January 29, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
        Riverside Division

From: Lynda Bell, Chair   *Lynda S. Bell*
        Graduate Council

RE: Graduate Council comments on Proposed Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental
        Tuition (PDST)

Graduate Council discussed the Proposed Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition
(PDST) at its meeting on January 16, 2014. We benefitted from the detailed background provided
to us from our CCGA representative, John Kim, on the current state of discussion at CCGA not
only on this proposed policy but also on the general problems and potential overlap (and
problems differentiating among) state-supported professional degree programs and self-
supporting professional degree programs. We will say more on this general discussion below.

As for the current policy proposal before us, dealing with timelines and procedures for setting and
altering professional degree supplemental tuition, Graduate Council members did not have much
to say. We queried our members who are faculty in UCR's professional schools and they assured
us that faculty do not really "care" much about these fee-setting processes; rather, they stressed,
these are issues about which deans care a great deal, tending not to like too much regulation from
above. By and large, however, the bulk of opinion expressed at the Graduate Council meeting is
that centralized regulation of such fees is necessary and important, and that the financial aid
aspects of the procedures is especially important to monitor.

Subsequently, John Kim, our CCGA representative also provided us with a summary of recent,
point-by-point commentary on some aspects of the proposal at CCGA, as well as with an
interlaced discussion of the currently circulating policy on SSP's that the discussion seems to
have spawned. We provide these points here for your advice and note that Graduate Council
supports these as well.

1. PDST Implementation Protocols (p. 1, Item I.B.): Require the President to notify the
    Academic Senate before changes can be made to the implementation protocols.

2. PDST Implementation Protocols (p. 9, Item VIII.B): Require the President to consult with
    the Academic Senate when deciding if a regular academic program can become a PDP.

3. SSP Policy (Section H): The CCGA calls for clearer wording for a PDP's conversion to an
    SSP. It requests the following wording: "Converting an existing state-funded program to
    SSGPDP [a.k.a. SSP] is regarded as exceptional. Special justifications must be given for a

conversion application to be approved. For example, clear and overwhelming evidence must be provided to demonstrate that the existing state-funded model is no longer feasible or has unduly restricted the development of the program."

4. SSP Policy (Section O): Make the financial models for PDPs and SSPs more alike, such that SSPs must also pay a financial aid "tax."

5. SSP Policy (Section O): If item 3 above is not feasible, then SSPs should at least be required to collect the same accessibility data as is currently proposed for PDPs.

Finally, to be perfectly frank, we spent most of the time at our meeting on the general problem of proliferating documents regarding SSP's and PDP's, and the growing inability for all of us to differentiate between them adequately so as to have meaningful, productive discussion. Increasingly, Graduate Council members find it difficult to interpret exactly what is going on and to what issues we should (or should not) be paying specific attention. Thus, we wish to say emphatically at this point that we would value an overarching policy document on all issues regarding PDP's and SSP's from the Academic Planning Council (which Dean Childers assures us should be forthcoming in March).