Suggested Guidelines for Periodic Academic Review of Self Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs)

Purpose: The purpose of this document is to provide suggested guidelines to local Graduate Councils for the periodic academic review of Self Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs). Through its evaluation of SSGPDP proposals, CCGA has identified a number of concerns that are common to many SSGPDPs. Four main concerns include: 1) Academic quality and whether the SSGPDP meets the standards of the University of California; 2) Curricular issues and the extent to which SSGPDP courses intersect state funded courses; 3) Impacts on faculty, such as instructor overloads and course buyouts; and 4) Educational and professional outcomes, including graduation rates and placement. Because SSGPDPs often provide professional preparation for a different population of students than academic Masters programs (such as working adults with industry experience), and may be delivered through alternative means and venues, it is anticipated that additional or revised criteria may need to be considered in their review. CCGA encourages local Graduate Councils to consider use of these guidelines in assessing the performance and positive and negative impacts of SSGPDPs for graduate education, and in developing and refining best practices for such programs. It is anticipated that, in turn, local Graduate Councils will then be able to provide helpful feedback to CCGA to help refine the committee's review process for SSGPDPs.

Example questions that local graduate councils may consider asking SSGPDPs to provide are listed below.

Number and Quality of Applicants
a) Number of applicants to program in each review year. Should specify numbers
    Assessment: Pick one from 1-3 and one from 4-6.
    1) Applications exceed projections
    2) Applications match projections
    3) Applications below projections
    4) Applications show increasing trend (good)
    5) Applications more or less neutral
    6) Applications declining.

b) Quality of applicants if applicable* in each admission cycle
    Metric (undergraduate GPA, GREs, discipline specific, other). Please specify assessment criteria
    1) Excellent academic/professional quality (Exceeds peer institutions or peer comparative group)
    2) Very good academic/professional quality (Meets expectations, similar to peers)
    3) Good (At or slightly below peers).

4) Needs improvement
* The nature of the program will govern measures of applicant quality. For example, in a less academic program, years of prior experience may be a better metric than GPA.

c) Number of applicants admitted. Percentage admits vs applicants for each year.
1) Exceeds expectations*
2) Meets expectations
3) Below expectations
* A low admit rate is likely a measure of high quality, but this will depend on the expectations of the program.

d) Take rate. Percentage of students admitted who accepted. A high take rate is considered good.
1) Exceeds peers or departmental/university norms
2) Matches peers or departmental/university norms
3) Below peers or departmental/university norms

e) Diversity and access as defined by the University of California.
1) Applicants diversity exceeds diversity in comparable programs.
2) Applicant diversity comparable to comparable programs
3) Applicant diversity below expectations

f) Impact on state supported program(s) (e.g. number of applicants)
1) None (no overlap in type or content)
2) Beneficial (improves quality of state supported program(s))
3) Neutral or uncertain
4) Negative (decline in quality or quantity of state supported applicants in related program).

Curricular Content Addressing Need(s) of Profession
a) Quality of offerings
1) Clearly defined curriculum that matches objectives of SSGPDP and meets needs of profession
2) Curriculum clear, but departs somewhat from proposal
3) Curriculum needs improvement to best meet needs of profession

b) Regularity of offerings
1) Courses regularly taught with clearly defined instructors
2) Most courses regularly taught, some gaps
3) Significant identifiable gaps in instruction.

c) Overlap with related programs
    1) Extensive overlap with state supported instruction
        a) Complementary, benefits state instruction (e.g. increased enrollments in small classes)
        b) Neutral (neither harmful, nor beneficial)
        c) Negative interaction. Detracts from state supported programs either though quality, available resources, duplicates/replaces state supported.
    2) Modest overlap with state supported programs (complementary neutral, negative)
    3) Little to no overlap.

d) Extent to which curricular content meets needs of profession
    1) Exceeds pace of developments in field (state of the art)
    2) Keeps pace with changes
    3) Requires updates

Graduation Metrics
a) Time to degree
    1) High percentage graduate in expected time
    2) Minor departures from expectations
    3) Significant departures from expectations

b) Graduation rate. Report percentage graduating from program.
    1) Exceeds expectations
    2) Meets expectations
    3) Falls below expectations

c) Placement. Report placement rates
    1) Exceeds expectations
    2) Meets expectations
    3) Falls below expectations

Participant Evaluation
SSGPDPs should be encouraged to develop a set of survey questions to assess whether the program is meeting expectations. The survey population could be current students, recent graduates or industry.

State Supported Faculty Engagement in SSGPDP
Ladder Rank Faculty engagement (report percentage engaged)
a) Minimal, SSP taught almost exclusively by faculty/lecturers hired for **SSGPDP.** Assessment
    1) Faculty/instructor resources meets needs

2) Faculty/instructor resources may be inadequate

3) Faculty/instructor resources inadequate

b) Modest. Ladder rank faculty engaged as proposed
    1) Faculty adequately compensated for participation
        Specify forms of compensation if known (e.g., summer salary, stipend, buy out)
        Instructional overload. Specify average instructional overload/participant.
    2 Faculty not adequately compensated
        Instructional overload. Specify average instructional overload/participant.

c) High. Ladder rank faculty engagement exceeds expectations, likely adversely impacts state supported programs.
    1) Faculty adequately compensated for participation
        Specify forms of compensation if known (e.g., summer salary, stipend, buy out)
        Instructional overload. Specify average instructional overload/participant.
    2) Faculty not adequately compensated
        Instructional overload. Specify average instructional overload/participant.

Facilities and Staff Support

a) Facilities (Specify all facilities, including none if that applies)
    1) Program facilities meets or exceeds needs
    2) Program facilities adequate
    3) Program facilities inadequate
    4) Program facilities external to campus

b) Staff support (Specify all staff needed)
    1) Program staff meets or exceeds needs
    2) Program staff adequate
    3) Program staff inadequate (Specify how need is met and whether state support is used)

Online courses

a) Facilities (Specify all that are needed: Computational/physical space). If none, specify
    1) Program facilities meets or exceeds needs
    2) Program facilities adequate
    3) Program facilities inadequate

b) Staff support (Specify all staff needed, including maintenance or upgrades)
    1) Program staff meets or exceeds needs
    2) Program staff adequate
    3) Program staff inadequate (Specify how need is met)

c) Instructor/student interaction

    1) Extensive (e.g., chat rooms, on-line discussions)

    2) Modest

    c) Minimal, partially to fully automated.

Financial Considerations

Graduate Councils and local Planning and Budget Councils are advised to obtain all of the costs analysis (aka budget sheets) for review purposes to assist Graduate Councils in identifying items of fiscal concern, including progress towards a full self-supporting status, phase in etc.

Potential financial impacts on self-supporting programs

a) Positive. State supported program(s) benefit directly from SSGPDP either financially or in other material ways

b) Neutral. State supported program(s) not impacted positively/negatively

c) Negative. One or more state supported program(s) are negatively impacted

d) Unclear.

Professional Engagement, Internships

a) Fundamental element of SSGPDP including internships

    1) Exceeds expectations

    2) Meets expectations

    3) Below expectations

b) Expected, but not fundamentally required

    1) Exceeds expectations

    2) Meets expectations

    3) Below expectations

c) Not required