. UCORP is the lead committee for systemwide review. For a new MRU to be established the Senate must favorably review the proposal and the Vice President for Research and Innovation must recommend approval to the Provost and to the President; the President has the final authority for approval. After Presidential action, the Vice President for Research and Innovation informs the Chancellors and the Chair of the Academic Council of the action.

In cases of disagreement about whether to establish an MRU, the Vice President for Research and Innovation, the Chair of the Academic Council, and the Vice Chancellor for Research of the host campus will establish a process of adjudication; however, the Vice President for Research and Innovation retains final recommendation authority concerning establishment of a new MRU.

Details of the Process

1. The host campus prepares and submits to UCOP Office of Research and Innovation (R&I) a 1- to 2-page description of the proposed MRU. R & I then notifies all relevant systemwide bodies including UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA. The Office of Research and Innovation and Senate committees' reviews address the systemwide perspective.
2. Proposal Development: The proposal for an MRU originates at the campus that will host the MRU's administrative headquarters. To establish an MRU, faculty members concerned submit a proposal stating the proposed unit's goals and objectives. The proposal must also describe the value and capabilities that will be added by the new unit and explain why these cannot be achieved within the existing campus structure. The proposal should make clear how the MRU will be greater than the sum of its parts; e.g., by fostering new intellectual collaborations, stimulating new sources of funding, furthering innovative and original research, or performing service and outreach to the public. The proposal should also contain the following information:
 - Experience of the core faculty in applicable research collaborations;
 - Research plan for the first year of operation and projections for subsequent years of operation;
 - Budget estimates for the first year of operation, projections for the five years following, and anticipated sources of funding;
 - Names, titles, and departments of faculty members who have agreed in writing to participate in the unit's activities, and the nature of their participation;
 - Projections of number of faculty members and students, professional research appointees, and other personnel needed for the specified periods;
 - Statement about immediate space needs and how they will be met for the first year, and projections of future space needs;
 - Statement of other resource needs, such as capital equipment and library resources, and how they will be met for the first year, and projections of future resource needs;
 - Statement about anticipated benefits of the proposed unit to the teaching programs of the participating faculty members' departments; and
 - Statement specifying the applicable administrative unit's commitment of funds, space, and other resources necessary for the successful operation of the proposed MRU.

The proposal should also list similar units that exist elsewhere, describe the relation of the proposed unit to similar units at other UC campuses, and describe the contributions to the field that the proposed unit may be anticipated to make that are

not made by existing units. Prior to a recommendation for approval of an MRU by the Vice President for Research and Innovation, an organizational plan must be developed by the faculty members and appropriate assurances finalized between the MRU and related academic units concerning administrative services, space, and facilities.

3. The proposal is submitted to the appropriate administrative officer, normally the Vice Chancellor for Research of the host campus. The Vice Chancellor for Research seeks input from the Divisional Academic Senate and other administrative committees. Upon approval by the campus administration and favorable review by the Divisional Senate (ordinarily, at a minimum, the Committee on Research, the Committee on Planning and Budget, and the Graduate Council, or their equivalents) at the host campus, the Chancellor simultaneously sends all required materials to the systemwide Senate and to UCOP's Office of Research and Innovation.
4. The Office of Research and Innovation reviews the proposal for completeness, collects any missing information from the host campus and sends the proposal to the Chancellors of the non-host participating campuses and to the Academic Council Chair with a letter including a due date for comments. The Academic Council Chair sends the proposal to the Divisional Chairs and the UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA chairs.
5. Review at non-host participating campuses includes consultation with the relevant Divisional committee(s) (ordinarily, at a minimum, the Committee on Research, the Committee on Planning and Budget, and the Graduate Council, or their equivalents) and appropriate administrators. The Chancellors notify the Vice President for Research and Innovation of all campus comments, including those from the Senate and from the Administration.
6. UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA review the proposal. UCORP is the lead committee. If additional information is needed from the campus by any of the reviewing Senate committees, the committee communicates in writing with the campus to request the additional information and copies the chairs and analysts of the other reviewing committees, the Academic Council Chair, and the Vice President for Research and Innovation.
7. The Senate committees report their recommendations to the Academic Council, which serves as arbiter if there is not concurrence among the committees. The Academic Council Chair notifies the Vice President for Research and Innovation of the outcome of the Senate review.
8. In cases of disagreement about whether to establish an MRU (or a new branch campus of an existing MRU), the Vice President for Research and Innovation, the Academic Council Chair, and the Chancellor at the host campus or his or her designee (normally the Vice Chancellor for Research) establishes a process of adjudication; however, the Vice President for Research and Innovation retains final recommendation authority

concerning establishment of a new MRU (or new branch campus of an existing MRU).

9. After receiving all comments, the Vice President for Research and Innovation makes a recommendation to the Provost and to the President.
10. After Presidential approval, the President or his/her designee notifies the host campus Chancellor and others of the decision.

V.B.2. Multicampus Research Unit Leadership and Appointments, Administrative Operations, and Annual Reports

Leadership: An MRU is led by a Director who must be an Academic Senate member at the rank of Associate Professor or higher and who is typically affiliated with the host campus of the MRU. The MRU Director is responsible for the administrative functions of the MRU and for guiding the unit or program's activities in accordance with its established goals.

The Director of an MRU is appointed by the President or his/her designee after consultation with the Academic Council and with the advice of a Search Committee appointed by the President or his/her designee. Nominations for membership on the Search Committee for an MRU Director are solicited by the President or his/her designee from the Chancellors of campuses with faculty actively participating in the MRU and from the Academic Council Chair, who will forward a list of nominees from each participating campus' divisional Senate. The Academic Council may add nominees from the systemwide level but may not change the list submitted by the campus divisional Senate(s). The President or his/her designee shall select Search Committee members primarily from the lists of nominees from the Chancellors and from the Academic Council. Normally at least one member of the MRU Advisory or Executive Committee serves on the Search Committee.

Prior to appointing the Director, the President or his/her designee shall consult with the Search Committee, the Chancellor of the host campus, other campuses that are part of the MRU, and the Chair of the Academic Council.

MRU Directors are generally appointed for a five-year term with the possibility of reappointment if the MRU continues for another term. In addition to his/her regular campus faculty salary, the Director of an MRU may receive an administrative stipend, summer salary, course buyouts, and/or support for graduate student researchers using funds from the approved MRU budget. The Director of an MRU may not hold a concurrent appointment as Dean, Associate Dean, or Department Chair unless an application endorsed by the Vice Chancellor for Research of the host campus is approved by the Vice President for Research and Innovation.

