

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Daniel L. Simmons  
Telephone: (510) 988-0711  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: daniel.simmmons@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 18, 2011

LARRY PITTS  
PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

RE: Review of Self Supporting Programs

Dear Larry:

This is in response to your letter of August 3, 2011, regarding review of self-supporting programs. Also, I have heard from campuses that the concerns expressed in your letter of June 6, 2011 to Executive Vice Chancellors and Graduate Deans about the CCGA policy have raised questions about policy implementation that are causing delays in campus reviews of SSP proposals. Your letter has caused some confusion among campus administrators about whether they must follow the CCGA directives for review by campus Graduate Council's. Finally, there is confusion as to whether the President's Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree programs has actually been executed.

The CCGA memo to Divisional Graduate Councils, dated March 2011, and endorsed by the Academic Council on March 30, 2011, describes the review process that will be followed by Divisional Graduate Councils in the course of determining whether to approve a self-supporting degree program. As you know, the Senate has authority under Regents Standing Orders 105.2(b) to "authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies to approve degree programs . . ." The CCGA guidelines, with the authority of Academic Council approval, direct the campus Graduate Council's to consider particular issues in the exercise of their review. *New self-supporting degree programs will not be approved in the absence of answers to the questions posed by Divisional Graduate Councils.*

The CCGA policy guidelines were necessitated in part by the absence of specific guidance in the Compendium regarding review of self-supporting programs and the absence of a formal policy on such approvals. The CCGA guidelines for Senate review are fundamentally consistent with the draft President's policy (which was being developed in consultation between your office and CCGA) and were promulgated to provide uniform guidance to Divisional Graduate Councils in their review and to program proponents by specifying concerns that were required to be addressed in program proposals.

In both of your letters you express your doubt that Divisional Graduate Councils "will have sufficient capacity to meaningfully evaluate every year the extent to which each SSP on their

respective campuses is recouping the full cost of operations.” Please note that your May 13, 2011 draft President’s policy states that:

If the campus determines a graduate degree program should be offered on a self-supporting basis, such programs should be fully self-supporting upon inception or within a short phase-in period; “self-supporting” means that full program costs, including but not limited to faculty instructional costs, program support costs, student services costs, and overhead, should be covered by student fees or other non-state funds. The sponsors of each proposed self-supporting program should submit a cost analysis and fiscal phase-in plan with their request for approval of proposed student fees to the Office of the President [see Implementation Guidelines].

With respect to budget issues, the CCGA guidelines provide:

Graduate Councils are ill-equipped to consider the financial aspects of proposed new SSPs in the context of the broader planning and budget considerations facing campuses and the university as a whole; consequently, all new SSP proposals shall be submitted to the campus Planning & Budget for comment. P & B comments shall be considered by Graduate Councils and the Graduate Council’s view of P & B comments shall be communicated to CCGA following approval of the proposed program. CCGA will, in turn, seek the advice of UCPB in evaluating all proposed new SSPs.

In this regard, I note that CCGA has full power to consult with UCPB or other Senate committees as needed to fulfill its responsibilities in reviewing proposals for new programs. The Administration has no authority to limit that consultation, which is purely a Senate matter.

In the context of on-going review, the guidelines state:

Graduate Councils, in consultation with P&B, should request that departments and schools demonstrate on an annual basis that SSPs are in fact recouping the full cost of their operation. Graduate Councils shall report the degree to which SSPs are succeeding in recouping their full costs to CCGA at the end of each fiscal year. In the case of SSPs that show a pattern of failing to recoup their full costs (such as incurring losses in two years out of three, for example), Graduate Councils shall consider suspending admission to the program(s) in question.

These budget provisions in the CCGA guidelines do no more than require that self-supporting programs comply with University policy that self-supporting programs recover full program costs, as stated in your draft President’s Policy. Indeed, this follows from the additional requirement in the draft President’s Policy that, “Such programs shall not be undertaken if they strain the resources of the department that sponsors them or have an adverse effect on regular programs on campus.” The latter requirement is also an academic issue. Assuring that programs, both as proposed and as operated, comply with Presidential policy is clearly within the authority of the Academic Senate to both supervise courses and curricula and to advise Chancellors on the campuses and the President regarding the budget. I am deeply disappointed to read in your letter of August 3 that Senate

attempts to assure that self-supporting programs comply with University policy “blur the distinction between responsibilities that properly belong with the administration and those that properly belong with the Academic Senate.” As I indicated, the Senate is responsible to supervise courses and curricula, and that responsibility must include whether academic programs comply with Presidential policy in their initiation and execution. I hope that you also believe that the Administration shares a similar responsibility.

With respect to your concern that Graduate Councils “have the time and expertise to review SSP finances,” I again point you to the specific language of the CCGA guidelines. That document does not call for a “review of SSP finances,” but instead requires a demonstration “that SSPs are in fact recouping the full cost of their operation.” As you state in your August 3 letter, I indeed anticipate that campus administrations would collect the financial data necessary to demonstrate that an SSP is in fact self-supporting and present the data to the Divisional Graduate Council and Planning and Budget Committee. You can facilitate this process by making it clear to campus administrators that presentation of clear data with assurance of the self-supporting nature of proposed and continuing programs will facilitate the approval and review of these programs.

