ESTABLISHMENT OF A GRADUATE PROGRAM
LEADING TO A NEW OR EXISTING DEGREE

I.   Purpose and Scope

These procedures describe the required steps to establish a graduate degree program leading to a new or existing degree. All graduate degree programs shall be established according to these procedures.

II.   Authority and Coordination

A.   The president has delegated authority from The Regents of the University of California to authorize new graduate degree titles at UCSB upon approval by the Assembly of the Academic Senate (or Academic Council, acting for the Assembly).

B.   The president approves implementation of new graduate degree programs upon approval by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and concurrence by the California Post Secondary Education Commission (CPEC).

C.   The Faculty Legislature has final authority to approve a graduate program before it is submitted for universitywide review and approval. Faculty Legislature action follows approval by the Graduate Council and endorsement by the chancellor.

D.   The Graduate Division is the coordinating office for campus reviews and liaison for communications from univeritywide reviewers.

III.   Procedures for Establishment of a Graduate Program Leading to an Existing Degree

A.   UCSB is currently authorized to confer the following graduate degrees:

Academic Degree Titles	Professional Degree Titles
Master of Arts (M.A.)	Master of Education (M.Ed.)
Master of Science (M.S.)	Master of Environmental Science & Management (M.E.S.M.)
Candidate in Philosophy (C.Phil.)[*]	Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.)
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	Master of Music (M.M.)
	Doctor of Education EdD
	Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.)

B.   Early Planning Stage--Campus Five-Year Perspective

Review time for new graduate degree programs depends on a number of factors, including the clarity and completeness of the proposal, the turn-around time for revisions, and the timing of reviewing agency meetings. For planning purposes, two academic years should be allotted for campus and systemwide reviews. If the proposal is for a joint doctoral program with a State University campus, additional steps are required; please refer to the *Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs* at http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/uccsu/jointdochandbook030502.htm.

Before preparing a detailed proposal for the establishment of a new graduate program, consultation with the faculty, academic dean(s) and provost(s) is strongly recommended. If the program is found feasible, it must be included in the Campus Five-Year Perspective.

---

[*] The C.Phil. is not a terminal degree. It is awarded to students in certain departments upon advancement to candidacy to the Ph.D. degree.

C.   Proposal Development

1.   The initiators consult with the academic dean(s) or provost(s) and the dean of the Graduate Division prior to preparation of the draft proposal to discuss the guidelines, any areas of concern, and the "Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal" (Appendix).

2.   The initiators submit three copies of the draft proposal to the dean of the Graduate Division for preliminary review. Comments from the dean and Graduate Division staff are intended to assist the initiators in the inclusion of administrative and programmatic elements critical to the evaluation of the proposal by Graduate Council.

D.   Campus Review of Proposal

1.   The initiators submit two paper copies and an electronic copy to the dean of the Graduate Division. The dean sends an electronic copy of the proposal with a request for comments to the academic dean(s) and provost(s) of the initiating school/college, assistant chancellor, Budget and Planning (BAP), Graduate Council, the faculty executive committee(s) (FEC(s)) of the initiating school(s)/college(s), and the Academic Senate chair for review by the Councils on Planning and Budget, and Research and Instructional Resources.

2.   Comments from the reviewing agencies are forwarded to the dean of the Graduate Division who submits them to Graduate Council. At the same time, the dean submits the proposal and comments to the executive vice chancellor (EVC) for concurrent administrative review and comment. Graduate Council consolidates its comments with those of the other reviewing agencies, and notifies the initiators of any recommended changes to the proposal, with copies to the academic dean and provost of the relevant school/college and the FEC. When the initiators submit a revised proposal, Graduate Council reviews it for incorporation of recommended changes and consults with the academic dean(s). There may be several iterations of this step, leading either to approval or disapproval of the proposal by Graduate Council. In its review, council ensures that consultation with affected departments and programs has taken place and takes any resultant comments into consideration.

3.   During Graduate Council review (see #2 above), the EVC confers with the chancellor, and may request a staff analysis of the proposal by Budget and Planning. The chancellor sends his/her response (endorsement or not and any comments) to the Graduate Council.