Administrative Operations: The MRU reports to the Vice President for Research and Innovation (or, by delegation, the Vice Chancellor for Research of the host campus) and must follow administrative review and approval processes set forth by the Office of Research and Innovation. MRUs are expected to follow all UC policies related to

academic responsibilities including teaching and service workload within the faculty's respective home academic units, faculty commitment of effort and/or compensation, honoraria, travel, and sabbatical leave.

Annual Reports: Every MRU shall submit an annual report to the Vice President for Research and Innovation (or, by delegation, the Vice Chancellor for Research of the host campus) that should include the following:

- Numbers of graduate and postdoctoral students directly contributing to the unit or program who: a) are on the unit's or program's payroll, b) participate through assistantships, fellowships, or traineeships, or c) are otherwise involved in the unit's or program's work;
- Number of faculty members actively engaged in the MRU's research or its administration;
- Numbers of FTE of professional, technical, administrative, and clerical personnel employed;
- A list of publications and intellectual property resulting from the collaborative endeavors of the MRU;
- A list of grant awards to participating faculty that includes sources and amounts (on an annual basis) of support funds of all types such as income from service facilities, from the sale of publications, and from other services;
- A summary of expenditures that includes use of funds for administrative support, matching funds, direct research, and other specific uses;
- A Description of the space currently occupied on all campuses and national laboratories; and
- Any other information deemed relevant by the Office of Research and Innovation to the evaluation of the effectiveness of a program or unit, including updated plans for future years.

V.B.3. Procedure for Five-Year Reviews

The initial term of an MRU is five years, with a sunset review after fifteen years. The MRU is automatically disestablished at the end of each five-year term unless it requests to be reviewed and to be extended for another five-year term. If an MRU does not seek extension of its term, then the Director will provide a final report to the Vice President for Research and Innovation. An MRU not seeking extension of its term may request a one-year no-cost extension of its operation to permit an orderly termination or transfer of contractual obligations.

After a request for review and extension has been submitted by an MRU, a five-year review of that MRU is conducted by UCORP as the lead committee with participation by UCPB and CCGA. The authority to conduct the MRU review can be delegated by the Academic Senate to the Committee on Research or its equivalent at the host campus after consultation with the MRU Director, the Vice President for Research and Innovation, and the Vice Chancellors for Research at all participating campuses. The review will assess the unit's activities with regard to its stated purpose, present functioning, funding record, future plans, and continuing development to meet the needs in the field. The review should also consider whether the unit should merge with another similar unit or be

disestablished. The review report is provided to the MRU Director for information.

Self-report materials prepared by the MRU and the annual reports for the preceding five years are reviewed by UCORP (or, by delegation, the Committee on Research or its equivalent at the host campus), and a recommendation concerning continuation of the unit is made to the Vice President for Research and Innovation upon consideration of the information provided. Requirements for the self-report are similar to the application process for new MRU proposals. MRU five-year reviews are not competitive. The Five-Year Review report is submitted to the Vice President for Research and Innovation, who distributes it to the Chief Academic Officer of each participating campus for campus comment, and the Chair of the Academic Council for comment by UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA. The MRU Director and the Chairs of the Advisory and Executive Committees may also comment on the Five-Year Review Report and optionally may request an external review if there is sufficient evidence that expert opinions outside the University of California system would provide additional information helpful to measure the MRU's performance. Based on the Five-Year Review Report and the comments on the Five-Year Review Report, the Vice President for Research and Innovation either approves continuation of the unit, implements changes in the structure or functioning of the unit, or recommends disestablishment of the unit to the President.

V.B.4. Name Changes of Multicampus Research Units

Overview of Process

If the proposed name change is not associated with a fundamental change in the nature of the MRU or a need for substantial new resources, then the decision making process by the participating campuses is final. There is no system-level review, but the action must be reported to the Vice President for Research and Innovation and certain supporting materials must be provided. Campus decision making need only involve approval by the MRU advisory committee, favorable review by the participating campus Committees on Research (or equivalent) and Graduate Councils (and any other Senate committees the Division stipulates), and approval by the appropriate participating campus administrators. If such a "simple" name change is contemplated, the MRU director should consult with the Vice President for Research and Innovation and the UCORP Chair.

Details of the Process

When faculty want to change the name of an MRU, the MRU director should consult with the Vice President for Research and Innovation and the UCORP Chair to determine whether it is a "simple" name change. The process described here is for "simple" name changes and is relevant only when the name change does not also involve (or signal) a fundamental change in the nature of the MRU and the MRU does not require substantial new resources. If either condition pertains, particularly a fundamental programmatic change, most likely system-level review process such as that for establishing a new MRU will be requested.

1. The director of the MRU prepares a proposal describing the rationale for requesting a new name for the unit, certifies that there is no associated fundamental change in the

nature of the MRU or any need for substantial new resources, and gets approval from the MRU advisory committee.

2. The director of the MRU submits the material to the participating campuses' Chancellors, Committees on Research (or equivalent), and Graduate Councils with copies to the advisory committee of the MRU, the Divisional Chair (in case other Divisional committees should review the proposal), and the Vice President for Research and Innovation, who consults with the Chair of UCORP to confirm that the two agree that it is an uncomplicated name change proposal.
3. After the participating campuses' Divisional Senates favorably review the proposal and appropriate administrators approve it and communicate that approval to the host campus Chancellor, the host campus Chancellor immediately notifies the Vice President for Research and Innovation. The Vice President by letter approves the proposed name change, confirms that the action does not involve a fundamental change in the nature of the MRU or require substantial new resources, and indicates that favorable reviews and approvals have been obtained. This notification also includes the MRU director's proposal and letters from the Divisional Senate committees (each letter indicating favorable review and confirming that the action does not involve a fundamental change in the nature of the MRU or require substantial new resources), from the advisory committee of the MRU, from participating campuses' Committees on Research (or equivalent), Graduate Councils, any other Divisional Senate committees asked to comment, and from Chancellors (each letter, as appropriate, endorsing or approving the name change). The Chancellor copies the UCORP chair and analyst and the Council Chair on the notification letter only. The approved name change shall also be reported at the time the annual report is requested by the Office of Research and Innovation.
4. The Vice President for Research and Innovation informs all relevant parties of the name change.

