Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Self-Supporting Degree Program Task Force Report

March 27, 2012

Divisional Chair Bisson and Provost Hexter received the Self-Supporting Degree Program Task Force Report on January 31, 2012. The report is enclosed for review and comment.

Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)

March 27, 2012 4:48 PM

Response continued on next page.

Dear Professor Bisson,

The L&S Executive Committee has reviewed the Self-Supporting Degree Program Task Force Report, which prompted considerable discussion. Some committee members felt that, if the demand for such programs truly exists, it behooves us to take advantage of it in these difficult financial times. In particular it was mentioned that Art History might be interested in this for their current M.A.-only program. A prohibition against converting current M.A./M.S. programs which lead to Ph.D.'s seems sensible.

Some cautionary notes were sounded; one committee member with extensive experience at another university, where such programs exist, said that having a "regular" master's program and a "self-supporting" master's program within a single department can lead to very uncomfortable situations, in which there are, or appear to be, two tiers of students in terms of ability, potentially sharing at least some of the same classes. The committee also was concerned that such programs could easily devolve into programs with all classes running at night, with very few, if any, Senate faculty involved, but nevertheless leading to an M.A./M.S. degree from UCD.

Finally, the concept that the administration would screen the program proposals to "protect the UCD brand" (section 1.4) struck the committee as an infringement on what is a key faculty prerogative, that is, determining what constitutes a viable (in every sense) academic program on our campus.

Sincerely,

Abigail Thompson, Chair
Executive Committee
College of Letters and Science

CAP Oversight Committee

March 28, 2012 10:05 AM

The discussion focused on identifying any issues in the report and proposal that would affect CAP or the personnel process and faculty participation in it. We note the following:

1. The Executive Summary states that the Task Force recommendations include "Consideration of the impacts of SSDPs on faculty workload, merit/promotion …," but we do not find any place in the report or accompanying documents where issues of merit and promotion are discussed. CAP has questions about the role that teaching and service in SSDPs should play in merit/promotion considerations, what criteria and metrics should be used in evaluating participation, and how to weigh participation in SSDPs relative to participation in the regular academic programs.

2. CAP is concerned that shifting of teaching by Academic Senate faculty from regular programs to SSDPs may result in their only being replaced by lecturers or temporary instructors. One of the central arguments for SSDPs is that they will be 'self-supporting,' implying that they should have no impact on existing, regular programs. However, a replacement of Academic Senate faculty by lecturers is a significant impact.

3. If an SSDP shifts service effort by faculty members from other university activities, is the SSDP really self-supporting? How should a faculty member's service for an SSDP be evaluated in the merit/promotion process if other service is reduced? This consideration led some members of CAP to propose that service to an SSDP should only be viewed as additional service (similar to service to community) and not treated as a replacement for the normal expected campus service. Otherwise, it is unclear that the SSDP is truly self-supporting.

4. If faculty are additionally compensated for their participation in SSDPs, should their participation also be considered in merit/promotion cases, and if so, in what way? The situation would be analogous to that of a faculty member teaching a summer-school course for which they are additionally compensated.

5. If an SSDP is successful in bringing money into the university, should leadership and participation in the SSDP be viewed as a significant service in merit/promotion reviews?

6. If the net effect of SSDPs is that more faculty are hired, that would lead to a greater workload for CAP. Given that the workload of CAP already is substantial to the point of affecting CAP members' pursuit of research, developments such as this should prompt a revisiting of the organization of CAP's workload

Courses of Instruction

April 9, 2012 9:16 AM

The COCI (Committee on Courses of Instruction) reviewed the Report of the Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs dated January 31, 2012. The committee thinks the report is well thought out. However, we believe there are some areas of concern that must be discussed. It is important that seed funding be available or many departments will not have the resources to try this. We also think this will lead the university further into privatization.

