

DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

It is the policy of the university to allow development of new doctoral programs (either independent or programs developed in conjunction with other institutions). Joint doctoral programs may be in any field in which there is strong demand for doctoral educated persons and in which the University has the faculty expertise to implement the program. Independent doctoral programs shall be limited to specific fields authorized under state law, and in which the University has the faculty expertise to implement the program. Yet the university also recognizes that doctoral programs require a high level of commitment and funding. The cost of training doctoral students is almost certainly much greater than what is required for educating master's and baccalaureate students although the specific costs for doctoral programs will vary across fields.

Doctoral program proposals may be initiated by any appropriate campus source including single academic departments, groups of academic departments, groups of faculty members in different departments, and administrators. Regardless of the proposal source, doctoral program advocates must consult with affected academic departments and colleges. It is also expected that new doctoral programs will draw upon the curricular and substantive expertise of current faculty and existing departments. Nothing in this policy should be construed as prohibiting the formation of new graduate groups, provided appropriate consultation has occurred and existing expertise is used. Note that for purposes of this document a graduate group is a group of faculty with the highest level of scholarship and knowledge of the field of study and serves as the organizational means for ensuring distinct governance, consultation, and faculty leadership for interdisciplinary doctoral programs. Graduate faculty groups may include full-time faculty members from different academic departments and units as well as qualified part time faculty.

After consulting information derived from the Council of Graduate Education, the Carnegie Foundation and the National Science Foundation to create doctoral program categories, California State University, Sacramento distinguishes between professional doctorates (PDoc), such as the DPT (Doctor of Physical Therapy), and research doctorates (RDoc), such as the EdD (Doctor of Education) and the Ph.D. (Doctor of Philosophy). The distinction between these degrees is largely drawn by the difference in requirements to obtain them.

The Professional Doctorate (PDoc) is a degree conferred upon completion of a program providing knowledge and skills for recognition, credential or license for professional practice. Professional doctorates are awarded in certain fields where most holders of the degree are not engaged primarily in scholarly research, but rather in a profession, such as law, nursing, physical therapy, or medicine.

The Research Doctorate (RDoc) is a degree conferred upon completion of a program with a focus on applied research, or research as used for professional purposes. It involves mastery of a subject beyond the master's degree coupled with practical training on application of that knowledge in practice. It is the highest academic degree conferred by a university to students who have completed at least three years of graduate study beyond the bachelor's and/or master's degree and who have demonstrated their academic ability in oral and written examinations and through original research presented in the form of a dissertation.

The following sections specify processes for approving new doctoral programs to be used in conjunction with the new degree programs approval process, effective 6/96. Section I addresses joint doctoral programs, e.g. with University of California campuses. Section II addresses independent doctoral programs. While requirements for each type of program are similar, there are also some provisions that apply only to one or the other type.

I. JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

A. REQUEST TO NEGOTIATE

Permission to negotiate formally the establishing of a joint doctoral program with another institution in no way implies approval of the program which eventually emerges. For that reason, such requests need not be elaborate documents, and the criteria for evaluating them are relatively simple.

1. **NEED:** There should exist an evident population to be served. There should exist an evident social need and career opportunities for the graduates of such a program. There should exist a need for the program in the region and/or state. Mere duplication is not a deciding factor; the deciding factor is need.
2. **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO CAPABILITY:** The California State University, Sacramento department or group should possess prima facie evidence of a faculty with extensive experience with master's programming and master's theses, highly articulated, cohesive, and relevant research experience and interests, and demonstrated potential for obtaining needed funding for research. The department should append degree programs offered and theses/projects completed and number of degrees awarded. Though not specifically described here, the expectations in these areas are greater in the case of desiring to offer an RDoc as compared to a PDoc.
3. **COLLABORATING INSTITUTION CAPABILITY:** If the collaborating institution already has a doctoral program in the field, information on degree programs offered and number of doctoral degrees awarded must be provided. If the institution does not have such a program, evidence of the general capability of the faculty along the lines indicated in #2 (above) will need to be provided. In both cases, a rationale for the selection of the collaborating institution shall be provided. In all cases it is presumed that these criteria will be applied in a spirit of collegiality.
4. Permission to negotiate formally the establishment of a joint doctoral program is the first formal step of a process to develop a program. It is not approval of a program; consideration of approval comes as a later and final campus step, with the results of the negotiation at hand. Normal campus degree approval processes must be followed for both review of the permission to negotiate and final program approval.
5. The proposal to negotiate will be reviewed by the Graduate Studies Policy Committee (GPSC) at California State University, Sacramento, who will offer a recommendation on whether to proceed to the Faculty Senate via its Executive Committee.

B. CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETE JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAM PROPOSALS

1. Rationale for Doctoral Program:

- a. The proposal should specify how the program grows out of the intellectual life of the department and what its purpose is. Conversely, it will need to show how the proposed program furthers the department's goals and objectives. It will also need to show how the proposed program will be integrated with the programming already in place.
- b. The proposal should show how the program will interact with and affect undergraduate and other graduate programming at California State University, Sacramento.
- c. The proposal should indicate how the California State University, Sacramento program compares with regionally and nationally recognized programs in the field. The proposal should indicate what features, specialties, or lines of inquiry it may possess which are unique to the discipline.
- d. The proposal should indicate how the program responds to the needs of the region and/or state which are not currently being met. The proposal should also describe what new constituencies the program is expected to attract, as well as the competition it will encounter.

2. Rationale for Collaboration:

- a. The proposal will need to indicate why the department has chosen to collaborate with its counterpart at the particular external institution. It will need to delineate the interests and purposes to be served by the program at each institution.
- b. The intellectual connection with the other department will need to be developed: how do the areas of research, methodologies, and intellectual concerns of the two faculties complement and interface with each other.
- c. When the program is interdisciplinary (not proposed by a single academic department) the proposed governance structure (e.g., graduate group) should be included. Special relationships with the practitioners or professional community should be identified especially as they may suggest shared responsibilities in curricular planning, admissions, teaching, etc.

3. Faculty:

- a. The proposal will need to provide a list of all faculty who are expected to teach in the program indicating their research, publications, grants, etc. Full CVs of all faculty will be appended to the proposal. The review will be both individual and collective.

- b. The proposal will list all participating faculty from the collaborating institution in the same way and with similar materials. These faculty will be similarly reviewed to ensure that they meet California State University, Sacramento standards. No faculty member from either institution will subsequently teach in the program without being first reviewed and approved through normal campus processes.
 - c. Faculty teaching in doctoral programs and serving on doctoral committees will inherently be participating in education experiences of a high level and quality. It is therefore essential that these faculty meet standards appropriate to such an undertaking. The research expectations of faculty are greater in the case of programs desiring to offer an RDoc or a PDoc as compared to a master's program, and all doctoral faculty are expected to maintain currency. Therefore, changes to the UARTP Policy and the post-tenure review process at the department level must receive campus approval before final Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) approval of the program in order to provide guidance for evaluating doctoral faculty.
 - d. Faculty teaching in doctoral programs and serving on doctoral committees should be clearly defined for all members of the faculty, both adjunct and part time. As doctoral programs require educational experiences of a higher level, how the program intends to deliver those experiences should be delineated and distinguished from Master's level work.
 - e. If the new doctorate is subject to an accrediting board's approval regarding faculty requirements, the proposal must describe specifically what these approval processes are, the criteria that will be used by the accrediting body to sanction the program, and how the approval processes are to be achieved.
 - f. The proposal must demonstrate how practitioners are to be involved in the program, to the extent such involvement is desired by the department(s) submitting the proposal and/or required by state law. Practitioner involvement may include the planning and development of the curriculum, recruitment and selection of students, teaching of classes and support of culminating experiences, and evaluation of the program. Practitioner involvement must be consistent with University personnel policies, faculty governance and curriculum policies.
 - g. The proposal should describe the process and qualifications for the selection of adjunct faculty, the nature of the role of adjunct faculty in teaching, advising, mentoring, and dissertation or culminating experience support.
 - h. Any special arrangements regarding workload for faculty teaching in the doctoral program should be described.
4. Students:
- a. The proposal should review the character and standards of the department's current and future graduate students. It will analyze the department's productivity

in terms of its students during the past five years. In addition, the expectations for scholarly achievement of students in the new program should be articulated.