V.B.5. Sunset Reviews of Multicampus Research Units

All MRUs that have been in existence for 15 years or more are subject to a Sunset Review. At that time, they are required to justify their continuation in terms of scholarly or scientific merit and campus priorities.

An MRU undergoing a Sunset Review must develop a formal proposal for continued MRU status, support funds, and space within the context of current campus and University needs and resources. The proposal should explain whether the MRU proposes to continue unchanged in the future and if so, how it continues to address important issues that cannot be addressed through another mechanism or structure within UC. If the MRU is continuing in a new direction, the proposal should describe the new structure, vision, and intended accomplishments. If continued MRU status is not a goal, the Director will provide a final report to the Vice President for Research and Innovation.

Any proposal for continuation should describe: 1) The MRU's achievements over the past 15 years (or more, if it has been in existence longer); 2) the contributions the MRU

has made to research, graduate and undergraduate education, and public service; and 3) the consequences if the MRU were not continued.

Sunset Reviews are conducted by UCORP as the lead committee with the participation of UCPB and CCGA. The authority to conduct the Sunset Review can be delegated by the Academic Senate to the Committee on Research or its equivalent at the host campus after consultation with the Vice President for Research and Innovation and the Vice Chancellor for Research at the host campus. Sunset Reviews are not competitive.

Based on the Sunset Review Report and comments on the Sunset Review Report, the Vice President for Research and Innovation approves continuation of the unit, implements changes in the structure or functioning of the unit, or recommends to the President disestablishment of the unit.

V.B.6. Disestablishment of Multicampus Research Units

An MRU that does not proactively request to be reviewed and have its term extended is automatically disestablished after the completion of its current five-year term. Normally, upon request, the MRU will be granted a one-year no-cost extension of its operation to permit an orderly termination or transfer of contractual obligations.

An MRU may also be disestablished as a result of a recommendation to disestablish that MRU. Such a recommendation may follow a five-year review, a Sunset Review, or other process of review established by the Vice President for Research and Innovation or the Vice Chancellor for Research of the host campus. If the disestablishment initiates at the host campus, the Vice Chancellor for Research submits the request for disestablishment to the Vice President for Research and Innovation after review by appropriate Divisional Senate committees. The Vice President for Research and Innovation refers any recommendation for disestablishment to the Chair of the Academic Council for comment by UCORP (the lead review committee), UCPB and CCGA.

In cases of disagreement about whether to disestablish an MRU, the Vice President for Research and Innovation, Chair of the Academic Council, and Vice Chancellor for Research of the campus will establish a process of adjudication; however, the Vice President for Research and Innovation retains final authority for the decision to recommend disestablishment of an MRU to the President. After Presidential approval, the Vice President for Research and Innovation informs the Chancellors and Chair of the Academic Council of the action.

Normally, upon request, an MRU which has been recommended for disestablishment will be granted a one-year no-cost extension of its operation to permit an orderly termination or transfer of contractual obligations.

VI. Systemwide Academic Units

Any aggregation of academic programs organized as a school, college, division, or another title that appoints faculty who are members of the Academic Senate and who vote as a unit under Academic Senate [Bylaw 55](#) shall be treated as an academic unit. If a new systemwide academic unit or entity emerges that does not fit precisely into the existing categories in the Compendium, review of the proposed systemwide academic unit must follow existing guidelines as much as possible (see Section III. *Academic Units*).

Specific proposals will not be reviewed until: a) campus and Divisional Senates' review process has been specified; and b) the Divisional Senates have been consulted about the review process. If current review processes are deemed inappropriate by Academic Council for any new systemwide academic entity, the Academic Planning Council should be responsible for formulating the review process for new systemwide academic entities, based on existing guidelines for similar entities.

VI.A. Systemwide Schools

Any systemwide school must be piloted as a joint academic degree program/research institute prior to undergoing review to become a school.

VII. Accelerated Review Schedule for any Action

The campus may request that the systemwide Senate and UCOP initiate system-level review simultaneously with campus review. Such a request would most likely occur when very rapid action is needed—for example, to institute budget reductions that might be achieved through reconstitution. Campus and systemwide representatives of the Senate and administration agree on the schedule, materials, distribution procedures, and problem resolution processes. Usual campus and systemwide review and approval processes are carried out simultaneously. If the campus proposal begins to diverge markedly from the proposal under systemwide review, the systemwide review can be suspended. Final systemwide approvals may be given after the campus approves the proposal and it is verified that the approved campus proposal is consistent with that reviewed systemwide.

Details of the Process

1. The campus administration, Divisional Chair, Academic Council Chair, and Provost initiate a discussion to reach agreement upon a schedule for concurrent campus, Divisional Senate, systemwide Senate, and UCOP review. This negotiation may also concern the materials to be included in the review package (normally, the same proposal that is circulating for review on campus); procedures for distributing proposals; and a preliminary plan for how to resolve potential roadblocks to a faster conclusion of reviews.
2. Upon sending notice of the proposed academic program or academic unit action(s) to the Provost, the Chancellor also sends review materials to the reviewers, as agreed to in step 1.
3. The Senate review committees that would ordinarily review the proposed action and any other committees the Academic Council Chair designates convey questions regarding the proposal directly to the campus for response, copying other reviewing committees and the Provost.
4. The Chair of the systemwide committee that would ordinarily be the lead Senate committee for the proposed action (e.g., the CCGA Chair for a school that would offer graduate degree programs, the UCORP Chair for an MRU) is responsible for coordinating the systemwide committees participating in the accelerated review. As necessary, this Chair convenes the Chairs of the other systemwide Senate committees participating in the review. The Chair of the Divisional Senate may also be included in these discussions.
5. The systemwide Senate committees make their final recommendations only after the Divisional Senate and campus administration have opined on the proposal. If the proposal undergoes significant change during campus/Divisional review, the

systemwide Senate may suspend further review until the fully revised proposal is available and near campus agreement.

6. The Senate review committees report their comments, final recommendations, and any required approvals to the Academic Council Chair. If CCGA would ordinarily act on behalf of the Senate with regard to all or part of the proposed action (e.g., a graduate program), then its decision is also final in an accelerated review. If there is not concurrence on other actions among the reviewing committees, the Academic Council serves as arbiter. If any part of the proposal requires Assembly action, the Academic Council Chair makes appropriate arrangements. The Council Chair reports the Senate comments and recommendations to the Provost.
7. The Provost reviews the Senate materials, resolves any issues arising from the reviews with the campus, and makes a recommendation to the President who, depending on the proposed action(s), approves, approves implementation, or recommends to the Regents approval of the action(s).
8. If Regental action is required, the President recommends approval to the Regents.
9. Upon Regental action, the Provost informs the Chancellor of that action, copying others involved in the process.