4.   Action by Graduate Council will be reported to the Academic Senate office with copies to the initiators, the dean and provost of the relevant school or college. If Graduate Council approves the proposal, the council chair sends a copy of the final proposal and supporting documentation to the Academic Senate office. The memorandum will indicate the effective date of implementation. In addition, the initiators submit an abstract of the proposal to the Academic Senate Office for inclusion in the next agenda of the Faculty Legislature.

5.   The Academic Senate office reports the Faculty Legislature action to the chancellor, EVC, the initiators, the academic dean(s), provost, and the Graduate Division dean who will send one copy of the approved proposal and supporting documentation to the EVC for transmittal to the chancellor.

6.   The Graduate Division transmits the approved proposal with supporting documentation (transmittal letter from the chancellor, which addresses resources available for the new program and states the proposed effective implementation date,

letter of approval from the divisional Faculty Legislature, letter of approval from the divisional Graduate Council, faculty curriculum vitae, response to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) questionnaire, name and contact information for lead faculty member, department chair and administrative staff contact) to the members of the Coordinating Council on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), and the CCGA analyst. Two copies of the entire dossier are also sent to the provost and senior vice president for Academic Affairs and staff analyst. (The initiators may need to provide up to twenty additional copies of the approved proposal for the distribution described above.)

E.   Off Campus Review of Proposal

1.   Upon notification by the CCGA Chair that the initial discussion of the proposal suggests that it will be favorably reviewed, the coordinator-Program Review sends the CPEC Summary to CPEC for review that runs simultaneously with CCGA's review. If any issues remain to be resolved before CPEC concurs with the proposal, the coordinator-Program Review works with the campus to resolve them. CPEC reports its concurrence to the coordinator-Program Review, with a copy to the vice provost–Academic Initiatives.

2.   CCGA carries out its review, which normally includes full committee discussion, exchanges with the campus to clarify issues, written review of the proposal by at least two disciplinary experts, and a site visit by the CCGA lead reviewer. Upon completion of this review, CCGA transmits its approval to UCOP.

NOTE: If the proposal is for a graduate degree program leading toward a new degree title (e.g., MFA), that has never been used before on the campus, then additional Academic Senate reviews and approvals are needed following CCGA's approval of the degree program.

3.   After the coordinator-Program Review has compiled the CCGA approval, lead reviewer's report and any appended materials, the CPEC concurrence, and his/her own analysis, he/she notifies the provost & senior vice president who recommends to the president that the proposed graduate program be implemented. E-mail use is encouraged.

4.   After the president approves implementation of the proposed program, the coordinator-Program Review e-mails the campus and CCGA of final approval and then sends a print copy of the president's formal recommendation to the campus. The chancellor forwards copies of this notification to the initiators, the Academic Senate, the registrar, and the Office of Budget and Planning.

Endorsed: Executive Vice Chancellor, 3/12/04
Approved: Executive Council, 2/24/04
            Faculty Legislature, 3/4/04

APPENDIX
Format for the Graduate Degree Program Proposal

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

Date of Preparation

Section 1. Introduction

1. Aims and objectives of the program. Any distinctive features.
2. Historical development of the field and historical development of departmental strength in the field.
3. Proposed implementation date and timetable for development of the program, including enrollment projections. Consistency of these projections with the campus enrollment plan. If the campus has enrollment quotas for its programs, state which program(s) will have their enrollments reduced in order to accommodate the proposed program.
4. Relationship to and effect of the proposed program on existing programs on campus and the Campus Academic Plan. If the program is not in the Campus Academic Plan, why is it important that it be established now? Evidence of high campus priority. Effect of the proposed program on undergraduate programs offered by the sponsoring department(s).
5. Interrelationship of the program with other University of California institutions, if applicable. The possibility of cooperation or competition with other programs within the University should be discussed. Initiators should send copies of their proposal to all departments on other campuses offering similar degrees. Review letters should be obtained from chairs of such departments and these letters should be attached to the proposal.
6. Department or group that will administer the program. Vote of the faculty. (See Section 4 for Interdisciplinary Group programs.)
7. Plan for evaluation of the program within the offering department(s) and campuswide.

