

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Michael T. Brown  
Telephone: (510) 987-0711  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: [Michael.Brown@ucop.edu](mailto:Michael.Brown@ucop.edu)

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council  
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

August 29, 2008

**ROBERT GREY, PROVOST**

## **Re: Re-establishment of CCGA Authority over Reviews of First Professional Degree Proposals**

Dear Bob,

At its July 23, 2008 meeting, Academic Council approved the request from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) to reinstate CCGA's plenary authority to approve new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs. CCGA has concluded that its 1995 decision exempting these degree titles from Senate oversight, thereby allowing relevant professional schools to approve new programs with these degree titles, was not made with an appreciation of the distinction between the approval and oversight roles of the Senate. While CCGA concurs that ongoing oversight is best left to professional schools offering these five degree titles pursuant to Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b), it is the experience of CCGA that two aspects of its review – the removal from internal pressures and influences within host campus, and the mandate to solicit expert reviews from outside the University – provide compelling motivation for conducting a review of proposed new degrees within the structure of the system-wide Senate. CCGA also noted that the satisfaction of accreditation requirements should not serve as a proxy for the rigorous review of new graduate programs performed by the Academic Senate.

**CCGA is reinstating its plenary role in the approval of *new* M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs effective immediately.** It leaves the discretion of oversight of established degree programs to their campus Graduate Councils or their designees. Please inform the relevant staff and officers in those units associated with the review of new professional degree programs with these degree titles at both the Office of the President and the campuses about this change in CCGA policy. For your reference and convenience, I have enclosed CCGA's letter to Council and its rationale for the change. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this policy change.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael", is written below the text.

Michael T. Brown, Chair  
Academic Council

Copy: President Yudof  
Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Beckwith  
Academic Council  
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director

Encl. 2



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)  
Bruce Schumm, Chair  
schumm@scipp.ucsc.edu

The Assembly of the  
Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 587-6138  
Fax: (510) 763-0309

August 12, 2008

**MICHAEL T. BROWN, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**RE: Re-establishment of CCGA Authority Over Reviews of First-Professional Degree Proposals**

Dear Michael:

Recent consideration by the Office of the Provost of the role of the University in the provision of professional doctoral education has prompted CCGA to reconsider its authority over the review and oversight of professional doctoral programs. CCGA has concluded that the 1995 decision by the Subcommittee on Professional School Oversight decision exempting the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree titles from Senate oversight was not made with an appreciation of the distinction between the approval and oversight roles of the Senate.

At the subcommittee's request, UCR&J considered Senate regulations relating to the oversight of Professional School academics, and concluded that "...while the Academic Senate lacks authority over courses in graduate professional schools, it does have authority over degrees and degree-programs. The Senate's authority over *courses* derives from SOR 105.2.b, wherein graduate professional schools are exempted from that authority. The Senate's authority over *degrees* derives from SOR 105.2.a, wherein graduate professional schools are not exempt from the Senate's authority over degrees.

Upon review of its 1995 deliberations, the current CCGA finds no arguments that would weigh against the reinstatement of its authority to approve proposals for the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree titles, and notes that the 1995 subcommittee stated a degree of reservation in its recommendation to relinquish its authority to approve proposals for these titles. Thus, in accordance with SOR 105.2.a, CCGA has chosen to reinstate its plenary role in the approval of new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs, while leaving the discretion of oversight of established degree programs to their campus Graduate Councils or their designees.

This memo serves as notice to the University community of the re-establishment of CCGA's authority to review and approve proposals for these degree titles, effective immediately. We ask that you circulate this memo to the appropriate offices, including those of the Systemwide and divisional Provosts, the divisional Graduate Deans, and the chairs of the divisional Senates and Graduate Councils.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions that this memo may raise.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Bruce Schumm', written in a cursive style.

Bruce Schumm  
Chair, CCGA

Copy: CCGA  
Executive Director Martha Winnacker

Enclosure (1)

## **CCGA Reconsideration of Its Authority Over the Review and Oversight of Professional and Doctoral Programs**

Recent consideration by the Office of the Provost of the role of the University in the provision of professional doctoral education has prompted CCGA to reconsider its authority over the review and oversight of professional and doctoral programs. A consensus has emerged that the satisfaction of accreditation requirements should not serve as a proxy for the rigorous review of new graduate programs performed by the Academic Senate. In particular, it is only during this system-wide review of proposals for new graduate programs that the advice of disinterested experts, both within and outside of the University, is sought. The incorporation of peer review in the approval of new graduate programs lies at the core of the Senate's promotion of excellence in the University's graduate enterprise.