VIII. Role of the Academic Planning Council

The Academic Planning Council (APC) was established in 1994 to provide guidance on planning issues of systemwide concern. It is chaired by the Provost with the Academic Council Chair serving as Vice Chair. While membership composition and member titles may vary slightly depending on the year, membership usually includes the Vice Chair of the Academic Council; the Chairs of CCGA, UCPB, UCEP, and UCORP, Divisional Senate representatives; key administrators including an EVC and Vice Chancellors for Research, Planning and Budget, and Student Affairs; and both a Graduate Dean and an Undergraduate Dean and both undergraduate and graduate student representatives. The APC is staffed by UCOP Academic Affairs.

Although the APC may take actions that have implications for individual campus proposals reviewed systemwide, the APC does not take any direct action on such proposals. APC has the option of reviewing the *Five-Year Planning Perspectives* and pursuing planning issues arising from their review. Also, throughout the Compendium, there are references to routes by which the Senate or Provost can identify potential systemwide issues to be referred to the APC for deliberation. These are mechanisms by which APC may bring a systemwide perspective to the attention of those on the campuses developing proposals to be submitted for system-level review and approval. The composition of the APC assures representation of many viewpoints in its deliberations; the aim is to bring together Senate and Administration representatives to address challenging planning issues.

While many Compendium-related questions can be resolved by interactions with the campuses, some issues are of a magnitude that goes beyond single-campus resolution. Systemwide issues of this sort often have implications for efficient use of resources across the UC system, including:

- Potential for cooperative planning/cost-effective alternatives;
- Disappearance of programmatic area from the entire system;
- Appropriateness of a major new programmatic direction to campus mission;
- Student interest in various programmatic areas;
- Needs of the state and nation; and
- Resource needs and opportunities.

Such planning issues should be referred to the APC for discussion on how to proceed. The APC might recommend referral to existing groups, creation of ad hoc task force, a special staff study, convening of a subcommittee, or other approaches to gather information and expert advice. At the conclusion of the planning activity, the Chair and the Vice Chair of the APC should determine how to transmit the results to the campuses.

IX. List of Appendices

- A. Glossary of Terms
- B. State Program Review Principles
- C. Systemwide Professional School Planning: Recommended Guidelines and Model, Endorsed by the Academic Council - July 2004
- D. UCOP Policy on Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units, 1979
- E. Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Multicampus Research Units

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Academic Assembly	The Assembly of the Academic Senate represents the faculty in the governance of the University as mandated by the governing documents of the Regents. The Assembly is authorized to consider any and all matters of concern to the Senate as a whole, has the power to take final action on all legislation substantially affecting more than one Division, and is ready at all times to advise the President. The Assembly consists of the following members: The President of the University; the Chair and Vice Chair of the Assembly; all members of the Academic Council; and forty Divisional Representatives chosen from other than chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, chief administrative officers of colleges and schools, and members of the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.
Academic Council	The Academic Council is the administrative arm of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts in lieu of the Assembly on non- legislative matters. It advises the President on behalf of the Assembly and has the continuing responsibility to request committees of the Senate to investigate and report to the Council or to the Assembly on matters of systemwide concern. The Council may act on behalf of the Assembly in approving the establishment of new graduate degree titles. The Academic Council consists of a Chair and Vice Chair, the Chairs of the ten Divisional Senates, and the Chairs of eight systemwide Senate committees: the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS); the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA); and the University Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD), Academic Personnel (UCAP), Educational Policy (UCEP), Faculty Welfare (UCFW), Planning and Budget (UCPB), and Research Policy (UCRP).
Academic Planning Council	This systemwide Administration-Senate committee consists of the Provost (Chair); Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair; Academic Council Vice Chair; Chairs of CCGA, UCPB, UCEP, and UCORP; a Divisional Senate representative; an Executive Vice Chancellor; a Vice Chancellor for Research, a Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, and a Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; a Graduate Dean and an Undergraduate Dean; a graduate student representative and an undergraduate student representative; and select UCOP administrators. APC provides systemwide guidance on academic and strategic planning, coordinates systemwide academic planning activities, reviews <i>Five-Year Planning Perspectives</i> , and guides innovation and redirection of academic efforts within UC as a whole.
CCGA	The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), an Academic Senate committee, consists of one representative from each Divisional Graduate Council, and two at large members, one serving as Chair and the other as Vice Chair. CCGA reviews and approves proposals for new programs for established graduate degrees, and recommends approval for new graduate degree titles. It also comments on proposed actions involving schools and colleges and MRUs, as well as the proposed actions in the <i>Five-Year Planning</i>

	<i>Perspectives</i> , particularly those involving graduate degree programs. CCGA advises the President of the University and all agencies of the Senate regarding the promotion of research and learning related to graduate affairs.
Chancellor	Chancellor of a UC campus or his or her designee. In most Compendium actions, the Academic Vice Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor acts as designee. The Chancellor approves proposals involving departments, schools and colleges, ORUs, and MRUs, and favorably reviews proposals involving undergraduate and graduate degree programs.
College	A college is an academic unit typically comprising one or more departments offering academic degree programs. A college is headed by a dean or provost. The Faculty of the college is established by the Academic Senate. A “college” is distinguished from a “School” in that it does not house units that offer professional degrees (e.g., Law, MBA), but only “academic” degrees (e.g., PhD, MA, MS). A variation on this categorization is in place at UCSC and UCSD, where colleges denote academic communities for undergraduates. Although these colleges can offer courses, they cannot offer degrees.
Consolidation	For the purposes of a reconstitution of an academic unit or program, a consolidation entails combining two or more programs or units to form a new unified program or unit.
(Academic) Council Chair	The Council Chair is the Chair of the Academic Council and Assembly of the Academic Senate. The Council Chair is elected as Vice Chair by the General Assembly, serves one year as Vice Chair, and then one year as Chair. He or she organizes Council consideration of committee reactions to proposals involving schools and colleges and MRUs, manages Senate commentary on the <i>Five- Year Planning Perspectives</i> , and provides leadership as needed in the systemwide review processes.
Degree Program	A degree program is an approved set of coursework, examination, and other requirements within a discipline (or across disciplines) which leads to a degree, commonly referred to as a “major” at the undergraduate level. The names of degree programs are posted on transcripts and diplomas.
Degree Title	A degree title is the type of degree associated with the academic program. Examples include B.A., B.S., M.A., M.F.A., M.S., Ed.D, and PhD. When a new degree title is introduced on a campus, the procedures under <i>II.C. Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs with Unique Titles</i> must be followed.
Department	A department is an academic unit that typically offers baccalaureate, master, and doctoral degree programs, headed by a chair. A department typically represents a field of knowledge that is well established. Departments usually exist within the framework of a college or school. Actions involving departments are carried out on the campuses, and do not involve system-level review.