Section 2. Program

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

1. Undergraduate preparation for admission.
2. Foreign language. "The CCGA recognizes that foreign language competence may be an important element of graduate education of doctoral programs. It is the responsibility of the Divisional Graduate Councils to insure that the proponents of new doctoral programs have carefully considered the value of a foreign language requirement. We shall assume that when a proposal for a new doctoral degree has been forwarded to CCGA, this issue has been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Division. Divisional Graduate Councils should apply the same standard adopted for new programs in reviewing existing doctoral programs." (CCGA Minutes, 5/14/85, p. 6)
3. Program of study:
   a. Specific fields of emphasis.
   b. Plan(s): Master I and/or II; Doctors A or B.
   c. Unit requirements.
   d. Required and recommended courses, including teaching requirement.
   e. When a degree program must have licensing or certification, the requirements of the agency or agencies involved should be listed in the proposal, especially the courses needed to satisfy such requirements (CCGA Minutes, 1/17/78, p. 5).
4. Field examinations – written and/or oral.
5. Qualifying examinations – written and/or oral.
6. Thesis and/or dissertation.
7. Final examination.
8. Explanation of special requirements over and above Graduate Division minimum requirements.
9. Relationship of master's and doctoral programs.
10. Special preparation for careers in teaching.
11. Sample program.
12. Normative time from matriculation to degree. (Assume student has no deficiencies and is full-time.) Also specify the normative lengths of time for pre-candidacy and for candidacy

periods. (If normative time is subsequently lengthened to more than six years, prior approval of CCGA is required.) *Other incentives to support expeditious times-to-degree:* what policies or other incentives will assure that students make timely progress toward degree completion in the proposed program?

13, If the proposal is for a joint doctoral degree with a State University campus, please refer to the "Program Proposal" section of the *Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs* at http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/uccsu/jointdochandbook030502.htm#5.

Section 3. Projected need

1. Student demand for the program.
2. Opportunities for placement of graduates. UC anticipates that CPEC in particular will expect detailed and convincing evidence of job market needs. This will be especially true for programs in graduate fields now well represented among UC campuses and California independent universities, as well as programs in the same field proposed by more than one campus. If UC already offers programs in the field, what are their placement records in recent years? What recent job listings, employers surveys, assessments of future job growth, etc. can be provided to demonstrate a strong market for graduates of this program, or for graduates of specialty areas that will be the focus of the program?
3. Importance to the discipline.
4. Ways in which the program will meet the needs of society.
5. Relationship of the program to research and/or professional interests of the faculty.
6. Program differentiation. How will the proposed program distinguish itself from existing UC and California independent university programs, from similar programs proposed by other UC campuses? Statistics or other detailed documentation of need should be provided.

Section 4. Faculty

A statement on present faculty and immediately pending appointments. This should include a list of faculty members, their ranks, their highest degree and other professional qualifications, and a citation of relevant publications; data concerning faculty should be limited to only that information pertinent to the committee's evaluation of faculty qualifications. (For Interdisciplinary Group programs only, one copy of letters from participating faculty indicating their interest in the program should be included, and letters of support from participating department chairs. In addition, comments from chairmen of departments with graduate programs closely related to or affected by the proposed program, or with similar name, should be included.)

Section 5. Courses

A list of present and proposed courses including instructors and supporting courses in related fields. The catalog description of all proposed courses should be appended. The relationship of these courses to specific fields of emphasis and future plans. How will the courses be staffed given existing course loads?

Section 6. Resource Requirements

Estimate for the first five years the additional cost of the program, by year, for each of the following categories:

1. FTE faculty
2. Library acquisition
3. Computing
4. Equipment

5. Space and other capital facilities
6. Staffing requirements and costs
7. Other operating costs.

Indicate the intended method of funding these additional costs.

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

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

Section 7. Graduate Student Support

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

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

Section 8. Changes in Senate regulations

If the proposal is for a new degree title, please append draft enabling legislation. If the proposal requires amendments to any Senate regulations, please so state. May be submitted later in the review process. Contact the Director of the Academic Senate for assistance.

CPEC Questionnaire: may be submitted later in the review process. Contact the Graduate Division for assistance.

CIP Code: may be submitted later in the review process. The code is required to ensure that data relating to the new program are kept in relationship to data in similarly coded disciplines. Contact Institutional Research in the Office of Budget and Planning for assistance.