It seems as if a major focus will be to provide online graduate courses for working professionals, and Task Force Recommendation 4.7 states that Graduate Council and the Committee on Courses of Instruction should establish a policy regarding online graduate level courses. Since the committee already has a policy for online courses we are not sure how these graduate online courses would be treated any differently than the online courses we already have or will have in the near future.

The committee agrees with the Graduate Council's recommendation to not build a large number of SSDP's until experience shows how they affect the academic culture and placing a cap on new SSDP's until existing ones are in compliance with Graduate Council and administrative requirements emerging from the SSDP Task Force Report. By capping new SSDP's, it will allow COCI to get a better idea of how many SSDP courses go through the regular approval process.

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

March 23, 2012 4:01 PM

No response at this time.

Graduate Council

April 24, 2012 3:25 PM

Response continued on next page.

April 24, 2012

Report of the Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs: Graduate Council Response

A research university's teaching focus must be on educating individuals capable of generating new knowledge in academic, industrial and governmental environments.   In the current economy, this requires primarily the preparation of PhD students. Graduate Council is concerned that creation of a large number of SSDPs, will result in

    i)   faculty participation in the SSDP programs at the expense of participation in other research/academic work now serving graduate education on campus,

    ii)   creation of graduate programs that are not supported by existing Academic Senate faculty and existing campus research infrastructure,

    iii)   creation of non-PhD graduate degrees motivated primarily to generate campus resources spurring a permanent separation of colleges and schools by income,

    iv)   creation of a significant proportion of students in self-funding programs who are viewed as "profit-generating entities" and who are not held to the same academic standards as students in other graduate programs.

For such reasons, we recommend not building a large number of SSDP's until experience shows how they affect the academic culture, and placing a cap on new SSDP's until existing ones are in compliance with Graduate Council and administrative requirements emerging from the SDDP Task Force Report.

University policy requires that graduate students be continuously enrolled unless they are on an approved leave of absence (e.g. PELP at UC Davis). It seems natural that students in part-time self-supporting degree programs might have occasional need to temporarily interrupt their graduate study for one or two quarters due to the demands of their employment. Because PELP policy does not permit that mechanism to be used by students on part-time status and because the needs of working professional students are not adequately covered under PELP, Graduate Council recommends that the campus create an "Employment Leave" category strictly for students in SSPDs. Students would be eligible for this leave for 1-3 quarters at a time up to a maximum of 6 quarters during the course of their graduate study. A small administrative processing fee (comparable to that for PELP) would be assessed for each leave instance. Students participating in a SSDP that is designed for enrollment during a limited number of terms each year (e.g. a summer-only program) would not need to request leave through this mechanism.

Graduate Council specific responses to the recommendations of the Task Force are:

Reference Number	Task Force Recommendations	Graduate Council Response
1.1	**Eligibility to Propose an SSDP.**	Agree
1.2	**Impetus for an SSDP.**	Agree
1.3	**Approval Process.**	Agree. All SSDP proposals should originate from the faculty since the faculty are responsible for education.
1.4	**Screen Proposals for Strategic Vision.**	Agree. It is imperative that new SSDPs proposals gain the support from the administration during the formative stages.
1.5	**Market Analysis.**	Agree.
1.6	**Administrative Review of SSDP Financial Plan.**	Agree. It is imperative that new SSDP proposals are supported by detailed independent financial analysis by Administrative Resource Management/Budget and Institutional Analysis office.
1.7	**Academic Quality Review of Proposed SSDPs.**	Agree
1.8	**Expediting the Review Process.**	Agree
1.9	**Process to Transition from State to Self-Support.**	Agree
1.10	**Use of State Funds During Transition Period.**	Agree
1.11	**Multiple Tracks.**	We do not endorse the recommendation on multiple tracks. Graduate Council opposes the existence a degree that consists of parallel tracks, indistinguishable to the outside world, where decisions in one track are driven by