Discontinuance	Elimination of an academic program. (Does <u>not</u> refer to academic units.)
Disestablishment	Elimination of an academic unit or research unit. (Does <u>not</u> refer to academic programs.)
Division	For the purposes of the Compendium, a division is an academic unit comprising a portion of a college or school. A division typically is headed by a dean. In rare instances, when there is a distinct delineation within the discipline, a department may be divided into administrative components called divisions. Many campuses also use the term “division” to group graduate education programs (i.e., a Graduate Division). While headed by a Graduate Dean, this configuration is an administrative, rather than academic, structure.
Divisional Senate(s)	The ten Campus Divisions of the Academic Senate. Under authority from the Regents, faculty belong to an Academic Senate that is organized into divisional Senates, one for each campus, and a systemwide Senate. On each campus, review processes for academic programs, academic units, and research units are similar to those used at the system level, with committees of the divisional Senate variously approving and favorably reviewing proposed actions in these three areas. Divisional Senate committees also have the opportunity to review the <i>UC Five-Year Planning Perspectives</i> . Divisional Senates are sometimes called “Divisions”, but should not be confused with administrative divisions.
Emphasis	An emphasis is a focused area of study that may be offered as a track within a department’s degree program, or as an optional interdisciplinary addition to an existing graduate degree program in one or more departments. An emphasis is noted on transcripts but does not appear on the official diploma.
Graduate Academic Certificates	A graduate academic certificate (GAC) program is an approved set of courses and other requirements in a specific area of inquiry, not covered by a degree program, which leads to a formal certificate of completion of graduate studies. Senate Regulation (SR) 735 authorizes Graduate Divisions to grant certificates of completion of graduate curricula. The Compendium requires that these certificate programs be approved by both the local Graduate Council and by CCGA. Certificates offered by University Extension are not covered by SR 735. A GAC is defined as a certificate program that: a) does not require its students to be enrolled in another graduate program; b) is not offered solely through a UC Extension Program; c) has an independent admissions process, which requires at least a baccalaureate degree for admission; and d) carries a minimum of 3 quarters (or 2 semesters) of full-time resident study.
Hybrid Undergraduate/ Graduate Degree Programs	Undergraduate/Graduate hybrid degree programs allow students to complete an undergraduate and graduate curriculum simultaneously.
Interdisciplinary Group or Graduate Group	An Interdisciplinary Group is headed by a chair, is composed of a number of participating faculty from various departments, and offers at least one interdisciplinary degree program. The Group is governed by an advisory committee and has no

	permanent faculty. The area of study offered by a Group typically represents a new direction in teaching and scholarship. CCGA requires that all interdepartmental graduate program (IDP) or graduate group proposals include a set of governance bylaws as well as other information about campus commitment to the proposed program (e.g., teaching-assistantships, library resources, courses planned, etc.).
Interdisciplinary Program	An Interdisciplinary Program is an academic unit offering at least one degree program drawing on multiple academic disciplines. It is headed by a chair and has permanent faculty. The interdisciplinary area of study offered by a program is of a more established nature than that of an interdisciplinary group.
Joint Graduate Degree Program	Joint graduate degree programs combine the intellectual and physical resources of UC and CSU. In particular, Joint Doctoral Programs (JDPs) are designed to be beneficial to campuses from both systems and to meet a need not currently addressed within the University. Students enrolled in such programs take advantage of the combined resources and disciplinary expertise. It is expected that the research interests and program strengths of the proposing academic departments complement one another in synergistic fashion rather than duplicate existing offerings. These partnerships broaden the base for program development and provide greater depth of curricular and faculty resources. Final review and approval of all JDPs rests with the Joint Graduate Board (JGB).
Minor	A minor is a set of courses that taken together provide a systematic understanding of a subject or some specified part of it, but provide less depth and breadth than a degree (major) program. Minors are posted on transcripts and on diplomas.
MRU	Multicampus Research Unit - A research unit established by UC to provide an infrastructure for long-term research and/or creative work being carried out on at least two campuses or at least at least one campus and one national lab.
President	The President of the University of California. With respect to Compendium processes, the President approves establishment and disestablishment of MRUs; under a delegation from the Board of Regents, approves the creation of a new graduate degree titles; and recommends to the Board of Regents approval of the establishment and disestablishment of a school or college. Per Senate Bylaw 10 , the President is ex-officio President of the Academic Senate and a member of the Assembly of each Division and Faculty.
Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition	Programs with Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) are those in which students are charged supplemental tuition in order to achieve and maintain excellence in the preparation of students for professional careers and effectively advance the mission and strategic academic plan of the given graduate professional degree program. Approval of PDST fees are separate from the review and approval of new programs with PDST, and include Regental approval.

Provost	The Provost reports directly to the President and is responsible for all system-level engagement with UC academic life. Many system-level administrative review processes are managed by the Provost who frequently acts as the President's designee.
The Regents	The University of California is governed by the Board of Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs." The Regents consist of seven ex officio members (Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, Superintendent of Public Instruction, President and Vice President of UC Alumni Association, and UC President), 18 members appointed to 12-year terms, and one student member appointed for one year. Two alumni regents designate, two faculty representatives (the Chair and Vice Chair of the systemwide Academic Senate), and two staff advisors also participate in meetings of the Board of Regents. Many Regental responsibilities have been delegated to the President, Chancellors, other administrators, and the faculty. In the Compendium processes, the Regents approve the establishment and disestablishment of schools and colleges.
School	A school is an academic unit typically comprising one or more departments that also offer one or more professional degree programs. ¹⁷ A school is headed by a dean or provost. The Faculty of the school is established by the Academic Senate. A school is distinguished from a college in that it typically offers professional degrees (e.g., JD, MBA) rather than "academic" degrees (e.g., PhD, MA, MS). On some campuses, however, a school will include <i>both</i> professional and academic programs. ¹⁸ For some campuses, a school represents a naming opportunity and is a source of philanthropic giving.
Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs	Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) are programs that primarily serve professionals seeking to advance their careers. All program costs for SSGPDPs, both direct and indirect, are covered by revenues generated by the program such as student charges or other alternative revenues that are not disallowed funds. All SSGPDPs shall be fully self-supporting within three years of inception. Approval of SSGPDP fees are separate from the review and approval of new SSGPDPs, and include Presidential approval.
Senate	The systemwide Academic Senate. Under authority from the Regents, faculty members belong to an Academic Senate that is organized into Divisional Senates—one for each campus—and a systemwide Senate. In the Compendium, the term Senate refers to this formal faculty structure. The Senate has approval authority for various actions involving academic degree programs and consults on actions involving academic units and research units.
System-level review	System-level review is review at the level of the Office of the President and/or the Academic Council.

