

March 8, 2013

**MOLLY THEODOSSY**

Policy Coordinator  
Offices of the Chancellor and Provost

**RE: Proposed PPM 200-26 – Self-Supporting Degree Programs**

The proposal was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees within the schools and colleges for comment. Detailed responses were received from Planning and Budget and the School of Veterinary Medicine Faculty Executive Committee.

The Davis Division agrees substantially with the proposed implementation of the UC policy on Self-Supporting Degree Programs (SSDP). However, there are a few areas where we seek clarification.

We are not sure what a “student financial support plan” entails. Some understand this to mean that SSDPs must provide scholarship assistance to students. Why is there a student support plan for self-supporting students? We would like additional details on Sections 3.D and 4.A.2.c that mention a student financial support plan.

We are especially concerned about the effect SSDPs will likely have on faculty workload. While funding sources for SSDPs and non-SSDPs are separate, faculty attention might be disproportionately diverted to SSDPs, and the financial contributions by SSDPs to the university are not always comparable to the resources they use. There might be competition for faculty attention between state funded programs and SSDPs. We therefore strongly recommend revising section 4.A.2. to contain stronger wording that protects non-SSDPs from suffering from lack of faculty participation.

Furthermore, there must be additional protocols and procedures that protect state funded programs from financial and other program risks. For example, in the event that an income generation program incurs a substantial debt because a new program ceases to be commercially viable, the unit would have to absorb that loss, potentially putting other core state funded programs at risk. To avoid these risks, we recommend establishing clear protocols for ensuring that consultation with state funded Academic Senate Faculty be substantive prior to considering SSDPs, as well as requiring that SSDPs be subject to rigorous and frequent financial monitoring so that programs that are not financially stable are discontinued expeditiously.

We also note that SSDPs will be required to generate surplus funds. We would like to see how surplus funds are going to be defined, and how this will relate to expenses and encumbrances going forward.

Finally, many SSDP budget and academic issues could fall into an area between the designated responsibilities of Committee on Planning and Budget and Graduate Council. Therefore, Graduate Council should refer budgetary issues that arise during SSDP review directly to CPB, and CPB should refer academic and student issues that arise during CPB review of SSDPs

directly to Graduate Council. We recommend adding the bolded sentence below to Section 4.C.2:

2. To assess the ongoing financial viability of the SSDP and compliance with applicable policies, the Dean-Graduate Studies requests a campus audit or financial review of each SSDP to occur after the first three years, and on a regular schedule thereafter to coincide with the Graduate Council program review. Please add: **"This information will be provided to CPB for comment."** to the policy language.

While we generally support the proposed PPM 200-26, as written some areas might affect faculty workload, or be too broad to be effective. The Davis Division asks to review a revised version of the policy that incorporates the suggestions and addresses the concerns mentioned above.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruno Nachtergaele", written in a cursive style.

Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Mathematics