Reference Number	Task Force Recommendations	Graduate Council Response
		being a self-supporting or profit-generating entity. Such a practice makes it impossible to base decisions on academic criteria that treat students equally. It will inevitably lead to differing academic expectations and potentially to a profit driven race-to-the-bottom by lowering expectations and admission of less qualified students. To guard against this, Graduate Council insists that each SSDP must have a distinctive name and there exists a financial boundary between SSDP degree tracks and all other graduate degrees. This acknowledges that the acquisition of professional skills is more readily subject to a cost/benefit analysis.
1.12	**Required Memoranda of Understanding**	Agree
1.13	**Periodic Reviews of SSDPs**	Agree
1.14	**Discontinuing a SSDP.**	Agree
1.15	**Applicability of Task Force Recommendations to Current SSDPs.**	Agree. Graduate Council firmly endorses Recommendation 1.15 that subjects existing SSDP programs to a financial analysis within the next three years to ensure they meet the requirements as outlined in Recommendation 1.6. This is deemed so important, that it was suggested that no new SSDP should be created until it is ensured that existing SSDPs conform to financial expectations as outlined in Appendix F.
2.1	**Financial Model for SSDPs.**	Agree
2.2	**SSDP Budget.**	Agree

Reference Number	Task Force Recommendations	Graduate Council Response
2.3	**Generation and Use of Surplus Revenue.**	Graduate Council has received varying opinions on the generation and use of surplus revenue. In general we are in support of dedicating surplus revenue to graduate education, but most important is that all SSDPs are required to break even. This includes a campus assessment for administrative services provided by the Academic Senate. Graduate Council experience in the last few years with administrative matters related to Forensic Science and International Commercial Law made it clear that the administrative cost of running such programs is severely underestimated. Provided that programs "break even" based on criteria defined by the Administrative Resource Management/Budget and Institutional Analysis office, we do recognize that SSDPs that target educating students for the public service sector are in a higher need of providing financial assistance to their students. For such programs, a surplus should be reinvested in the program itself.
2.4	**Campus Investment.**	Agree
2.5	**Responsibility for Financial Risk.**	Agree
2.6	**Campus Assessment**	Agree
2.7	**Determining Value of Faculty Participation in SSDPs.**	To the extent that is recognized that faculty participation in a SSDP during the academic year will come at the expense of participation in other research/academic work, Graduate Council is in general supportive of this recommendation. The value of faculty participating in a SSDP is an important issue that must be defined in consultation with the Academic Senate.
2.8	**Use of Non-State, Non-Fee Based Funds.**	Agree
3.1	**Administrative Structures.**	Agree

Reference Number	Task Force Recommendations	Graduate Council Response
3.2	**Roles and Responsibilities.**	Agree
3.3	**Identification of "Lead Dean."**	Agree
3.4	**Definition of "Lead Dean."**	Agree
3.5	**Central Services Model for SSDP Administration.**	For Graduate Council to play it's intended role for the Academic Senate, it is essential that the Dean of Graduate Studies is responsible to lead the central administrative support for SSDPs, and makes final recommendation as to what administrative services can be delegated to other units.
4.1	**SSDP Admission Standards and Academic Progress.**	Graduate Council, on behalf of the Academic Senate, will determine the criteria for acceptance and graduation for all SSDPs just as other graduate degree programs. Graduate Council expects that admission requirements for a SSDP must be at least as high as for a regular degree. A SSDP must commit and will be held to the same stringent academic notions of competitive admission, fair and academic-driven evaluation, dismissal for poor academic performance, etc.
4.2	**SSDP Students and Degrees.**	Agree
4.3	**Definition of Degree Eligible to be Self-Supporting.**	Agree
4.4	**Definition Full and Part-time Enrollment in an SSDP.**	Agree. Graduate Council will apply consistent criteria for full-time and part-time student status to all graduate programs.
4.5	**Dual Enrollment/Double**	Agree

