CCGA is pleased to present you with a significant revision of the CCGA Handbook. Our aim has been to make the Handbook clearer and more consistent and reflective of current language and practice. We ask that Graduate Council Analysts bring this update to the attention of anyone currently in the process of drafting a proposal for a new graduate degree, and that the Graduate Deans similarly inform other Deans and campus officials who promote, review, or approve proposals.

CCGA aims to give all new proposals as expeditious a review as is possible consistent with responsible oversight. The proposers of new graduate degrees and campus reviewers can optimize the chances of successful and timely review at CCGA by following completely and exactly the format for new proposals outlined in Appendix B of this Handbook. Please note that the “format of proposals” instructions are also found in the Compendium, but the Compendium version is out of date and proposers should follow this Handbook.

After observing that certain kinds of questions are repeatedly posed by, and certain data constantly requested by, CCGA members and the expert reviewers recruited by CCGA, we have added a number of additional specifications in the instructions in Appendix B. We thus hope to ensure that proposals contain all the information that is needed for CCGA review, so that CCGA does not have to request such information after the proposal reaches systemwide level.

CCGA has clarified in this version that the requirement to show a proposal to chairs of comparable programs at other UC campuses is intended to provide useful feedback to the proposers at an early stage and that such consultation does not serve the same purpose as the internal reviews that CCGA will obtain in most cases after an approved proposal arrives from a campus. See Appendix B, Section I.5 (p. 17).

Furthermore, we strongly recommend that proposers consider carefully what degree title to use, particularly for professional degrees. Selecting the proper title at the outset makes the process of review and approval go more smoothly and quickly. For CCGA’s current thinking on degree titles, see Appendix J.

Among the changes to language and terms in the Handbook we may mention as examples the following: any remaining instances of “self-supported” have been replaced by “self-supporting” (the currently approved term); references to CPEC review have been removed; designated staff in UCOP involved in the
approval process are referred to generically rather than with a specific title, since specific titles tend to change over time.

In addition, the appendices have been reordered so that those that are most relevant to CCGA members to and current practices come before those that have tangential or historical interest.

Please note the following, which we consider the most significant changes:

- the CPEC questionnaire is no longer a required part of a graduate degree proposal, since CPEC has been discontinued. The information elicited by this questionnaire is already present in other parts of the proposal.
- CCGA aims to give the most expeditious review possible to every proposal, consistent with fulfilling its oversight function; references to a special kind of “expedited review” have been removed or hedged, and proposers are requested not to ask for “expedited review” and not to build into their timeline unrealistic expectations of the length of review at systemwide level.
- uniformity of process for state-supported and non-state-supported degrees (see p. 7): that is, M.A.S. proposals and other SSP/SSGPDP proposals should not expect any special treatment. CCGA aims to act expeditiously on all proposals and always uses its discretion as to whether any elements of the process may be reduced or omitted because of the nature of the evidence already available.
- the steps of CCGA’s review process have been clarified and reorganized (pp. 6-9).
- the list of relevant CCGA policies (pp. 11) has two new items, concerning expectation for naming of graduate professional degrees and the Senate role in reviewing proposals to add PDST to a program that did not previously charge PDST.
- Appendix B (Format of Proposals): IMPORTANT: additions have made to the description of the required content of proposals; some of the highlights of these additions are the following:
  - proposal title will include mention of PDST or SSP/SSGPDP status;
  - date will make clear process of revision;
  - executive summary now required;
  - if a capstone project is used, it needs to be described in some detail;
  - profile of target audience should be described (in-state, out-of-state domestic, international);
  - fuller details required about role of faculty in teaching in SSP/SSGPDP;
  - fuller details required about online courses;
  - fuller details required about financial support of graduate students
- Appendix C: clarifications, simplifications, modernizations in listing of duties and actions of lead reviewer.
- Appendix I: note additional specifications about joint Master’s degree capstone projects adopted by CCGA in February 2014.
- Appendix J: this is new to the Handbook, and concerns the titles used for professional Master’s degrees (a policy applied by CCGA for several years, but explicitly communicated to campuses in February 2014); Appendix J contains additional background beyond what was provided in February 2014 and there have been some changes and additions in phrasing after further consultation.
- Appendix N: this is new to the Handbook, but was approved in 2011 and should have been added to the Handbook then (statement on Senate role in evaluating new proposals for charging PDST)
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