- b. The proposal should also analyze the department's productivity in terms of graduate student placement: Where have recent graduates within the last five years found employment or continued their studies? Would any of these be likely to return for doctoral study at California State University, Sacramento?
 - c. The proposal should indicate the numbers of full and part-time students the department anticipates attracting to its program. What proportion of these students does the department anticipate supporting?
 - d. The proposal should discuss the employment prospects of graduates from the new program and what placement mechanisms it intends to establish.
 - e. If the new doctorate is subject to an accrediting board's approval regarding student requirements, the proposal must describe specifically what these approval processes are, the criteria that will be used by the accrediting body to sanction the program, and how the approval processes are to be achieved.
 - f. The proposal should identify any changes or differences between master's and doctoral admission standards.
 - g. The proposal should specify the expected demographics and the corresponding accommodations in terms of such matters as course scheduling to meet the needs of the students.
 - h. The proposal should identify the academic structure of the program, e.g., the timing of qualifying examinations, advancement to candidacy, etc.
5. Research Capacity
- The proposal should identify how the program expects to encourage and support an active research capacity for both the faculty and the doctoral students.
6. External Funding:
- a. The proposal will provide a table which lists and describes what grants, contracts, fellowships, etc., the faculty have (a) applied for and (b) won during the past five years.
 - b. The proposal will describe what funding sources and objectives are now in place and projected.

- c. The proposal will indicate the number of graduate students the department anticipates funding through these awards and the level of their support.

7. Internal Funding and Resources:

- a. The proposal will describe existing facilities at California State University, Sacramento indicating whether they will be adequate to the proposed program. Part of the proposal will be a report on the result of consultation with the appropriate library faculty regarding library resource requirements needed to support the proposed program. What further expenditure on library, technical facilities, equipment, space, etc., is anticipated within the next five years to ensure that the program meets quality standards? Will these costs be one-time or recurring? (see section 8)
- b. The proposal will need to indicate what additional faculty appointments are envisioned over the next five years to ensure the program meets quality standards. (see section 8)
- c. The proposal shall include a five year budget projection indicating enrollments, direct and indirect costs, and budget requests to the state.
- d. The proposal shall include a letter from the President and/or Provost indicating the University's commitment to fund the program at an adequate level for at least five years.
- e. The proposal will include a description of faculty workload, including the extent to which teaching load is equivalent to traditional undergraduate and master's courses.
- f. If the PDoc requires an internship, the proposal will describe in detail how this internship is to be operated and run.

8. Admission Standards

The proposal will compare its admissions standards with those of comparable programs nationally. How does the department justify its standards?

9. The Program:

The outline of the program should include the following features:

- a. core courses, options, special areas of emphasis
 - b. course descriptions, syllabi, examinations, etc.
 - c. qualifying examinations: samples, when administered, how evaluated
 - d. special requirements: foreign language, etc.
 - e. residence requirements at each institution
10. Joint doctoral programs will be bound by the usual campus requirements with respect to program review.

11. External Evaluation:

- a. The proposal should have appended to it at least three letters from qualified individuals (e.g., chair of department at another institution, figure in the field, member of an accrediting board,), discussing both the proposal and its potential constituencies.
- b. The proposal should address any external evaluation requirements, e.g., those set by the state legislature, WASC or CPEC and identify the timelines and preliminary approach to meeting these external requirements.

12. Appendices:

- a. faculty curriculum vitae
- b. thesis titles from the department for the past five years
- c. syllabi or proposed syllabi, sample qualifying examinations, sample doctoral dissertation topics, etc.
- d. accrediting body criteria
- e. external comment
- f. letter from President and/or Provost
- g. proposed catalog copy

C. REVIEW OF COMPLETE DOCTORAL PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Unlike the Request to Negotiate, the complete doctoral proposal is to be a major document, addressing a number of different topics in depth. The proposal will be reviewed by the Graduate Studies Policy Committee (GPSC) at California State University, Sacramento who will offer a recommendation on whether to proceed to the Faculty Senate via its Executive Committee.

II. INDEPENDENT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

A. OVERVIEW

The process for approving new doctoral programs is divided into two stages. In the first stage, those making a proposal are to show that adequate authority exists under state law, outline the program, demonstrate the need, and secure commitment for adequate funding. This stage should include adequate consultation with campus units. In the second stage, program advocates are to provide specific curriculum plans and evidence of ability to meet the requirements of the program. The preliminary and complete proposals will be reviewed by the Graduate Studies Policy Committee (GPSC) at California State University, Sacramento who will offer a recommendation on whether to proceed to the Faculty Senate via its Executive Committee.

B. PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL

1. The preliminary proposal for the independent doctorate is intended to communicate with the campus community and appropriate campus units the plans for developing the more

formal proposal. For that reason, the preliminary proposal need not include elaborate documentation and should be approximately 3-5 pages in length. The proposal should address the items below:

2. **Need and Proposed Focus:** There should exist an evident population to be served and a discernible demand or need for the program. The proposed response and programmatic focus of the doctoral program requires clear, if preliminary, explanation.
3. **Campus Capability:** Resources required in terms of faculty positions, laboratory equipment, and/or operating expenses need to be described; identification of the source of those resources, e.g. student fees, reallocation etc., needs to be provided. A commitment of those resources to the new program must be included. Faculty capacity in terms of extensive experience with post-graduate programming and post graduate theses and projects, and the necessary capacity to secure research resources should also be described.
4. **Governance Structure:** When the program is interdisciplinary (not proposed by a single academic department), the proposed governance structure (e.g. graduate group) should be included. Special relationships with the practitioner or professional community should be identified especially as they may suggest shared responsibilities in curricular planning, admissions, teaching, etc.
5. **Status of the Preliminary Proposal:** The preliminary proposal is the first formal step of a process to develop a program. It is not approval of a program; consideration of approval comes as a later and final campus step. Normal campus program review processes must be followed for both review of the preliminary proposal and complete program proposal.

C. REVIEW OF COMPLETE DOCTORAL PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Unlike the preliminary proposal, the complete doctoral proposal is to be a major document, addressing a number of different topics in depth. The proposal will be reviewed by the Graduate Studies Policy Committee (GPSC) at California State University, Sacramento who will offer a recommendation on whether to proceed to the Faculty Senate via its Executive Committee.

1. **Rationale for Program:** elaborate on the need and focus as presented in preliminary proposal as follows:
 - a. The proposal should specify how it reflects the needs of the professional community and the faculty and university's role in meeting those needs. The proposal should indicate how the program responds to the needs of the region and/or state, needs not currently being met. The proposal should also describe what new constituencies the program is expected to attract, as well as the competition it will encounter.
 - b. It should also show how the proposed program will be integrated with the appropriate graduate and undergraduate programs.

- c. The proposal should indicate how the program compares with regionally and nationally recognized programs in the field, indicating what features, specialties, or lines of inquiry it may possess that are unique to the field.

2. Description of Program

The description of the program should include the following features:

- d. Faculty governing mechanisms
- e. Core courses, options, special areas of emphasis
- f. Course descriptions, syllabi, examinations, etc.
- g. Qualifying examinations: samples, when administered, how evaluated
- h. Special requirements if any: (foreign language, etc.)

3. Governance Structure

- a. The proposal should specify the program's governance structure as it relates to decision-making on curricular, academic policies, admissions, etc. The proposal should clearly spell out the processes for selecting faculty, conveners, and directors.
- b. Any partnership/collaborative structures with institutions or individuals outside the university should be described which clear explications of the charge and membership of those partnership groups

4. Faculty

- a. The proposal should provide a list of all faculty who might teach, including their areas of expertise as evidenced by research, publications, grants, or unique professional expertise. Full CVs should be appended to the proposal. The review will be both individual and collective.
- b. The proposal should describe the process and qualifications for the selection of adjunct faculty, the nature of the role of adjunct faculty in teaching, advising, mentoring, and dissertation or culminating experience support.
- c. Any special arrangements regarding workload for faculty teaching in the Independent Doctoral Program should be described.
- d. Faculty teaching in doctoral programs and serving on doctoral committees should be clearly defined for all members of the faculty, both adjunct and part time. As doctoral programs require educational experiences of a higher level, how the program intends to deliver those experiences should be delineated and distinguished from Master's level work.
- e. Faculty teaching in doctoral programs and serving on doctoral committees will inherently be participating in education experiences of a high level and quality. It is therefore essential that these faculty meet standards appropriate to such an undertaking. The research expectations of faculty are greater in the case of programs desiring to offer an RDoc or a PDoc as compared to a master's

program, and all doctoral faculty are expected to maintain currency. Therefore, changes to the UARTP Policy and the post-tenure review process at the department level must receive campus approval before final WASC approval of the program in order to provide the appropriate guidance for evaluating doctoral faculty.

