October 28, 2008

Mary Croughan
Professor, Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences
Chair, UC Systemwide Academic Senate
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Mary:

RE: REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE OF THE UC TASK FORCE ON PLANNING FOR PROFESSIONAL AND DOCTORAL EDUCATION

The above request was reviewed by the Committee on Planning and Budget, Educational Policy and Graduate Council. All the three committees unanimously support of the report and endorsed the specific recommendations of the Report.

In particular, the Committee on Planning and Budget had the following comments to make:

1. The P&B Committee endorses the establishment and use of an oversight or adjudicating board that is impartial and representative of the various constituencies involved in a proposal. The plan to consider each proposal on a case-by-case basis is also appropriate given the many issues and implications of each specific doctorate proposal.
   a. It is important that the adjudicating board also include expertise relevant to a particular proposal so that any issues unique to that program are considered thoroughly. It was not clear if this is included in the current plan.
   b. The Committee would like to review the Mission Statement of this board when it is written.

2. The P&B Committee strongly feels that both UC and CSU (1) should be involved in the initial planning stages of all such programs and (2) be able to sign off on any program that advances beyond this initial planning phase, even in cases when an institution does not foresee any further involvement.

3. Given the practical nature of these doctorate programs, a needs-base approach is appropriate for their development. As much as possible, the needs assessment must include the time it takes to establish or ramp up these programs to the doctoral level
and the anticipated costs associated with this timeline in terms of cost increases, lean budget years, and other competing market forces. Also, as much as possible, some additional funds should be included in the budget to cover unforeseen costs. It was unclear

a. how these needs will be identified and whether a need must pass some threshold of demand in the state to be considered for a doctorate program,
b. whether the resources and time required to develop and set up a doctoral program will be able to address these needs adequately and do so in a timely manner, and
c. how the actual cost of setting up and running these programs will be determined.

4. The overall cost to the state for any doctorate program must be identified and both UC and CSU must have an opportunity before final approval to review this cost and understand what the financial implications are for the universities if the program goes forward.

5. If a program has direct impact on a UC campus, e.g. through courses or facilities, will any funds be available to the Graduate Division on that campus to cover administrative and student support costs of the program?

6. What might be the implications for a UC campus that is not directly involved in a doctorate program and how will this impact be assessed? (e.g., competing for the same pool of individuals who are interested in graduate training in the state)

7. Will state funds be increasingly affected by needs-based planning at the graduate level? If so, how will this affect graduate funding in areas where UC already offers doctorate degrees?

Yours faithfully,

Anthony W. Norman
Distinguished Professor of Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences; and
Chair of the Riverside Division