Systemwide	Systemwide means by or for the entire UC system. For example, systemwide review is review by all UC campuses and locations (campus review typically includes consideration by both campus administrations and by the Divisional Senates); systemwide Academic Senate is the body to which faculty belong and which enjoys shared governance; systemwide committees include the Academic Planning Council and the committees of the Academic Senate (e.g., CCGA, UCEP, UCORP).
TCDD	Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuance, and Disestablishment. These four processes substantially transform academic programs, academic units, and/or research units, and may occur together as “reconstitutions.” Transfer is moving a program or unit into another one that subsumes it; consolidation is bringing together two or more programs or units to form a new unified program or unit; discontinuance is elimination of an academic program; and disestablishment is elimination of an academic unit or research unit.
Transfer	Moving a program or unit into another one that subsumes it.
UC	University of California. UC refers to the University as a whole and to any of its parts — students, faculty, staff, and administrators on the ten campuses, and systemwide, etc.
UCEP	University Committee on Educational Policy—a committee of the systemwide Academic Senate. UCEP consists of a Chair, a Vice Chair, the Assembly Chair, and a representative from each Divisional Committee on Educational Policy. UCEP initiates appropriate studies and reports on the establishment or disestablishment of curricula and academic units, and on legislation or administrative policies involving educational policy. In the Compendium processes, it comments on and recommends approval of proposed actions involving schools and colleges. UCEP also analyzes the <i>Five-Year Planning Perspectives</i> , particularly those involving undergraduate degree programs.
UCOP	University of California, Office of the President. UCOP refers to the system-level administrative arm of the University, including senior administrators and staff.
UCORP	University Committee on Research Policy—a committee of the systemwide Academic Senate. UCORP consists of a Chair and a representative from each Divisional Senate, one of whom is Vice Chair. UCORP considers matters pertaining to fostering research, general research policies, and procedures. In the Compendium processes, UCORP comments on and recommends approval of proposed actions involving MRUs. UCORP also analyzes the ORU and MRU proposed actions included in the <i>Five-Year Planning Perspectives</i> .
UCPB	University Committee on Planning and Budget—a committee of the systemwide Academic Senate. UCPB consists of a Chair, a Vice Chair, the Assembly Vice Chair, the UCORP Chair, and a representative from each Divisional Committee on Planning and Budget (or equivalent). UCPB advises university administration on policy regarding planning and budget matters and resource allocations. In the Compendium processes, UCPB comments on and recommends approval of proposed actions

	involving schools and colleges and MRUs. UCPB also analyzes the <i>Five-Year Planning Perspectives</i> .
WSCUC	The Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) is a regional accrediting body based in the Western US. It is an institutional accrediting agency for college and universities that award baccalaureate degrees or more advanced degrees. WSCUC accredits individual UC campuses, not the system as a whole. It also conducts <i>substantive change reviews</i> .

Appendix B: State Program Review Principles

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. 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.

Advancement of Knowledge

The program review process encourages the growth and development of intellectual and creative scholarship. When the advancement of knowledge seems to require the continuation of existing programs or the establishment of programs in new disciplines or in new combinations of existing disciplines, such considerations as costs, student demand or employment opportunities may become secondary.

Appendix C: Systemwide Professional School Planning: Recommended Guidelines and Model

Endorsed by the Academic Council - July 2004

A significant and ongoing component of the UC response to the demand for increased post-graduate education is the development of new professional schools on the various campuses. Most will develop as a result of local campus initiatives in response to the academic vision, programmatic needs and strengths of the campuses, along with the community needs for trained professionals. To facilitate both the planning of these new schools and their review by the Academic Senate and administration, it is useful to articulate some of the general qualities and requirements for starting these schools and, likewise, to outline some of the general considerations in their initiation.

In viewing the development of new schools, three major issues dominate: 1) the local and systemwide *academic rationale*, 2) the *student and societal need* for the school and its graduates and 3) the feasibility from a *resource* standpoint. This document touches on each of these, though it focuses principally upon the third, and particularly on the planning process related to resource development and allocation.

ACADEMIC POSITION OF THE NEW SCHOOL

Because resources need to flow along pathways established by academic needs, it is important to emphasize that resource planning must necessarily align with a well-formulated academic plan. This background rationale needs to be clearly defined and described in the formulation and application process. A proposal for a new professional school should address and outline in some detail these points: Among the issues to be considered (and outlined in some detail when proposing a new school) are:

1. How this new school fits 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 new school should thus fit with the campus in its current configuration and its longer-term vision.
2. How it will develop into a top-ranked school with an academic program consistent with a research university of UC quality.
3. An outline of a proposed curriculum that can be evaluated by those in the field.
4. Planning should include a clear vision of the faculty of the new school and indicate their number during the different phases of development (see below), and the balance of full-time faculty at various ranks with lecturers and other temporary or part-time teaching help. The need for particular specialties and sub-specialties should also be articulated and should fit with the curriculum.

5. The eventual size of the school should fit with this academic vision and with its aspirations of achieving high national ranking.
6. Facilities and space need to be adequate for the enterprise. Before considering their costs, their academic rationale needs to be clearly defined.
7. The administrative structure and staffing must be adequate for the needs of the school.

