



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Proposed Policy - Self-Supporting Graduate Programs

June 7, 2013

Enclosed is a proposed Graduate Studies policy governing creation of self-supporting graduate programs for Academic Senate review and comment.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: HACCS)

June 6, 2013 11:03 AM

Letters and Science Executive Committee

Consultation Report

Proposed Policy—Self-Support Graduate Programs

The policy document largely clears up several areas of concern and confusion from earlier discussion of self-supporting graduate programs. The Executive Committee's only concern remains the issue of funding faculty merits and promotions for those hired on funds from SSDPs. As we voiced in our response to the two versions of the white paper on faculty resources, faculty hired by units using SSDP must have both salaries and merits and promotions covered by these units. The safeguard that protects faculty whose salaries are funded centrally from having financial interests enter into decisions about merits and promotions does not protect faculty hired on other funding sources. Shouldn't this protection apply to all faculty? Does this create a two-tiered system of faculty wherein some are protected and some are not (those supported by SSDPs)?

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

June 6, 2013 2:05 PM

No response at this time.

Faculty Welfare

June 7, 2013 5:01 PM

Response of the Faculty Welfare Committee to the Proposed Policy for Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs

A policy for developing self-supporting graduate programs is necessary in an era when academic units face declining state support and are expected to generate some portion of their own revenue. The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that this policy addresses most of the appropriate issues involved in creating a self-sufficient program. Yet our assessment was not universally positive, especially given the limited time that was available to review this initiative.

This policy will serve as one of several tools academic units can use to raise revenue and limit the adverse effects of diminishing state support. Unfortunately, all academic units are not in a strong position to launch a self-supporting program. The professional schools could certainly benefit. Some academic disciplines that identify a marketable set of skills their faculty could offer might develop self-sufficient programs. But departments in the humanities are far less likely to anticipate that they can generate future revenue streams by building a master's program under this policy.

Beyond this general problem there are specific questions that need to be addressed more fully before this policy goes into effect. Under section I.G. it is not clear how an academic unit will sustain two "separate but equal" tracks in terms of faculty effort, student interactions, overall management and resources. The implication of this policy (see section II.E. and elsewhere) is that an academic unit will effectively manage the financial risks involved in establishing a self-supporting program. Will that unit hire tenure-track faculty to meet the added teaching loads when those individuals cannot be released if the anticipated number of paying clientele fails to appear? A far less risky strategy of hiring contract employees that have no prospect for tenure inevitably raises questions about the program's commitment to quality. These issues focus attention on section III.A.3. and the need for a high quality market analysis of the program's prospects. Would the proponents of a new program ask for a rigorous analysis if they know that the results might call into question their proposal? The prospect of biased analyses that lead to poorly subscribed new programs cannot be easily dismissed.

Graduate Council

June 14, 2013 2:12 PM

Response continued on next page.

June 12, 2013

RFC: Graduate Studies Policy on Self-Supporting Degree Programs (SSDPs)

The Graduate Council charged its Academic Planning and Development (APD) Subcommittee with the review of the abovementioned RFC on the Proposed Policy – Self-Supporting Graduate Programs.

As noted in Vice-Provost and Dean Gibeling’s cover letter, this policy draws from both PPM200-26 and the Academic Senate’s review process for proposed new graduate programs, and complements them to provide a comprehensive policy for SSDPs on campus. The APD committee observed that the concept of “Lead Dean” which is referenced throughout the document (Sections I.B, III.A.2, III.A.4.d, and V.E), has yet to be clarified, especially how it pertains to the role that academic Deans have regarding graduate education in the context of the new budget model.

The committee expressed some concerns regarding Section V.E, which pertains to the use of the marginal portion of surplus revenue, i.e. surplus revenue in excess of what is needed to establish a reserve. Specifically, the committee commented that the language of that section should be strengthened to include all relevant Graduate Programs/Groups among the entities with which MOUs should be established regarding how the marginal surplus revenue would be used.

At its June 10th 2013 meeting the Council voted to approve APD’s recommendations.

Accordingly, Graduate Council submits for your consideration the aforementioned recommendation(s).

Sincerely,



Rachael E. Goodhue, Chair
Graduate Council

/vm

c: Gina Anderson

Planning & Budget

June 6, 2013 2:00 PM

CPB discussed the proposed policy for Self-Supporting Graduate Programs. CPB agrees that such a policy is necessary. However, the committee agrees that the language in Policy I.C should be rewritten to maximize flexibility in student selection while ensuring student quality. CPB recommends that the language in this document should match the UC policy and should be no more restrictive than the systemwide policy. While CPB believes that the qualifications of the students admitted to self-supporting degree programs should be commensurate with that in our regular graduate programs, the committee also notes that students in SSDPs may have substantial professional experience that should also be considered in a holistic admissions process. While the committee agrees that we should not accept students with lower academic ability for admission into these programs, the metrics used to measure ability might differ from the reliance on minimum GPA and GRE scores used in admission of traditional students to graduate school. However, not all self-supporting programs will focus on career professionals with experience; thus, criteria for admission must be flexible for SSDPs.

Research

June 6, 2013 1:58 PM

The Committee on Research discussed the proposed policy for self-supporting graduate degree programs. Overall, COR understands the motivation behind this proposal and can see, in limited situations and under specific circumstances, the advantage of such programs for the campus. However, the committee remains very concerned about the potential impacts this may have on graduate education on this campus. In addition, the proposed policy does not explain how faculty members can continue to do their current jobs when they are being paid to teach in the self-supporting programs.

If faculty are incentivized to teach in self-supporting programs (flow of money back to unit – i.e. department, etc.) than it is hard to avoid the fact that other graduate (and professional) programs may suffer. Given the rather tenuous position of non-departmental based graduate groups in particular, which all have difficulties as it is to attract sufficient faculty to teach in their courses, this policy could exacerbate the problem and in the long-run erode the quality of our existing graduate programs and thus the research and teaching missions of the university. Although the current draft policy uses stronger language to ensure that the true costs of such a program are taken into account, COR remains concerned about the potential impact this will have on existing graduate programs.