November 21, 2008

Mary Croughan
Chair of the Academic Council
University of California

In Re: Professional Doctorates

Dear Mary,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the report of the Subcommittee on the Professional Doctorate of the UC Task Force on Planning for Professional and Doctoral Education. Upon receipt of the report, I distributed it to all Academic Senate Committees, and specifically requested a response from the Graduate Council (GC; please see attached). The Executive Board also reviewed the document and has endorsed the GC’s response.

The UCLA Academic Senate is pleased to lend its support to the report and its recommendation, contingent upon one correction. There is an inaccuracy on page ten of the report. It states “by 2006, all UC campuses except Riverside, Merced, and San Francisco had introduced new Ed.D. programs in partnership with neighboring CSU campuses.” UCLA does not have such a program and should therefore be added to the list of exceptions.

Aside from that inaccuracy, both the GC and the Executive Board were impressed by the report’s thoughtful and systemic approach to a complex issue.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review and opine upon this issue.

Sincerely,

Michael Goldstein
UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Jaime R. Balboa, CAO UCLA Academic Senate
To: Michael Goldstein, Chair, Academic Senate  
From: Jan Reiff, Chair, Graduate Council  
Date: November 18, 2008  

RE: Report of the Subcommittee on the Professional Doctorate

As requested, the Graduate Council considered the Report of the Subcommittee on the Professional Doctorate of the UC Task Force on Planning for Doctoral & Professional Education.

The Council noted that the report contained one inaccuracy on page 10 of the report. There, the report says that “By 2006, all UC campuses except Riverside, Merced, and San Francisco had introduced new Ed.D. programs in partnership with neighboring CSU campuses.” UCLA does not have such a program.

Other than that inaccuracy, however, the Council was impressed by the report’s reasoned approach to a very complex issue and felt that it could support the recommendations as articulated. The categories of doctoral degrees the report utilized are recognized within the academy and work well to frame future discussions about new doctoral programs. Its suggestions for encouraging the ongoing cooperation between the University of California system and the California State University system seem highly appropriate, as does the need for a politically neutral adjudicating body to resolve any contested issues. The Council was also pleased with Recommendation 8 that asks APC and CCGA to assess the agreement’s effectiveness.

Should you have any questions concerning this response, please do not hesitate to contact me at extension 55029 or the Council’s analyst, Kyle Cunningham, at extension 51162.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate  
Kyle Cunningham, Graduate Council Analyst