



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE  
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502  
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

January 20, 2011

**DANIEL L. SIMMONS, CHAIR**

Assembly of the Academic Senate  
Academic Council  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607

**Re: Review of Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs**

The proposed revision of the 1996 Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSP) and its Implementation Guidelines were forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of Academic Senate as well as the Faculty Executive Committee in each college and professional school. Comments were received from the Committees on Planning and Budget and Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction as well as Graduate Council. The following is a summary of major concerns expressed:

Regarding financial obligations to campuses, we believe policies must be adopted in order to ensure that a given SSP is truly self-supporting. The campus must not provide implicit monetary support to the SSP. The proposed policy states that the campus will be responsible for financial losses. For other graduate programs to bear this cost is unacceptable. We view the offering of an SSP does incur costs that will affect the campus and are difficult to quantify, library, information technology, registrar. The SSP should also reimburse the campus for the additional work and staff required in Graduate Studies, Academic Senate, Admissions and department administrative offices. Hence, at the very least the "overhead" rate should be the same as what is charged to external grants that are "off campus", assuming that all facilities etc. for the SSP are off campus. If the SSP operates on campus, then the minimum rate should be the same as what is charged to external grants that perform research "on campus". These rates would presumably be applied to the income coming to the unit in charge of the SSP and would be covered through student fees/tuition and, if relevant, grants. The proposed policy does not give concrete requirements for financial aid. Students in these programs should not have access to funding available to students in regularly funded state programs, at UC Davis, this is called the Block Grant. The SSP should reimburse the campus for all salaries, retirement and health benefits associated with faculty members who teach in the SSP. The proposed policy must include a clear directive that SSP shall not strain resources of the sponsoring department or have an adverse effect on regular academic campus programs. for the costs. We also feel funds charged by campus must be reflective of a UC graduate education label. There are a number of provisions in the proposal that mention "monitoring costs" and so forth, but it is unclear who will do the monitoring and how the monitors will be paid.

A second concern is about how SSPs will compete with academic graduate programs and other faculty responsibilities. The policy must include a clear directive that SSPs shall not be undertaken if they strain the resources of the department that sponsors them or have an adverse effect on regular academic programs on campus. Additionally, review of the personnel teaching in the programs is essential, whether they are

professionals in the field or regular faculty teaching on overload. There needs to be explicit requirements in this policy on this issue.

The absence of clear objectives in this proposed policy raises serious questions and concerns. Due to the importance of this policy, it is essential that clearly articulated objectives of SSPs are included. What are the reasons for developing SSPs? Are they intended to be self-supporting or revenue generating? Are there particular outcomes by which each program shall be evaluated? Without concrete goals and evaluative measures articulated, SSPs could easily lead to a “pay for degree” culture in the UC that would devalue UC diplomas and lead to the wholesale privatization of a UC education. The new draft definition of a SSP is so broad that any graduate program could be included. This is particularly concerning given the reluctance of our administrative leadership to allow review of programs that are discontinued and immediately reconstituted as professional programs. If an existing graduate program were to want to become a self-supporting program, the current practice would not allow Senate oversight. An SSP should be identified as a program that is directed toward a non-conventional student constituency and that offers an alternative mode of delivery. There should also be clarification between professional degree and SSP.

We must consider the role of UC Extension for SSPs. There are regulations regarding the maximum amount of teaching faculty can do in Extension courses on top of their other responsibilities, but it is unclear how these regulations will apply in the case of an Extension-administered degree program. This needs to be clarified in the policy. The policy does not have a provision for cases where an academic unit offering a degree through SSPs transfers administration of the program to Extension. We suggest that policy prohibit such conversions. Alternatively, such a change must trigger Graduate Council review with the possibility of CCGA review. It is our opinion that Extension should not be allowed to administer SSPs, as it is likely that a wedge will be created between Senate control of the curriculum, campus control of revenues from graduate education, and funding for administrative and Senate oversight activities. We recommend that more controls be instituted limiting the role of Extension in graduate education, and restating the explicit oversight authority of Graduate Council in all such graduate course offerings, including any graduate programs for which Extension is a collaborative partner.

Finally, the Davis Division strongly believes that there should be a rigorous review of the functioning of all or a representative selection of current SSPs before any new policy is adopted. This would allow any new policy to be explicitly informed by best practices.

Sincerely,



Robert L. Powell III, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate and  
Professor and Chair, Department of  
Chemical Engineering and Materials Science