STUDENTS' AND SOCIETY'S NEED FOR THE NEW SCHOOL

Development of professional schools also must be considered in the context of the need of both students and society. These should be consonant – the school should fill a manifest need for training of qualified students who wish to fill a contemporary (and future) demand for qualified professionals in field. Thus,

8. There needs to be clear societal need for professionals in the field; a demand that is not being fully met by existing facilities. Projections of employment opportunities for the graduates must / should be defined.
9. This unmet need may be regional, national or international, or relate to particular social or demographic factors that the new school will address. The plans should clearly define how the school will address this unmet need.
10. Similarly, there should be a clear student demand for the new school. It should be shown that the school would attract qualified, fully-competitive students.
11. If there are professional 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 portfolio, whether related to the assets of the campus, other local opportunities or particular local demands. In this and in other respects, comparisons with existing UC or other schools of the desired rank should be included.
12. Access to the new school, including opportunities for qualified students who might otherwise be less likely to avail themselves of higher-level training in the field, should be considered.

FINANCIAL PLANNING FOR THE NEW SCHOOL

Since a new school most commonly will develop over several years, it is useful to define the timeline of its development and some of its critical landmarks. The attached “Financial Table for New Professional School” provides a general guideline for modeling this timeline and the needs at various points in development. The major landmarks of the school’s development are its size on opening day (year ‘X’ in the sheet) and at maturity (not necessarily its ultimate size, but the targeted size for a University-quality school).

The year of maturity also marks the time when the school is in financial balance, with revenues equaling expenses.

The timescale of development may vary with different schools, and the template can be adjusted accordingly. The years before the first landmark (X-n) span the time from the plan's approval to opening day. During this period the specific and detailed academic plans will be developed and the administrative structures established. Faculty will be hired or shifted to this school and administrative staff and structures put in place to meet the planning requirements and the opening needs. The years between opening day and maturity (X+n) describe the period of initial growth to the target; the faculty, administration and student enrollment will increase over this period in synchrony.

The attached planning template outlines the evolution over this timeline of the details of student enrollment, faculty and staff requirements, facilities needs and costs, and funding from various sources (page one), along with a summary of the costs and revenues (page two). This provides an outline for planning and a summary. Each individual item needs a clear rationale based upon realistic projections of needs and assets.

**Financial Table to be Submitted by the Campus to the Office of the President
With Any Proposal for a New Professional School**

Page 1 of 2

Please provide on a separate sheet, for each item, an explanation of the assumptions used to produce all of the numbers entered here.

	<u>Pre-opening Phase</u>		<u>Year X</u>	<u>Expansion Phase</u>				(add years as necessary)	<u>Mature Phase</u>
Academic Year =	<u>X-2</u>	<u>X-1</u>	<u>First Enrollment</u>	<u>X+1</u>	<u>X+2</u>	<u>X+3</u>	<u>X+4</u>		<u>Steady State</u>

Workload information

Student Total FTE by level
Undergraduate
Graduate
Total
Student Headcount by degree level
(e.g., Ph.D., MBA, BA and Total)
Faculty FTE
TA FTE
Staff FTE

Professional differential fee: proposed level

Facilities Costs

New Space
Renovation
Total

Capital Funding

State Funds
Gift Funds
University Funds
Other

Financial Table to be Submitted by the Campus to the Office of the President
With Any Proposal for a New Professional School

Page 2 of 2

Please provide on a separate sheet, for each item, an explanation of the assumptions used to produce all of the numbers entered here.

	Year					(add years as necessary)	Steady State
Academic Year =	X-2	X-1	First Enrollment	X+1	X+2	X+3	X+4

Operating Revenue ⁽¹⁾

Campus General Funds (i.e., State,
Educational Fee, other 19900 funds)
Professional differential fee
Self-supporting program fees
Sales and service
Gifts and endowments
Other (explain)
Total

Operating Expenditures

Salaries and benefits
Faculty
Deans
TAs
Staff
Recruitment & start up
Operating costs for facilities (e.g.,
moving, renovation, leases)
not counted under recruitment
Supplies, indirect, and related costs
Library
Financial support for prof. students
Total

Revenue Less Expenditures

¹ Include funding for benefits where appropriate.

Appendix D: UCOP Policy on Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and Units

Office of the President, September 19, 1979

Sound academic and fiscal planning requires that consideration be given to strengthening academic programs by intercampus transfer and consolidation and to terminating units and programs for which there is decreased long-term need or which cannot reasonably be expected to reach or maintain the level of quality expected in the University, or from which resources must be withdrawn to support higher priority programs.

The decision to transfer, consolidate, disestablish or discontinue an academic unit or program should be founded on considerations as careful and thorough as those for establishment. For the most part the same issues need to be examined, and the same Senate agencies and administrative officers should have the opportunity to participate consistent with the traditional system of shared governance in which the Academic Senate has the responsibility for approving academic programs and evaluating the quality of courses and curricula, and the administration has the responsibility for allocating resources and determining administrative organization. This policy is intended to further this concept of shared governance and to aid in the development of explicit and well-understood procedures by each campus for effecting such transfers and consolidations and or disestablishing academic units and discontinuing academic programs.

1. Each campus shall have written procedures.¹⁸ Such procedures shall recognize the responsibility of the Academic Senate to judge program quality and academic value and the responsibility of the administration to decide on administrative organization and on the allocation and use of resources. Campuses shall incorporate into their procedures mechanisms to insure appropriate consultation with students.
2. These procedures shall be developed by the Chancellor in consultation with the divisional Academic Senate, and are subject to approval by the President with the advice of the systemwide Academic Senate. Appropriate consultation with students shall be carried out at the campuses and at the system level regarding these proposed procedures.
3. For purposes of this policy, academic units are schools, colleges, boards of study, departments, and divisions within departments, schools, and colleges. An academic program consists of a sequence of courses leading to a degree; it does not include a concentration within a major. Changes in such concentrations within a major which may prompt transfers of individual students are not required to conform to this procedure.
4. The written procedures for each campus shall be based on the following policy

¹⁸ Procedures throughout this document shall be understood to refer to the procedures for intercampus transfer and consolidation of academic programs and/or units and for the disestablishment of academic units and discontinuance of academic programs

considerations:

a. Prior Review

- i. A decision to transfer or consolidate, to disestablish or discontinue an academic unit or program shall normally be preceded by a regular or ad hoc review of the unit or program conducted by a campus academic planning board or comparable bodies that guarantee board representation.

b. Consultation

- i. Broad consultation, including faculty and students who are affected by the proposed change, is essential. Peer review from outside the University in judging academic quality should take place whenever possible.
- ii. Committees of the divisional Academic Senate on Educational Policy, Academic Personnel, Planning and Budget and, if graduate programs are involved, Graduate Affairs shall be consulted as provided for in Senate regulations.
- iii. If the unit or program being considered for transfer, consolidation or termination is unique in the University, or if its closure would have systemwide or intersegmental effects, the President shall be consulted early in the process.