Reference Number	Task Force Recommendations	Graduate Council Response
	Major between Regular vs. SSDP.	
4.6	**Cross-Enrollment in Regular vs. SSDP Courses.**	Graduate Council endorses Recommendation 4.6 on cross-enrollment in regular and SSDP course, while recognizing the administrative accounting burden, it will be essential to ensure that state resources and SSDP resources are accounted for adequately. While graduate courses in existing graduate programs will remain the foundation of coursework requirements of PhD degrees, courses created by SSDPs will create additional educational opportunities for graduate students. Existing graduate programs will need to consider to what extent new SSDP courses should or should not be integrated into their degree requirements.
4.8	**Online Courses.**	Agree
5.1	**Financial Aid for SSDP Students.**	Agree
5.2	**SSDP Student Access to TA/GSR Appointments.** Adhere to the current Graduate Studies policy on TA/GSR appointments for students in SSDPs: GS2011-02.	Agree
5.3	**SSDP Students and Campus Fees & Related Services.**	Agree
6.1	**Teaching Policy.**	Agree
6.2	**Non-Regular Faculty Teaching.**	Agree. References to faculty, "non-regular" faculty, "teaching faculty," and "regular (ladder-rank)" faculty should be consistent with APM and in particular the "Academic Affairs Attributes Chart"

Reference Number	Task Force Recommendations	Graduate Council Response
		http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/Attributes_Chart.pdf
6.3	**Use of SSDP Funds to Hire Faculty.**	Graduate Council's support of this recommendation is contingent upon the majority of SSDP core academic functions being provided by qualified faculty, as evaluated by the Academic Senate, hired through established faculty FTE processes.
7.1	**SSDP Fee Levels Compared to Regular Fees.**	Agree
7.2	**Consideration of Market in Fee Setting for SSDPs.**	Agreed, provided that tuition cost for required of each student covers the costs of the student to the SSDP.
7.3	**Fees Charged to Nonresidents.**	Agreed, provided that tuition cost for required of each student covers the costs of the student to the SSDP.
7.4	**Fees for Cross-Enrollment in Regular vs. SSDP Courses.**	Agree
7.5	**Use of Filing Fee Status in SSDPs.**	Disagree. Graduate Council does not support Filing Fee for SSDP students. Faculty involved in state-funded programs are nominally compensated for time spent reading theses and dissertations or holding comprehensive examinations for students on Filing Fee through the normal I&R budget. If students in SSDPs are on Filing Fee, no funding is generated to pay for faculty time, resulting in a shift of costs from the SSDP to state funds.
7.6	**SSDP Student Access to the Planned Educational Leave Program.**	Disagree. Graduate Council disagrees with the recommendation to allow SSDP students in part time status to go on PELP. PELP will only be available to full-time students. The position of the taskforce in this recommendation is in conflict with their recommendation 4.4 that promotes

Reference Number	Task Force Recommendations	Graduate Council Response
		equal treatment of all students.
7.7	**UCOP Fee Setting Process.**	Agree. Graduate Council experience reviewing SSDP programs that operate on a UCOP approved budget supports the conclusion of the Taskforce that the financials of the programs are not based on firm data to show that the program is self-supporting. Therefore, we are in support the recommendation.

Planning & Budget

March 23, 2012 4:01 PM

CPB has reviewed the Self-Supporting Degree Program Task Force report. CPB strongly endorses the comments and recommendations outlined in the Graduate Council review of the report. In addition, CPB wishes to stress two points.

1) Both in the case of establishment and review, CPB should be consulted as part of the process. Information which clearly outlines the costs and revenues for such programs must also be made available for review at that time.

2) CPB notes that faculty time is limited and therefore in all cases there will be impact on "state supported graduate programs" due to faculty participation in SSDP's. In the process of establishing a SSDP, there must be a statement as to what that impact is and a case must be made that the impact is justified. Also, as outlined in the task force report, when a review of an SSDP occurs such impact must be documented. In addition, a case must again be made that the gain in value from an SSDP compared to the cost to state supported graduate programs is justified before the SSDP can be continued.

Research

March 23, 2012 4:01 PM

No response at this time.