- f. If the new doctorate is subject to an accrediting board's approval regarding faculty requirements, the proposal must describe specifically what these approval processes are, the criteria that will be used by the accrediting body to sanction the program, and how the approval processes are to be achieved.
- g. The proposal must demonstrate how practitioners are to be involved in the program, to the extent such involvement is desired by the department(s) submitting the proposal and/or required by state law. Practitioner involvement may include the planning and development of the curriculum, recruitment and selection of students, teaching of classes and support of culminating experiences, and evaluation of the program. Practitioner involvement must be consistent with University personnel policies, faculty governance and curriculum policies.

5. Students

- a. The proposal should review the character and standards of the department's current and future graduate students. It will analyze the department's productivity in terms of its students during the past five years. In addition, the expectations for scholarly achievement of students in the new program should be articulated.
- b. The proposal should also analyze the department's productivity in terms of graduate student placement: Where have recent graduates within the last five years found employment or continued their studies? Would any of these be likely to return for doctoral study at California State University, Sacramento?
- c. The proposal should indicate the numbers of full and part-time students the department anticipates attracting to its program. What proportion of these students does the department anticipate supporting?
- d. The proposal should discuss the employment prospects of graduates from the new program and what placement mechanisms it intends to establish.
- e. If the new doctorate is subject to an accrediting board's approval regarding student requirements, the proposal must describe specifically what these approval processes are, the criteria that will be used by the accrediting body to sanction the program, and how the approval processes are to be achieved.
- f. The proposal should identify any changes or differences between master's and doctoral admission standards.

- g. The proposal should specify the expected demographics and the corresponding accommodations in terms of such matters as course scheduling to meet the needs of the students.
- h. The proposal should identify e.g., the timing of qualifying examinations, advancement to candidacy, etc.
- i. If the new doctorate is subject to an accrediting board's approval regarding student requirements, the proposal must describe specifically what these approval processes are, the criteria that will be used by the accrediting body to sanction the program, and how the approval processes are to be achieved.

6. Research Capacity

The proposal should identify how the program expects to encourage and support an active research capacity for both the faculty and the doctoral students.

7. Internal Funding and Resources

- a. The proposal will describe existing facilities indicating whether they will be adequate to the proposed program. Part of the proposal will be a report on the result of consultation regarding library resource requirements needed to support the proposed program. What further expenditure on library, technical facilities, equipment, space, etc. is anticipated within the next five years to ensure that the program meets quality standards? Will these costs be one-time or recurring?
- b. The proposal will need to indicate what additional faculty appointments are envisioned over the next five years to ensure the program meets quality standards.
- c. The proposal shall include a five-year budget projection indicating enrollments, direct and indirect costs and any special budget requests to the state.
- d. The proposal shall include a letter from any involved Dean, Provost, and President describing the resource commitment and include evidence of alignment with goals as outlined-the Strategic Planning Council.
- e. The proposal will include a description of faculty workload, including the extent to which teaching load is equivalent to traditional undergraduate and master' courses.
- f. If the PDoc requires an internship, the proposal will describe in detail how this internship is to be operated and run.

8. External Funding

- a. The proposal will provide a table listing and describing what grants, contracts, fellowships, etc., the faculty have (a) applied for and (b) won during the past five years.

- b. The proposal will describe what funding objectives are now in place and projected.
- c. The proposal will indicate the number of graduate students the department anticipates funding through these awards and the level of their support.

9. Internal Evaluation

The Independent doctoral programs will be bound by the usual campus requirements with respect to program review.

10. External Evaluation

- a. The proposal should have appended to it at least one letter from a qualified individual (e.g., chair of department at another institution, figure in the field, member of an accrediting board) discussing both the proposal and its potential constituencies.
- b. The proposal should address any external evaluation requirements, e.g. those set by the state legislature, WASC or CPEC and identify the timelines and preliminary approach to meeting these external requirements.

11. Admission Standards

The program will compare its admissions standards with those of comparable programs nationally. How does the department justify its standards?

12. The Program:

The outline of the program should include the following features:

- a. core courses, options, special areas of emphasis
- b. course descriptions, syllabi, examinations, etc.
- c. qualifying examinations: samples, when administered, how evaluated
- d. special requirements: foreign language, etc.

13. Appendices:

- a. faculty curriculum vitae
- b. thesis titles from the department for the past five years
- c. syllabi or proposed syllabi, sample qualifying examinations, sample doctoral dissertation topics, etc.
- d. accrediting body criteria
- e. external comment
- f. letter from President and/or Provost
- g. proposed catalog copy