It is the conclusion of CCGA that the 1995 decision exempting the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree titles from Senate oversight was not made with an appreciation of the distinction between the approval and oversight roles of the Senate. This memo serves as notice to the University community that CCGA is reinstating its plenary role in the approval of new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs, effective immediately, while leaving the oversight of established degree programs to the professional schools that house them. CCGA's former position on the review of these five professional doctoral degrees stemmed from the conclusion of a 1995 Subcommittee on Professional School Oversight. This subcommittee requested that UCR&J report on Senate regulation relating to oversight of Professional School academics, receiving the following response:

*"UCR&J came to the conclusion that, while the Academic Senate lacks authority over courses in graduate professional schools, the Senate does have authority over degrees and degree-programs. The Senate authority over courses derives from SOR 105.2.b, wherein the graduate professional schools are exempted from that authority. The Senate's authority over degrees derives from SOR 105.2.a, which states that 'the Academic Senate . . . shall determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees other than honorary degrees. It shall recommend to the President all candidates for degrees in course [sic].' SOR 105.2.a does not exempt the graduate professional schools from the Senate's authority over degrees. In general, UCR&J has taken the position that the graduate professional schools retain their own authority over course-approvals and grading policies, but are otherwise subject to the same Senate oversight as any other graduate program."*

In this light, the Subcommittee generated the following recommendation, which was subsequently adopted by the Committee as a whole:

*CCGA's recently clarified constitutional responsibility for overseeing professional degrees therefore confronts the Senate with a dilemma. The oversight exemption practices that have historically evolved to give medical, dental, veterinary, pharmacy, and law schools autonomy appear to be effective and consistent, but difficult to rationalize or justify. Pragmatically, there are good reasons for maintaining the present system of exempting the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. from Senate oversight. The exempt professional schools appear to have developed Faculty Councils or other faculty governing bodies that serve oversight functions analogous to those of the Divisional Graduate Councils. These appear to be working well to insure program quality, and Divisional Graduate Councils currently report no problems or compelling reasons for changing governance and review procedures.*

*CCGA was approached by the Academic Council to consider problems of equal access by students to professional schools (affirmative action, differential fees) – not problems of quality. A shift to Senate oversight at this late date motivated chiefly by constitutional considerations would be gratuitously disruptive and counterproductive. CCGA therefore proposes to formalize the present system.*

*CCGA wishes to endorse the status quo of present exemption policies, stare decisis, as a willingness to stand by a settled state of affairs. In the interest of preserving rules of constitutional Senate jurisdiction, CCGA explicitly states its willingness to let Divisional Graduate Councils delegate their oversight responsibilities to professional schools offering the specific degrees of the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. Graduate Councils should base their delegation on the existence of rigorous and effective parallel review structures within the exempted professional schools. CCGA retains its right to review and make recommendations regarding any professional school policies and practices that do not result in effective faculty program reviews. CCGA also retains its right and obligation to review and make recommendations regarding professional school programs when the continuation or discontinuance of these programs have system-wide implications.*

While the current CCGA concurs that, stare decisis, ongoing oversight is best left to professional schools offering these five degree titles, it sees no reason to forego its review of new-program proposals for these five degree titles, or to abrogate its authority to approve and recommend proposals for these degree titles to the President of the University.

On the contrary, it is the experience of CCGA that two aspects of its review – the remove from internal pressures and influences within host campus, and the mandate to solicit expert reviews from outside the University – provide compelling motivation for conducting a review within the structure of the system-wide Senate. Upon review of its 1995 deliberations, the current CCGA finds no arguments that would weigh against the reinstatement of its authority to approve proposals for the M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree titles, and notes that the 1995 subcommittee stated a degree of reservation in its recommendation to relinquish its authority to approve proposals for these titles. Thus, CCGA has chosen to reinstate its authority to review and approve proposals for these degree titles, effective immediately.