c. Phase Out

- i. Arrangements shall be made to allow students already enrolled in the program or unit to complete their degrees.
- ii. Arrangements shall be made for the orderly and appropriate accommodations of academic and staff employees whose positions are affected by a decision to disestablish or discontinue or to transfer to another campus or to combine with another program or programs on a different campus. These arrangements shall be in accordance with existing personnel policies to the extent that they are adequate for each specific decision. Where existing policies are not adequate, supplemental policies shall be developed by the system-level Administration through appropriate consultation with the Academic Senate. Until such policies are adopted, historical precedent and established practice shall supplement existing personnel policies.

d. Decisions

- i. The final decision on the disestablishment of schools and colleges and degrees is made by The Regents on the recommendation of the President.
- ii. The final decisions on the intercampus transfer or consolidation, or on the

disestablishment of other academic units, shall be made by the President upon consultation with the systemwide Academic Senate and students as appropriate.

- iii. The final decision on intercampus transfer or consolidation or on discontinuance of an academic program is made by the Academic Senate and/or the Chancellors acting in their appropriate spheres of responsibility as delegated by The Regents.
- iv. Campuses shall report such transfers, consolidations and discontinuances annually on their Academic Program Inventory.

Appendix E: Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Multicampus Research Units (MRUs)

REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

The Review Process

As set forth in the *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units*, periodic reviews of MRUs are necessary to ensure that the research being conducted under the units' auspices is of the highest possible quality and that University resources are being allocated wisely and in line with University priorities. The five-year review requires that each MRU submit a proposal to be reviewed by an *ad hoc* review committee established by the Vice Provost for Research from a slate nominated by the Chair of the Academic Council and the Chancellors.

The Review Committee's Report is expected to provide an objective and balanced critical evaluation of the MRU to be reviewed and answer two key questions. One, does the unit provide a unique service to UC in research, support of graduate education, and public service that would not otherwise be accomplished in its absence? Two, should the MRU be continued for another five years? The information needed to complete the review will be gathered from the MRU Director's Report and from a site visit to the MRU's administrative headquarters and, if necessary, to other important locations. Where appropriate, the Review Committee's Report may simply refer to the Director's Report rather than duplicate information already provided in the Director's Report. The Review Committee should become familiar with the section on five-year reviews contained in *Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning organized Research Units*.

Review Committee Report

The Review Committee's report is the most important product of the MRU review process and its recommendations will be pivotal to decisions about the future of the unit. The report should address each of the areas identified below and emphasize for each the unit's strengths and weaknesses. A report from the Director of the MRU detailing information on the same areas will be provided to the Review Committee to assist it in carrying out the review. The body of the Review Committee's Report should not exceed 20 single-spaced pages, not including appendices.

F. Introduction and Executive Summary.

- a. Mission of the unit. Include, as an introduction, a concise statement describing the history of the unit, its mission, scope, and any changes that may have occurred in mission and scope over the life of the MRU. Does the unit serve the University in some unique way such that it represents a substantial asset to the University and the citizens of California? Is the unit visible and active on its home campus? On other UC campuses? Is there evidence of effective interaction with related units, e.g., departments, other campus entities, and, where appropriate, national Labs?

- III. Evidence of accomplishment. What are the MRU's major accomplishments over the over the preceding five year period in the following areas?
- a. Research: Describe the quality and productivity of research accomplished and in progress. What are the major achievements of the professional academic staff (publications, awards, honors, presentations) and administrative support staff? Is there compelling evidence that the MRU has contributed to outstanding research in the disciplinary and interdisciplinary areas in which it specializes?
 - b. Undergraduate and graduate education: What are the direct and indirect contributions of the MRU to graduate and undergraduate teaching programs of academic departments of the University?
 - c. Recognition for excellence beyond UC: Does the unit have a national or international reputation for excellence beyond UC?
 - d. Public service and outreach: Has the MRU made significant contributions to the public and the community external to UC? Does the MRU contribute to policy discussions and development at the State and national levels in areas encompassed by its special research interests?
- IV. Budget. Does the unit make cost-effective uses of UC funds (for example, is there an appropriate balance of expenditures for administrative versus research support)? Has the unit been successful in garnering extramural support to augment UC funding? Should additional UC funding be provided, and if so, what needs do you regard as most critical for the unit?
- V. Administration and governance. Does the administrative structure optimally meet the needs of the MRU? Are resources for administration appropriate and adequate? The report should separately address the following administrative issues:
- a. Director: Is the Director an effective leader of the MRU? What are the Director's strengths and weaknesses? Are there areas in which the Directors should place additional or fewer resources?
 - b. Space and resources: Is the space assigned to the unit adequate or reasonable from an overall campus perspective, in terms of footage and location? What specific changes would you recommend, if any? Does the Director have adequate control of space assigned to the unit, and has it been well utilized? Are necessary resources available to the unit and are they adequate?
 - c. Personnel: Is there adequate participation of faculty in the unit, both at the host campuses and on other campuses? Is the support staff adequate at the administrative headquarters?
 - d. Contract and grant administration: If the MRU administers faculty-generated grants and contracts, are the arrangements adequate and do the research projects receive appropriate levels of infrastructure support?
- VI. Advisory Committee(s): How effective is the Advisory Committee or committees in providing guidance to the Director? Does the Committee have a role in the MRU's

faculty research competition(s) and in the graduate student dissertation competition, if one exists? If so, are potential conflict-of-interests appropriately managed?

- VII. Problems and needs: Are there significant problems or needs that prevent the MRU from fulfilling its mission effectively and what actions should be taken to address them?
- VIII. Comparison with other units. What are the MRU's unique contributions to the University that distinguish it from other apparently similar research or academic entities at UC? Is the unit's continuance as a separate entity justified and what would be lost if the unit did not exist?
- IX. Conclusions and Recommendations.

CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT

- I. Introduction and Executive Summary
- II. Evidence of Accomplishment
 - a. Research
 - b. Undergraduate and Graduate Education
 - c. Recognition Beyond UC
 - d. Public Service and Outreach
- III. Budget
- IV. Administration and Governance
 - a. Director
 - b. Space and Resources
 - c. Staffing
 - d. Contract and Grant Administration
- V. Advisory Committee
- VI. Problems and Needs
- VII. Comparison with other Units
- VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations