

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) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: Daniel.Simmons@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*

April 15, 2011

**LAWRENCE PITTS, PROVOST AND EVP
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: Guidelines for the review of new Self-Supporting Programs

Dear Larry:

At its meeting on March 30, the Academic Council unanimously endorsed guidelines that CCGA developed for use by campus Graduate Councils and Committees on Planning and Budget in reviewing proposals for new Self-Supporting Programs. Council hopes that rigorous review at the campus level will help to expedite proposal approval. Please note that the guidelines do not address the conversion of existing graduate degree programs from state-supported programs to self-supported status; such conversions must be approved by the Senate. CCGA is developing guidelines for such cases.

The Academic Council requests that you disseminate the enclosed guidelines to the Executive Vice Chancellors and Graduate Deans. CCGA has forwarded them to the Graduate Councils.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Daniel L. Simmons, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

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

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
James Carmody, Chair
jcarmody@ucsd.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 23, 2011

DANIEL SIMMONS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR

Re: CCGA Memo to Divisional Graduate Councils: Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs

Dear Dan:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has recently seen an increase in the number of submissions of proposals for new Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs). Given the State of California's financial difficulties and the University's resulting financial constraints, CCGA expects to see a significant increase in the volume of new SSPs being proposed for the indefinite future.

A new SSP policy has been in development for some time, and a draft of the new policy was submitted to the Senate for review late in 2010. A revised draft is currently being worked on by both the administration and the Senate, and the new policy is likely to be approved by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. The attached following guidelines for Senate review of new SSP proposals describe the different stages of the review process.

CCGA respectfully requests that Academic Council:

- 1) Endorse the draft guidelines;
- 2) Forward the draft guidelines to local divisions; and
- 3) Request that the Provost disseminate copies to Graduate Deans and EVCs on the campuses.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about these guidelines.

Sincerely,



James Carmody, Ph.D.
Chair, CCGA

Copy: Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
CCGA Members

**CCGA Memo to Divisional Graduate Councils:
Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs
March 2011**

CCGA has recently seen an increase in the number of submissions of proposals for new Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs). Given the State of California's financial difficulties and the University's resulting financial constraints, CCGA expects to see a significant increase in the volume of new SSPs being proposed for the indefinite future.

A new SSP policy has been in development for some time, and a draft of the new policy was submitted to the Senate for review late in 2010. A revised draft is currently being worked on by both the administration and the Senate, and the new policy is likely to be approved by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. The following guidelines for Senate review of new SSP proposals describe the different stages of the review process.

Campus Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs

Each of the 10 UC campuses has its own unique culture, and the SSP Policy is intended to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate all of these cultures. Divisional Senate review should focus on the degree to which a proposed new SSP embodies and reflects the values of the campus and the specific needs of the target student body.

In addition to evaluating all new proposed SSPs under the criteria set out in the Compendium and CCGA Handbook, Graduate Councils shall consider the potential impact of the addition of an SSP on a department or school's established degree programs.

Proposals for new SSPs shall provide a detailed explanation of the measures taken in designing the SSP to ensure that faculty will continue to provide at least the current level of support to and commitment of energy to existing academic graduate programs, especially those programs leading to the granting of the doctoral degree.

Proposals for new SSPs shall provide a detailed explanation of how teaching assignments will be managed. The explanation shall explicitly discuss teaching assignments in SSPs in relation to the usual workload of concerned faculty members and whether teaching in the SSPs will be on an on-load or off-load basis; the explanation shall be accompanied by a copy of any campus policies that deal with off-load teaching and with teaching in SSPs specifically (CCGA strongly recommends that each campus develop and maintain such policies).

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.

Graduate Program Reviews: Self-Supporting Programs

SSP policy requires that all SSPs be reviewed along with all other graduate programs during regularly scheduled graduate program reviews, which typically recur on a 7-8 year cycle. SSPs shall bear their

full share of the cost of regularly scheduled graduate program reviews, including costs to the Academic Senate.

Graduate program reviewers shall be tasked explicitly with evaluating the impact of SSPs on academic graduate programs. Graduate Councils shall consider the suspension of admissions to any SSP that has been found, in the course of a graduate program review, to have had an adverse effect on academic graduate programs.

Given the sensitivity of SSPs to market forces, it may be advisable for Graduate Councils to conduct their own reviews of SSPs more frequently.

The Meaning of “Self-Supporting” in Self-Supporting Programs: Phase-in Periods

The SSP policy allows for a phase-in period during which a SSP may not be able to recoup its full costs. Any funds used to support an SSP are funds that are not being devoted to the support of existing programs. 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.

CCGA will, in the absence of exceptionally compelling arguments, decline to approve new SSPs with phase-in periods in excess of two years.

Uses of Self-Supporting Program Income in Excess of Cost

The process for reviewing proposed new SSPs described in this memo focuses on preserving the strength and potential for future growth of existing academic research programs, particularly those leading to the PhD degree. CCGA recommends that Graduate Councils conduct ongoing discussions with campus administrations on how SSPs might contribute financially to the campus beyond full-cost reimbursement since the value and viability of these programs rests on significant, long-term, state-supported investment in University academic programs and research. In the context of such discussions, Graduate Councils should consider proposals for new SSPs with a view to their potential for offering fiscal support to state-supported graduate research on campus.

Expedited Review of Proposal for Self-Supporting Programs

CCGA recognizes that the new SSP policy will increase the volume of new proposals in need of timely review. Programs that might once have been proposed as state-supported programs are likely to be proposed as self-supporting programs in the coming years. The current two-year review period for new degree programs may restrict the opportunities available to some departments and schools. CCGA has, therefore, decided to conduct an expedited review of SSP proposals on a case by case basis when, in the assessment of CCGA, such an expedited review is warranted. In order for CCGA to be able to grant a proposal an expedited review, the proposal will need to meet the following criteria:

The proposed degree requirements and curriculum must have been subjected to rigorous scrutiny at the campus level:

The proposers must solicit reviews from appropriate UC faculty members from other campuses or appropriate professionals. Such reviews must address the review criteria detailed in the CCGA Handbook. Proposers must address issues raised by the solicited reviews and make appropriate adjustments to the SSP proposal. When proposers first formally submit proposals to Graduate Councils for review, they should be accompanied by a narrative explaining how the proposers selected reviewers and responded to the issues they raised. Solicited letters that merely endorse the proposed SSP will be ignored by CCGA.

Graduate Councils must provide detailed accounts of their consideration of “the potential impact of the addition of an SSP on a department or school’s established degree programs” (see Paragraph #2 of “Campus Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs” above).