With respect to the conversion of a state-supported program to self-supporting status, please note the precise language of the CCGA policy:

Existing state-supported graduate degree programs may request their own disestablishment as state-supported degree programs in accordance with policy. Concurrently, faculty involved in the research, teaching, and administration activities of such existing state-supported graduate degree programs may present a proposal for the creation of a new self-supported program.

The word “concurrently” allows for a single process where a state-supported program requests disestablishment as a state-supported program, and establishment as a self-supporting program. This is not an “instruction to run two separate processes . . . and to require the submission of two separate proposals.” I think that both issues may be dealt with “concurrently” based on a single package.

The reference in the CCGA policy to disestablishment and establishment is necessary because of the absence of a procedure in the existing Compendium. I believe that this approach is the closest procedure in the Compendium to what in fact occurs on conversion, the end of the state-supported program, and the establishment of the self-supported program. You are correct that a program may want to continue as a state-funded program and establish a parallel self-supported program. The CCGA guidelines do not expressly preclude such an approach, although I do not believe any such proposal has been made. As you stated, these issues do touch on process relevant to the Compendium, which, as you note, requires agreement of the Senate and the Administration. I do not think it a good idea, however, that we cease the review and approval of conversions pending revision of the Compendium. The CCGA guidelines provide a process to evaluate proposals that satisfies the need of the Senate for assurance that conversion proposals are within University policy, again as outlined in your May 13 draft President’s Policy. I also agree that these issues should be examined by CCGA in the coming year and I hope that the Compendium can be revised to expressly address the procedure for creation and conversion of self-supporting programs.

As I noted at the outset, your expression of concern about the CCGA guidelines has generated questions about the review process. The confusion caused by your letters risks delay in the approval of proposals for self-supporting programs. I request, in order to assure an orderly and timely review process, that you promulgate and distribute the President's Policy on Self Supporting Programs as soon as possible if you have not already done so. In addition, I request that you clarify to the Executive Vice Chancellors and Graduate Deans, that Divisional Graduate Councils will follow the CCGA guidelines in their review of self-supporting program proposals. The required Divisional Graduate Council approvals will be more timely if proponents provide responses to the issues specified in the CCGA guidelines in their initial proposals, including data supporting the assurance required in your draft May 13 policy that the program will indeed be self-supporting and not require resources from other activities.

I have no doubt that my successors in Senate leadership and the incoming CCGA membership will be happy to revisit these issues in the Fall and to work with you to formulate a new section in the Compendium to address self-supporting programs. In the meantime, I hope we can move forward in the coming year to evaluate current proposals in a timely fashion.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dan", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Daniel L. Simmons

Copy: President Yudof  
Vice President Beckwith  
Vice Provost Greenstein  
Director Greenspan  
Assistant Director Baxter  
Academic Council  
CCGA In-coming Chair Goodhue



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT --  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

August 3, 2011

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR SIMMONS

Dear Dan,

As requested, I sent the EVCs and Graduate Deans the CCGA memo to Divisional Graduate Councils regarding review of new self-supporting programs (SSPs). My transmittal noted two issues of concern: Graduate Councils' capacity to meaningfully evaluate every year the extent to which each SSP on their respective campuses is recouping the full cost of operations and the absence of timeframes for various review processes described.

I have subsequently received campus feedback echoing these concerns. There is a question about whether Graduate Councils have the time and expertise to review SSP finances and whether, in fact, this is part of their proper role or within CCGA's purview. I believe the new CCGA guidelines blur the distinction between responsibilities that properly belong with the administration and those that properly belong with the Academic Senate. The administration has authority for funding and fee levels of academic programs and the Senate review should focus on matters of academic quality. To the extent that the Senate needs fiscal information as part of quality assessment, Divisions should rely on campus administrations to provide it rather than collecting it independently.

On a related note, I recently received the CCGA memo to Graduate Councils on conversion of existing graduate degree programs from state-supported to self-supported status (or vice versa). I understand, as these guidelines state, that review requirements of such conversions exceed those for a name change. However, I am puzzled by the instruction to run two separate processes—establishment and disestablishment—and to require submission of two separate proposals when programs seek to convert from one status to another. Since the guidelines allow proposals to be considered concurrently, this arrangement seems like unnecessary extra work. Also, a program rejected in a self-supporting form may still wish to continue as a state-supported offering but this would be complicated if it must first be formally disestablished.

Both the foregoing are important issues that I would like to revisit with the Senate this fall and CCGA in particular. The second touches on review processes relevant to the Compendium which require agreement of both the faculty and the administration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Larry', written over a light blue circular stamp.

Lawrence H. Pitts  
Provost and Executive Vice President  
Academic Affairs

**cc:** Vice Chair Anderson  
CCGA Chair Carmody  
CCGA Vice Chair Goodhue  
Vice Provost Greenstein  
Director Greenspan  
Assistant Director Baxter